



5.30.12


Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Purchased by the Hamill Missionary Fund.

Division DT878
Section Z9C6
v. 1



2 vols 7/6




Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

THE
RUIN OF ZULULAND.

VOL. I.





BISHOP COLENZO.



“Sobantu,” 1882.

“It has been terrible to see this great wave of wickedness rolling on, and to be powerless to help it—to be debarred all possibility of showing the injustice of the war until it was too late—too late to prevent the shedding of innocent blood, and the ravaging of a whole country—too late to save the lives of 2000 of our own soldiers and natives, and of 10,000 patriotic Zulus—too late to prevent the name of Englishman from becoming, in the Native mind, the synonym for duplicity, treachery, and violence, instead of, as in the days gone by, for truth and justice and righteousness.”

Bishop Colenso.



THE
RUIN OF ZULULAND:

AN ACCOUNT OF
BRITISH DOINGS IN ZULULAND SINCE
THE INVASION OF 1879.

BY
FRANCES ELLEN COLENZO.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

BEING A SEQUEL TO
THE HISTORY OF THE ZULU WAR,
BY
FRANCES ELLEN COLENZO
AND
LIEUT.-COLONEL EDWARD DURNFORD.

VOLUME I.
(WITH PORTRAIT OF BISHOP COLENZO.)

LONDON:
WILLIAM RIDGWAY, 169, PICCADILLY.
1884.



P R E F A C E .

IN continuation of such attempts as I have made to tell the English world a little of the truth concerning England's dealings, through her representatives, with the inhabitants of these far-away lands of ours in South Africa, I now put together and record the various events that have taken place since the termination of the Zulu war, having been in a position to learn the facts of the case as gathered by the persistent, conscientious, and disinterested labours of my father, and of my elder sister, who has been closely associated with him in all his labours.

The suggestion that I should undertake the present work was made to me by my father upon the last occasion on which we talked together, on this or any other topic; for I was away from home when he fell ill, a fortnight after, and although I returned at once, it was just too late to see him again.

I have since heard that not only had he spoken, during my absence, with pleased expectancy of my doing this work as he wished it to be done, but that, during the last night of his life, when for a while he was murmuring his thoughts without full consciousness of his surroundings, he had spoken repeatedly of certain papers which he fancied that

he had at hand, saying, "Take them up to Frances; she will do that work;" evidently alluding to what he had given me to do.

My first thought now is to fulfil that wish, the last expressed by him to me. I had already begun to write, according to his desire; and now, although I must finish my task without his help and supervision, it shall not be delayed through fault of mine.

The subject is one, perhaps, to attract but languid attention in England, where so many nearer interests absorb the minds of thinking persons. Yet to those who truly care for England's honour, her character for truth and justice, it should make but little difference whether her name be dragged in the dust by doings at home or abroad. The disgrace, the danger, is the same. Were it a question only of inaugurating a benevolent course of action towards the native races of South Africa, many a good man in England might be found to say, "While such misery exists at home, amongst our own poor, and the kindred race of the sister isle, we should do wrong to expend time, and thought, and care upon distant, alien nations." And, so that the speaker be truly spending himself, and doing his utmost in the good work at home, no one could gainsay him, though even the dogs may eat of the crumbs which fall from the children's table. But the South African question presents no such simple aspect. *Here England has already interfered*, not only unwisely and mistakenly, but cruelly and falsely: she has sowed the wind, and will herself some day

most grievously reap the whirlwind. Hence it is amongst the first duties of every loyal, patriotic English man, ay, and woman too, to learn the truth about these matters, in the hope that, even now, the worst consequences of our misdeeds may be averted from our victims, and the full punishment from ourselves.

My father's interest in the Zulu question, however, sprang from higher motives than even patriotism, and a regard for his country's name and honour. His mission in the world was to follow in the steps of his Master, and to labour for the truth, and for humanity, wherever he saw the need arise. Circumstances only made him the special champion of the African races; wherever it had pleased Providence to place him, there he would have fought the same good fight—there he would have laboured and would have died, as truly he now has died, for the truth against all falsehood, for justice against tyranny, for pity and mercy against cruelty and revenge.

Nor will his work die with him. Our Captain has been summoned home, and God has bidden him rest, but we, and every other member of the little band that has fought with him in the good cause, have yet to earn that sweet repose, and there is more than ever need that we should struggle on, until we, too, like him, shall have done our work.

FRANCES ELLEN COLENZO.

BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL,
June 1884.

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

Page 62, *in notis*.—After “forgiven” add “although condoned.”

The words quoted on page 158 are from an article by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.

The photograph of the Bishop was taken at Durban, Natal, in 1882, by Mr. B. Kisch.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN this book was commenced it was thought certain that early in the Session of Parliament which is now drawing to a close, attention would be vigorously directed to the miserable circumstances of the Zulu people and of their King. Cetshwayo was still alive; but the success of the well-trained bands of Zibebu, disciplined, armed, and led by Europeans, had left the National party, deprived at a stroke of many leading chiefs and warriors, hampered by the tyranny in the Reserve and by the displeasure of the Natal Government, little to hope from their own efforts.

So at least it appeared even to those who knew of the gallant stand made by Mnyamana, and were aware of the widespread loyalty to the National cause in Zululand—a loyalty which showed itself even among the most passive of the Zulus of the Reserve. It was felt then that a stringent and independent inquiry into the truth of the representations upon which the Colonial Office and local officials had based their conduct was urgently needed if the country was to be saved from utter ruin, and its government placed upon a healthy footing.

Circumstances which could not be controlled have

prevented the more rapid completion of this book, and in publishing a first volume only it is desirable to say that while the history of the last year of strife in Zululand must necessarily supply some of the data upon which any decision affecting the future of the country can be based, the following pages will afford a clue for unravelling the whole of the disastrous policy of which the late King and the flower of his nation have been the victims. Or at least, if no definite conclusions can be formed from the evidence here presented, it will appear that the strongest possible case has been established for the appointment of the much-needed Commission of Inquiry.

The main point to be borne in mind is that, in each case of South African disaster connected with Natal, the evil has been wrought by the same means, and that the same persons (or class of persons) are responsible for them. Hasty or arbitrary action on the part of Government officials, assisted by the land-hunger and contempt for the coloured races of a certain noisy faction amongst the colonists, has invariably been the first agent. The evil passions thereby engendered have then wrought up all concerned into a state of mind in which nothing but the absolute submission of the black race seems endurable. At this point were Natal able to govern herself, and strong enough to make her own wars, much high-handed injustice and some ruthless deeds would occur, but an enormous amount of official duplicity and pages

of official fiction would be spared.* England does not choose that the colonies over which she has still some control should manage their affairs after the old-fashioned manner of some of the early settlers in the New World, with whom might was the only right, and to whom the coloured inhabitants of the lands around them were wild beasts to be hunted down, or tamed into household drudges if possible. The English nation demands, whatever her alternate Governments may do, that any war with the aborigines in which she spends her treasure and her blood shall be a righteous war, necessary for the protection of her colonies, and *necessary* in the strict sense of the word—not merely “expedient” according to the modern use of the expression, which is in its nature unchristian and unholy. Therefore when a British colony and her officials desire to rob or wrong their coloured neighbours or subjects, they must first make out a good case against their intended victims for the Colonial Office at home to give to the British public; and this necessity is the origin of the most curious mass of misstatements, imaginary premises, and false deductions, ever laid upon the table of the Houses of Parliament. A small case of wrong takes but a few pages to make it sound right, a greater one may take volumes; but the means in every case are the same. It is a black national catalogue as far back as it has been

* This is not intended as an argument in favour of responsible government.

traced in this portion of South Africa, and the list may be made out as follows:—

1. *Matshana*, 1858.—A native chief enticed by Natal Government officials to a friendly interview, and then treacherously attacked, and many of his unarmed followers slain, though the attempt to seize the chief himself failed. This little transaction was so adjusted in the official reports that for sixteen years the real facts were concealed, though they elicited very severe reproof from Lord Carnarvon in 1875.

2. *Langalibalele*, 1873.—War declared, and H.M.'s troops sent out, against this chief on false pretences. Manipulated despatches might have successfully smoothed this matter over, had not the late Bishop of Natal by this time obtained an insight into the native policy of Natal, and added his true words to those of official fiction. The expedition and subsequent iniquitous proceedings were condemned in England, but the innocent tribe was already dispersed, many members of it killed, and the chief condemned to lifelong banishment at Capetown, where, after eleven years, he still remains a broken-hearted captive, in spite of many promises held out for his release.

3. *Putini Tribe*, 1873.—This tribe was attacked at the same time as that of Langalibalele, and their cause championed by the Bishop. In this case the late Colonel Durnford, R.E., also interfered with official fiction. Whereas there was no real charge against Langalibalele, there was not, as Lord Carnarvon satisfied himself, the shadow of a charge against the Putini tribe, and in this case, through

Colonel Durnford's influence, the Natal officials were obliged by England *partially* to undo their work*—the only case on record.

4. *Annexation of the Transvaal.*—Whether or no the Boers are fit to rule themselves or, which matters more, to rule others, there can be no doubt that we temporarily obtained possession of that white elephant, their country, in a very dishonest fashion. Official fiction in this instance was such as could hardly be surpassed. But, the Boers being able to make their case known for themselves, England acted towards them as no doubt she would towards the natives were they able to speak for themselves; and in this case official fiction finally lost the day, though not without great loss to us, and untold misery to the natives.

5. *Sikukuni's Country.*—Here official romance has had its full swing almost unmolested. The land is too far away: "the dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty." But we know this much, at all events, that one of our excuses for annexing the Transvaal was the war between the Boers and Sikukuni's people, and our (supposed) wish to save the latter. And we know that we then prosecuted that war ourselves; that Sir Garnet Wolseley blew up as many of Sikukuni's men, women, and children as the 50 or 70 lbs. of gun-cotton at his disposal could reach; that our Swazi

* A small proportion of the value of the possessions of which they had been stripped, *without even a shadow of a reason*, was ordered to be restored to them. By no means the whole of that have they ever received.

auxiliaries butchered a great many more ; and that the remainder, with their country, were handed over to—the Boers!

6. *The Disputed Territory* (between Boers and Zulus).—Here official truth, represented by Colonel Durnford, R.E., stepped to the front,* and for once a threatening matter was quietly and justly settled without the loss of a drop of blood, or the oppression of a single human being. But this was an innovation which was not to become a rule, and there followed fast upon it, sweeping away its results at a stroke—

7. *The Zulu War*.—This important incident may be divided into three periods, the first of which is that treated of in a previous work, ‘The History of the Zulu War.’† Here official fiction, under the able management of Sir Bartle Frere, wrought up a situation—peaceful as far as the Zulus were concerned, though complicated by our strained relations with the Boers—into the appearance of urgent necessity for an army of defence. This, being granted by England, was speedily employed for offence, and

* Three Commissioners decided this matter, of whom Colonel Durnford was one. He alone is mentioned as representing the official truth, because of the other two, one (Mr. J. Shepstone) is the man chiefly concerned in case No. 1, and convicted by Sir G. Colley of treacherous conduct towards Matshana ; and the other, Mr. Galwey, himself confessed, in the Natal Legislative Council of December 1880, that the “Ultimatum” which caused the Zulu war was “the joint production of himself and Sir Bartle Frere.”

† By Frances Ellen Colenso and Lieutenant-Colonel Edward Durnford.

brought about one of the most needless and disastrous campaigns that ever disgraced our British arms—a campaign in which honour was reaped, with very few exceptions, only by the dead, though *honours* have, in modern fashion, been sprinkled far and wide amongst survivors. This period, as far as Zululand is concerned, belongs to the history of the past. There are few now beyond the personal supporters of those who brought about the Zulu war, and some few of the “noisy faction” amongst the colonists already mentioned, who will maintain that the British invasion of Zululand in 1879 was either just, necessary, or “expedient,” even in the modern sense of the word. And for those few whom published facts have not convinced already, further information would be in vain.

Passing on we come to the second period, of which this volume treats, and during which persistent efforts have been made to prevent the restoration of Cetshwayo, and to justify, to a certain extent, the authors of our invasion of 1879. Whether sufficient proof has been given of the action of official fiction in it, our readers must determine for themselves.

There remains only the third period, the year 1883, in which the same means have been used to make it appear that the restoration of Cetshwayo was an error, that the exposers of official fiction during the second period were in the wrong, the Zulu King’s slanderers and ill-wishers in the right, and the Zulu people unfriendly to his rule.

It will be our task in the ensuing volume to show

that official fiction, as before, has produced this wretched state of things, and that it is not even yet too late to take a new departure, to find out the real feelings and wishes of the Zulu people, and to act upon the discovery with justice, mercy, and success. Had the restoration of Cetshwayo been carried out in the kind and honest spirit in which it was conceived, long ere this the misery of Zululand would have been over, and England would have been saved a great addition to the terrible responsibilities and disgrace which have burdened her concerning it since the beginning of 1879.

CONTENTS.



CHAPTER I.

Irresponsibility of the persons designated "responsible authorities," 2—Sir G. Wolseley's settlement, 3—He reverses the Boundary Award, 4-5—Zibebu, 6—Hlubi, 7—Treatment of royal house, 8-9—The Zulu nation is not consulted, 10—Its voice stifled, 11—The Zulus abandon figurative language, 12—Their deputations, 13—Official fictions, 14-15—The truth incredible, 16.

CHAPTER II.

The first deputation, 17—Cetshwayo's family, 18—Medicine for him, 19—Official reply, 20—Interview with Attorney-General, 21—Charges against Cetshwayo met and refuted, 22-3—The "war-cloud hovering on the border," 24—Marriage law, 25—The Bishop's advice, 26—Death-bed tribute to Cetshwayo's worth, 27—The second deputation, 28—Official reply, 29—Courage and devotion of Zulu emissaries, 30—Seven kinglets plead for the King, 31—Fatal message to Sir H. Bulwer, 32—Discredited Government messengers, 33—Futile application for passes, 34—The third deputation: Zulu figurative language, 36-7—Resident's pass indispensable, 38—Zulus wish to join the King, 39—Oppression by Zibebu, 40—Slaughter by J. Dunn, 41-4—His conduct approved, 45—Sir E. Wood visits Zululand, 46-7—Alleged repudiation of Zulu deputation, 48-9—Sir E. Wood addresses the Zulus, 50-1—Zulu loyalty outraged, 52—Effect of meeting, 53.

CHAPTER III.

Cetshwayo in captivity, 55—His quarters, 56—News of his home, 57—His people's fidelity, 58—Sir B. Frere, 59—Cetshwayo petitions for freedom, 60—His prayer refused, 61—Cetshwayo's corroboration of his chiefs' testimony, 62-3—Learns to sign his name, 64—His amusements and visitors, 65—Intended location of him with Langalibalele, 66-8—Cetshwayo offers a hostage, 68—The Bishop's letter to Sir G. Colley, 68—The letters patent, 69—Inconvenient questions, 70—Loyalty punished, 71—Trouble foreseen, 71-2.

CHAPTER IV.

Alleged repudiation of messengers, 73—The “categorical denials,” 74-5—Resident’s attitude, 77—Repudiation suggested, 80—Sir E. Wood’s valediction, 81—Seketwayo staunch, 82—The letters patent, 83—Their probative force, 84—Loyalty punished, 71—Thank-offerings, 86—Chiefs wish to join the King, 87—Interview at Government House, 88—The chiefs censured, 91.

CHAPTER V.

Effect of Sir E. Wood’s visit, 92—Zibebu’s raids, 94—Maduna’s young men retaliate, 96—Murder by white freebooter, 97—Raid by Zibebu, 98—Cetshwayo’s millet, 99—The Princes ordered under J. Dunn, 100—Mnyamana’s devotion, 102—Royal women insulted at the Resident’s, 103—Are housed, 104—Influence in Zululand of official views, 105—Official report upon deputation, 106—Criticised and condemned, 108-9—Real Zulu opinion elicited by the Bishop, 110—Expression thereof stifled by the Government, 112—The Bishop’s inquiry burked, 114—Zulus misrepresented, 115—The steadfast three wait at Bishopstowe, 116-7—Are plunged into despair by telegram, 118—The real telegram, 120—Official treatment of the Bishop, 121—The Native Affairs Office and Bishopstowe, 122-3—“Niggers” and yokels, 124—Leave to stay at Bishopstowe, 126—Pleasant prospects, 127—Justice for the King, 128—The Resident gracious, 129—His responsibility for oppression in Zululand, 130-1—Embarkation of chiefs for Capetown, 132—Misleading reply in council, 133—Alleged repudiation explained, 134-5.

CHAPTER VI.

Disgraceful insult to Zulu chiefs, 136-7—The Bishop addresses Sir E. Wood, 138-41—The Sitimela butchery, 142-7—Mr. Nunn’s apology for Hamu’s misdeeds, 148-51—Excesses of Zulus and British in warfare, 152-3—The massacre of the Aba Qulusi, 154-5—Breaches of conditions by appointed chiefs, 156-7—The Bishop’s Digest, 158.

CHAPTER VII.

The fifth or Great Deputation, 159—Recapitulation, 160—Intentions of Home Government, 161—Representative character of deputation, 162—Its object misrepresented, 163—Application for pass, 164—The pass denied, 165—Composition of deputation, 166—2000 Zulus enter Natal unarmed, 167—Their devotion, 168—Application to Resident, 169—Sir H. Bulwer’s suspicions, 170—The Bishop’s disclaimers, 171—Blindness of the Governor, 173, 183—A wild despatch, 174—The Governor’s informers, 175—Hopeless prejudice, 177—Self-restraint of loyal Zulus,

178—The Bishop's advice, 179—His letter to Lord Derby, 184—The Zulus and Bishopstowe, 185—The deputation approaches the city, 186—Their blameless conduct, 187—Passes indispensable, 188—But not procurable, 189—Further interview with Resident, 190—Zulu prayer stifled, 191—Earnest appeal for a hearing, 192—The Resident accused to his face, 193—Sir H. Bulwer's displeasure, 194—Mr. J. Shepstone deputed to hear Zulus, 195—Deputation referred back to Zululand Residency, 196—The peril incurred by the 2000, 197—They defend their language, 198—Mr. Osborn again meets them, 199—Preparations for return, 200—J. Dunn arrives on scene, 201—His tyranny, 202—He is confronted with his chiefs before Governor, 203—Tax money, 205—J. Dunn convicted, 206—The Governor's decision, 207—J. Dunn's remedy against disaffection, 208—His yoke intolerable, 209—Zulu feeling attributed to Bishop's advice, 210—The Governor disbelieves the Bishop, 212.

CHAPTER VIII.

Sir H. Bulwer's reception of Zulu appeals, 213—He directs his attention to grievances of little moment to Zulus, except as affecting the King's return, 214-7—Instances of his exclusion of a forbidden topic, 218-9—The Zulus turn homeward in peril of destruction, 220-1—The purposes of the demonstration, 222—The grounds for Sir H. Bulwer's conduct, 223—Zulus duly report themselves, 224—Their strict attention to form of no avail, 226-7—Two versions of Zulu speeches compared, 228-9—The Bishop's sound knowledge of the Zulu tongue, 230-2—List of his Zulu works, 232—The categorical denials, 233—Official method of learning the truth, 234-5—Helpless position of loyal Zulus under frowns of Government, 236-7—Choice of three chiefs for Capetown, 238-9—Official hypothesis tells against Government, 239-40—The Bishop's letters of June 1882, 241-3, 246-7—The Governor's reply, 244—Comments thereon, 245—Courtesy and patient explanation thrown away, 248-9.

CHAPTER IX.

Trip to Zululand abandoned by Governor, 250—Cetshwayo's visit to England, 252—His letters to Mr. Gladstone, 253—and to Lord Kimberley, 254—Effect thereof, 255—Sir H. Robinson's sympathy, 256—The King's letters, 257—Supplicates the Government on behalf of his family, 258-9—His petition neglected, 260—"English falsehood," 261—Report on King's family, 262—The visit delayed, 264—Legal difficulties, 265—Official estimate of Cetshwayo's character, 266-7—Law officers consulted, 268—Act of Cape Legislature refused, 269—The King's word taken, 270—Fresh difficulties, 271—Choice of a custodian, 272—Mr. H. Shepstone, 273—The King's letter to him, 274—Does not justify the choice, 275—Cetshwayo deprived of a devoted

friend, 276-7—A crisis in his fate, 278—Choice of an interpreter, 279—A cruel interference, 280—Sir H. Robinson pleads for the King, 281—A painful interview, 282—"An ant in a pond of water," 283—Cetshwayo's affection for his family, 284—The Governor's hobby, 285—Cetshwayo's letters, 286—The Governor misled, 287—Patience of Zulu nation, 288—The Governor requested to report, 289—Lord Kimberley, waiting in vain, sanctions Cetshwayo's voyage, 290-1—The unchecked machinations of Cetshwayo's foes, 292-3.

APPENDIX.

- (A.) Suppression of Second and Third Deputations, 295.
- (B.) Official and Zulu accounts of interviews between Mr. Osborn and Great Deputation analysed and compared, 301.
- (C.) The Bishop of Natal's letter to Lord Derby, 338.
- (D.) Letter to Lord Derby from the Bishop's son, 357.
- (E.) The Bishop of Natal's Conditions for Cetshwayo's Restoration, 358.
- (F.) Remarks thereon, and upon a recent article in the *Saturday Review*, 362.

INDEX, 373.

THE RUIN OF ZULULAND.

CHAPTER I.

SOME four years ago, a volume was published by the present author (assisted by Lieut.-Colonel Edward Durnford) under the title of the 'History of the Zulu War,' in which a passage occurs, so pertinent to the present state of things in this part of South Africa, and so prophetic of the complete failure of all subsequent efforts to put South African troubles to rest, that no better text for an exposition of the circumstances with which we are now concerned could be found than the following paragraph, taken from pp. 87 and 88 of the above-mentioned work (2nd edition):—

“And, further, we must protest against the spirit of the last sentence of Lord Carnarvon's despatch on the subject,* in which he expresses his 'earnest hope that his' (Colonel Colley's) 'report will be received by all parties to this controversy in the spirit which is to be desired, and be accepted as a final settlement of a dispute which cannot be prolonged without serious prejudice to public interests, and without a renewal of those resentments which, for the good of the community—English as well as native—had best be put to rest.'”

* The inquiry by Colonel Colley into the treacherous attempt to capture a native chief, made by Mr. John Shepstone in 1858.

A dislocated joint must be replaced, or the limb cannot otherwise be pressed down into shape and 'put to rest,' a thorn must be extracted, not skinned over and left in the flesh; and as, with the dislocation unreduced, or the thorn unextracted, the human frame can never recover its healthful condition, so it is with the state with an unrighted wrong, an unexposed injustice. The act of treachery towards Matshana, hidden for many years, looked upon by its perpetrators as a matter past and gone, has tainted all our native policy since—unknown to most English people in Natal or at home, and has finally borne bitter fruit in the present unhappy condition of native affairs."

When these words were written it was hardly imagined possible that, after the complete exposure then made of the evils of Natal native policy, and the untrustworthiness of the politicians concerned, the same course could longer be pursued. Yet now, four years later, the identical words might be used, and would rightly be aimed at the very same persons; and it would thus be no exaggeration to say that men who have once safely placed themselves under the sheltering wing of official employment may almost look upon themselves as irresponsible beings, who may commit what enormities they please without the smallest chance of dismissal or disgrace, however plainly misdeeds may be proved against them.

An account of what has taken place in Zululand, since the so-called "settlement" of that country by Sir Garnet Wolseley, up to the present date, is all that is required to fully illustrate the above remarks, while the truth of the tale will be made clearly manifest by the class of evidence offered, and the care with which it has been sifted and recorded.

In the concluding chapter of the 'History of the Zulu War,' quoted from above, the remark occurs that for once in the history of Natal, all classes, from whatever widely differing motives, were united in condemnation of Sir Garnet Wolseley's "Settlement of Zululand." Since that time a few ingenious individuals have been very persistent in assuring the public that the success of the said settlement *would have been* perfect if only a few other people had thought and acted otherwise than as they did. But it did not escape the observation of thinking persons, that there must be some inherent instability in a political "settlement" which could be entirely upset by the disapproval of one or two private persons. It has long been plain, in fact, that the "if" on which depended the wisdom of Sir Garnet Wolseley's plan was of very large dimensions, and that it included an entire change in the disposition and desires of the Zulu people, in the character of their king, and in all the main events of the preceding years with regard to Zululand.

The "settlement" itself was made indeed with all Sir Garnet Wolseley's habitual promptitude, and entire indifference to the result of his actions beyond the immediate present. In perfect keeping with the age of which he is the popular idol, his work is *never meant to last*; and his decisions were received at the moment by the Zulus with that half-stunned acquiescence which was natural in their crushed and vanquished state. They were in no position to make objections, however hard might be the condi-

tions of peace imposed upon them. And so, Sir Garnet Wolseley, having first arbitrarily cut off and given to the Transvaal the greater portion of that part of Zululand which England had justly restored to the Zulus immediately before she went to war with them, proceeded, as arbitrarily, to divide what remained into thirteen portions, and to set up a kinglet over each. No official notice has ever been taken of the first named action, although, perhaps, modern history contains no record of a more truly insolent act on the part of any one man than this. In 1878 England had, through her representative, Sir Henry Bulwer, and with the sanction of the High Commissioner, Sir Bartle Frere, appointed three commissioners to examine into the rival claims of the Transvaal Boers and the Zulus to a considerable strip of land which lay between their countries, and which had been in dispute between them for nearly seventeen years. During this time as many as eighteen messages were received from the Zulus by the Natal Government, wherein the latter were entreated to investigate the matter, and to judge between the Zulus and the Boers. The Boundary Commission of 1878 was the tardy result of these appeals, and the consequent decision in favour of the Zulus, with the grounds on which it was formed, was too palpably just and straightforward to admit of any doubt. A full account of these proceedings may be found at pp. 141-162 of the 'History of the Zulu War,' but for our present purposes it is only necessary to say that the commissioners, after long and careful

investigations, decided that the disputed territory rightfully belonged, solely and entirely, to the Zulus, and that the Transvaal had no claim at all upon any portion of it whatever,* although they recommended that the Zulu king should be requested to accept compensation for a certain part on which the white intruders had lived long enough to create a certain claim. This decision, arrived at by the commissioners, was accepted by Sir Henry Bulwer and (although unwillingly) by Sir Bartle Frere, and the latter's "award," in accordance with it, was formally delivered to the Zulus on Dec. 11, 1878. Two hours later the British "Ultimatum," followed on Jan. 4, by the British declaration of war, turned the said "award" into the hollow farce which some, though very certainly not all, of those concerned in the matter, had intended from the first. Nevertheless, from the moment that award was delivered the territory in question became, by England's own decision, as little disputed territory as Ulundi itself, and, therefore, after Sir Garnet's positive assurance to the Zulus, when the war was over, that although their country now belonged to the Queen of England, yet she would not take it from them, it was no more at his disposal than was any other part. Yet with reckless and ignorant disregard of the commissioners' labours, and of England's word, Sir

* The Boer claim rested solely on alleged cessions from the Zulus, and the decision of the commissioners was that "there has been no cession of land at all by the Zulu kings, past or present, or by the nation."

Garnet Wolseley drew a hasty finger across the map, and made over the greater portion of what once had been the disputed territory to the British Crown, as he intended, but, as a little later it turned out, in reality to the Transvaal Boers. This arrangement over, he proceeded, as we have said, to divide what remained of Zululand into thirteen unequal portions, and to set up a kinglet over each. John Dunn came first, of course—the clever way in which he had secured every possible benefit and kindness from the Zulu king, and had then done his best to betray him into the hands of his enemies, especially commending him to our favourable notice. He brought, in his hand as it were, Zibebu, a man whom he had indoctrinated, on whom he could depend to turn against his own king and cousin, and to crouch to the English, and of whom Sir Garnet Wolseley writes, “Zibebu, I am told, is of a time-serving disposition.” Yet this very man was one of the few Zulus against whom the English had some just cause of offence. He it was who, contrary to the orders of Cetshwayo and the other Zulu chiefs, fired at some of Lord Chelmsford’s soldiers, who were bathing, or taking their horses to drink at the Imfolozi, *during a three days’ truce*, which act led to the catastrophe of Ulundi. This incident is given by the *Times of Natal* (Government organ) thus: “At the Imfolozi, with his own hand, he (Zibebu) shot two men of the invading force, and did his utmost, with his followers, to dispute the crossing of that river;” but the actual facts of the case as given above are well known to

the Zulus themselves. So estimable a character as Zibebu, and one so highly commended by John Dunn, was sure to obtain reward, and he became another kinglet. Hlubi, the Basuto chief, was a third. His appointment showed even more than his usual sagacity, on Sir Garnet Wolseley's part. The Natal Basutos—of the same race though long separated from the inhabitants of Basutoland—well deserved some recognition and reward from Government for their faithful and gallant assistance throughout the late war, and it was impossible to pass them over. Yet it would displease the colonists were they to be given land in Natal, while any other form of reward would be expensive; and after the reckless waste and extravagance of the last nine months Sir Garnet Wolseley's orders were to study economy, apparently down to the least coin that could be saved on the compensation lists for the dead soldiers' kit, lost in the gutted camp of Isandhlwana. It was, therefore, a happy thought to give them a part of Zululand. The facts that even before the war, there was no good feeling between the Zulus and Basutos, and that the latter, since the death of their much-loved leader, Colonel Durnford, R.E., had nursed very bitter feelings against the people over whom they were to rule, were, it seems, hardly worth the notice of Sir Garnet Wolseley. Nor does he appear to have been influenced by the recollection of his own words, delivered to the Zulu people on July 14, 1879: "The English have no intention of annexing any portion"

(of the Zulu country) ; and again, at Ulundi, on the 1st of September, that the Queen had “no intention of depriving the Zulus ” of their land, although to the Zulu mind the nice distinction between “annexing ” a country for ourselves, and making it over to our allies, between “depriving ” them of their land, and allowing them to live upon it only on condition that they submitted to the authority of a perfectly alien people, might hardly be so plain as it appears to have been to that of England’s General.

These three specimens of the care with which the thirteen kinglets were selected, principally by John Dunn’s advice, form a fair sample of the wisdom shown in the whole arrangement, while it is impossible to find a consistent basis for it other than an intention to get rid of our next door neighbours after the fashion of the Kilkenny cats.

In this “settlement ” none of the king’s immediate relatives were treated with the smallest consideration, except Hamu, who had deserted him early in the war, and therefore received a chieftainship, while the principal brother, Maduna, with another Ziweddu, and Cetshwayo’s young son, Dinuzulu, were left under *the authority of Zibebu*, who used it in the most galling manner, with, apparently, the full approval of the Natal authorities.* The very existence, politically speaking, of the young prince was ignored, nor was any provision whatever made for

* The grounds for this assertion will be given further on, when the ill-treatment of the king’s family by Zibebu is recounted.

the destitute royal family, stripped as they were, not only of all power, but of their very means of support, which was left to the charity of their former subjects. There is actually no mention made of them in any of Sir Garnet Wolseley's despatches, or in his "instructions" either to the commissioner who marked out the boundaries of the new territories, or to the British Resident in Zululand, beyond one remark to the latter upon the desirability of collecting "the king's brothers, except Oham" (Hamu),* under the eye of John Dunn, (the man of all others towards whom their feelings must have been most bitter).

This, however, was in keeping with Sir Garnet Wolseley's most futile policy of humiliating Cetshwayo, and bringing him and his dynasty into contempt with the Zulu people, the keynote of which was struck when the General forgot the courtesy of a gentleman, and the respect due from a generous soldier to a brave, though conquered enemy, and refused to see the captured Zulu king at Ulundi, or to treat him with the respect due to rank. † Having thus crushed the Zulu nation beneath his iron heel, Sir Garnet Wolseley passed on to find fresh fields for his favourite occupation of creating a striking effect, warranted to last just as long as the world cares to look before turning to the next new thing. The usual subsequent collapse

* C. 2482, p. 280.

† "Cetshwayo," says the interpreter attached to the force, "who appreciates nicely the courtesies due to rank—as those who knew him tell me—felt this keenly."

occurred this time somewhat sooner than was expected, and certain inconveniently honest persons made it their business to prolong public attention till the illuminated word "success," following ever at Sir Garnet's heels, and displayed at the close of each exploit, began to flicker out, and to reveal the black and dismal waste beneath.

The "Settlement"—after making which Sir Garnet Wolseley writes, "I am now so confident of the thorough pacification of the country, that I am of opinion that one British Resident will suffice, and that a body of native armed attendants, fifty in number, will be all the men that need be assigned for service under him"—was about the last which was likely to produce the effect desired by those who had decreed Cetshwayo's downfall, namely, that of reconciling the Zulus to his loss, to a new order of things, and to the extinction of their existence as a nation capable of asserting their rights, the fear of which has, for more than thirty years, been the pet bugbear of Natal, *although unsupported during that time by one single instance of Zulu aggression upon British subjects.* In face of the empty and hypocritical assurances of British good-will towards the Zulu people, which first appeared in Sir Bartle Frere's "notification," of January 11, 1879.—"The British Government has no quarrel with the Zulu people"—and frequently repeated throughout the war, found its further expression in Sir Garnet Wolseley's address to the Natal native chiefs on June 30th, "Our war is not against the Zulu people"—and again

to the Zulu chiefs of the coast district on July 19th—in face of all such fine-sounding sentiments, the settlement, which was supposed to be a final one, was forced upon the people without the very smallest attention to what might be their own feelings and ideas; but was recklessly and harshly planted althwart all their long-cherished national sentiments, and deep-rooted prejudices. This was made only the more apparent by the affectation of respecting “the ancient laws and usage” of the country which was paraded for the benefit of the newspapers, and the British public. Within six months the Zulus made their first half-blind attempt at a national petition for their king’s return, and the attempt was repeated again and again during the two following years, each time with fresh experience won by failure. These efforts were made under circumstances of extreme difficulty, for the men through whom alone they could communicate officially with the authorities at home, from first to last did their very utmost to suppress the Zulu embassies and to silence the people’s prayer. When this was no longer possible, and the voice of the vanquished nation had penetrated to England’s ears, these same obstructions to, rather than channels for, official information, denied the reality of the prayer, and tried to explain away its meaning; and finally, when that attempt had also failed, they declared that it proceeded, not from the Zulu nation at large, but from a small and turbulent faction, and *that it was instigated by the Bishop of Natal!* The Zulu chiefs learnt many strange lessons at this time.

They learnt to make open use of their king's name, against the custom and etiquette of their land, because, if they prayed for his return under any of the customary figurative expressions, they found that their having asked for him at all was denied, while other forms of euphuistic phrase, with which their language teems, must be curtailed lest they should be pinned to the letter of what they had said by those who were on the look out for every chance of throwing obstacles in their way. Their figurative forms of speech were perfectly understood by some at least of the officials to whom they were addressed, and the Zulus were well aware of the fact, and that in many cases misunderstanding was feigned in order to baffle them, and to gain time on the other side. A noble lesson, truly, for Englishmen to teach the simple savage, and one quite consistent with the "English falsehood" which, alas! has passed into a proverb amongst them now. Nothing but the truest devotion to their exiled king—loving and personal loyalty such as is hardly to be found now-a-days except as a savage virtue—and with it a child-like faith in the one living man whom they had found to be uniformly just and true, the Bishop of Natal, "Sobantu" (the father of the people), could have upheld them through the long course of disheartening repulse and delay, of weary journeyings backwards and forwards to which they were perpetually condemned (nominally on account of trifling and unavoidable breaches of official etiquette), of misrepresentation, and of reproof, or even actual punish-

ment for persisting in their prayer. Sometimes a faint-hearted one amongst them would succumb before the manifold threats and trials to which they were subjected, and, by unsaying or denying their words, would give a little triumph to the foe. Or, again, some one who was staunch enough at heart, and had no intention of relinquishing the common object in the end, would yet take a lesson of ingenuity from ourselves, and contrive to evade the consequences of official wrath by ambiguous replies of which the most would be made in the next Blue-Book. But the body of the people remained firm, and the last deputation of all, which was refused an audience at Maritzburg because they had left Zulu-land without that permission from the British Resident which they had asked for repeatedly in vain, numbered with attendants, about 2,000 persons, amongst whom were representatives of nearly all the chief families in the land, including several of the appointed chiefs.

A short account of the Zulu deputations on behalf of Cetshwayo, upon preventing, concealing and explaining away the object of which so much official ingenuity has been bestowed, is necessary here to make our final purpose clear. And it may be as well to encounter beforehand an objection which is sure to arise in the minds of many of our readers, namely, how is it *possible* that so many English officials, men chosen, presumably, for superior qualities, since they are to be entrusted in their different degrees with their country's name and

honour, should one after another, or one and all, act in so unjust, insincere and unchristian a manner as we describe? Unhappily, where one object, that of self-interest prevails, all sorts and conditions of men are liable to the same temptations, and a false policy once inaugurated, carries along with it in its sweep, consenting to it, men who would not themselves be capable of *originating* the falsehood, and who would have *preferred* to follow an open and honest course had the "exigencies of the service" permitted. No weed upon the earth has such rapid growth and so great a power of reproduction, or is so hard to kill, as is *a lie*, and a political falsehood is one that will not stand alone, but must needs be bolstered up by a thousand others, perhaps far beyond the intention of the first. So it has been with Zululand, and indeed with all South Africa.

Sir Bartle Frere "invented" the necessity for a Zulu war—the danger of the colony of Natal, the aggressive intentions of our neighbours, and above all the imaginary character of their king—as a bloodthirsty and cruel tyrant, feared and hated by his subjects, who would be thankful to get rid of him. Probably Sir Bartle was not himself aware, at first, how purely imaginary his "invention" was. The Natalians easily *became* alarmed (when he told them that they had cause to be so); our neighbours had the power, and *might*, perhaps, have the will to attack us, while no doubt it was easy enough to find witnesses against Cetshwayo either from personal spite, mere love of gossip, or desire to please the hearer.

When the war was over it was still necessary to maintain the fictions which had been used to bring it about, and by this time there were a large number of persons who for their own credit or interests' sake were bound to do so. Very nearly every official who has since had anything to do with the matter has been earnestly engaged either for the sake of his own credit, or (in the case of subordinates) in obedience to the policy of his chiefs, in supporting this huge and tottering pretence, in keeping white the outside of a sepulchre which yet none can approach without disgust. "Cetshwayo must *not* be released, his people's affection for him must *not* be understood or recognised at home in England. It was unlucky that they really were not rejoiced to lose him, for that would partly have set us right with the world; but at all events, it must not be known that they want to have him back. And surely there can be little difficulty in that! The Zulus have no newspapers, they cannot read or write—Government has but to keep communication between them and England in its own hands in order to keep things straight. Meanwhile the king may die in captivity, or the people may after all forget him, and settle down, or else they may fall to fighting amongst themselves until too few are left to be a subject of anxiety to us. At all events *gain time*, delay is our best trump card."

Belief in some such reasoning as the above is forced upon us by a perusal of the dealings with the Zulu embassies of 1880 to 1883, on the part of the

Government of Natal. Indeed, the chief difficulty in putting before the British public an accurate picture of the treatment of the Zulus in the name of England during the last four years, lies in the fact that the most temperate and moderate report, *if true*, presents such a vision of falsehood and injustice as to appear incredible to the majority of readers, who will not unnaturally be disposed to think that so gloomy a tale must owe something to prejudice and exaggeration on our part. Yet such is not the case; no single incident shall be told by us of the truth of which we have not sadly conclusive proof, and most earnestly do we wish that what we have to tell were more to the credit of our country and our countrymen.

CHAPTER II.

THE first deputation from Zululand on Cetshwayo's behalf reached Bishopstowe upon February 9th, 1880. The party consisted of Umgwazeni, an uncle and devoted friend of the king, the well-known old messenger (between the king and the Natal Government) Umfunzi, and their two attendants. They had been sent by Mnyamana, the late prime minister, Maduna, the king's full brother, three other sons of Umpande, and other great men, amongst them two of the kinglets, or "appointed chiefs," and their errand was to beg that Sobantu (the Bishop of Natal) would inquire for them, and explain to them what had been the faults for which the king had been dethroned. They brought with them "Cetshwayo's Book" which was sent to him by the Queen, being a handsomely bound copy of Sir T. Shepstone's report of the proceedings at Cetshwayo's installation in 1873, and they asked Sobantu to point out in that book the words against which the king had offended, as they knew of none, nor what fault he had committed. The king, they said, had sent the book before to Sobantu, during the war, with a similar request. But when the

messengers reached Krantzkop (on the Natal side of the Tugela), they were turned back by Bishop Schreuder and the Border agent, who told them that "it was of no use to take it to Sobantu, as he could not help them now." In the flight from Ulundi it had been dropped, and lost in the grass, where it had lain until the Great Chiefs, wishing to bring it to Sobantu, sent a large party of men, who had searched for it until they found it.*

The deputation also brought a petition from the Great Chiefs on behalf of Cetshwayo's family, who, they said, were living in great misery and discomfort, and were ill-treated and tyrannised over by Zibebu, in whose territory they had been placed. This chief had himself "eaten up" the cattle which should have supported the king's children (five in number, the family consisting of four little girls besides Dinuzulu and younger than the youth), and he now insisted that the princes, Cetshwayo's brothers, should work for him like common men, and build his kraal, threatening them that if they did not obey him in this respect before the next "moon," he would turn them out of his country altogether. Zibebu was plainly following closely in the lines laid down by Sir G. Wolseley, by doing his utmost to humiliate the unfortunate family of the late king, and amongst other annoyances imposed by him upon them was the command that they should bury all

* The care with which this book had been preserved up to the very last is in itself a proof of Cetshwayo's dutiful feeling towards the English Government.

Cetshwayo's personal effects (the Zulu custom after death), as he was now, to all intents and purposes—dead, and also that in future no Zulu living in his district should swear by Umpanse, or by Cetshwayo, or by Cetshwayo's mother, but by Zibebu, and his father and mother instead. They wished, therefore, to ask the English authorities to give them land as their own to live upon, and they begged Sobantu to tell them whether they would be allowed to come themselves before the Governor, and to make this request to him. What little property the princes still possessed seemed, from the incidental remarks of these men, to be very insecure, since John Dunn, they said, had just sent out an *impi*, on the pretence that the sound of a gun had been heard in a certain direction, which *impi* had taken possession of cattle belonging to the Prince Maduna, which were in charge of a chief resident in that part of the country, although indeed, they added incidentally, John Dunn's people had plenty of guns themselves.

The messengers were advised (by the Bishop) to go and report themselves at the S. N. A.* Office in Maritzburg at once, and to state there that the chiefs were anxious to come down and see the Governor; and to this they gladly agreed. They then mentioned that on their way through Natal they had heard that the king was ill and was in want of a certain native medicine, a root which grew in Natal, but not at the Cape. They had dug some of it up,

* These initials will be used throughout to denote "Secretary for Native Affairs" Office.

and requested the Bishop to convey it to Cetshwayo. On being promised that this should be done if possible, they showed great satisfaction, saying that the fact of their having actually sent medicine to the king would silence those in Zululand who insisted that he was dead.

On returning from the S. N. A. office they said that they had been kindly received, and had not, on this occasion, been reproved for having come to Bishopstowe. They had been given orders for *beef*,* which the butchers had understood to mean *bone*, and had been promised blankets for themselves, and a "word" in a day or two, which they were to take back to the chiefs who sent them.

On Monday, February 16, they got the promised "word" as follows:—"The white authorities did not wish any one to be ill-used or to have his cattle eaten up. It was possible that at some future time the sons of Umpande might become petty chiefs; but it was not intended to distinguish

* It is the practice of the Natal Government to supply messengers sent to them by native chiefs, with certain rations of beef, but as this is done by merely giving them an "order" on one of the town butchers for so many pounds, they never receive anything but very inferior pieces, such as respectable Europeans would not purchase for the table, and certainly not such as Zulus of rank (as the messengers always are) are accustomed to at home. A good-humoured joke on this subject was made by one old messenger who had repeatedly experienced the scant hospitality of the Natal Government, viz.: That he supposed the Amakosi supplied them so frequently with *shin bones* in order to strengthen their legs for the long journeys on foot between Ulundi and Maritzburg.

Maduna in any way, as that house (branch of the family of Umpande, i.e. Cetshwayo's house) was destroyed. Mr. Osborne* was now appointed to live in Zululand. And any complaints which the chiefs wished to make, they should take to him, and he, if he thought proper, would send them on to the authorities."

On the same day they had an interview with Mr. Gallwey,† who called them into his office, and sent for the interpreter from the Magistrate's Court close by, to enable him to communicate with them. The interpreter, when he came, recognised the old messenger, Umfunzi, and asked him if he were not one of the party which appointed Mr. F. E. Colenso to be the king's agent in 1877, to which Umfunzi assented. Mr. Gallwey then urged them, through the interpreter, to make known the real wishes of the Zulus with regard to their future governance; but, although he questioned them unofficially, they appear to have held that it was not their place to speak for the nation; admitting, however, in reply to a suggestion concerning white magistrates, "We, for our part, should not like at all to have many white men, but that is a question for the Great Chiefs to answer."

They were detained two days longer by heavy rains, and then came to take leave of the Bishop,

* The newly-appointed British Resident in Zululand.

† Mr. Gallwey (Attorney-General) was known and regarded with respect by many of the Zulus, as a member of the Commission which gave a just and honest decision in their nation's favour on the question of the Disputed Territory.

and to receive his answer to the question brought to him by them from the chiefs.

“The Great Chiefs,” he said, “ask me what are the crimes of which Cetshwayo is accused. These are the principal charges brought against him by the Governor of Capetown.*

“1. That he armed his whole people with guns, intending to attack either Natal or the Transvaal.

“2. That he ordered out an *impi*, at the time when Sir T. Shepstone annexed the Transvaal, with the intention of making a raid on the Boers, and was only restrained from so doing by Sir T. Shepstone, who had first gone up to the Transvaal ;

“This Zulu army, indeed, never actually existed, the men having merely been told to hold themselves in readiness in case of need ; and the order being withdrawn as soon as Sir Theophilus sent word that he had no need of their services.” A remonstrance made by the late Colonel Durnford, R.E., may have influenced Sir. T. Shepstone’s declining Zulu assistance. “It were better,” he said, “that our little band of Englishmen here in Pretoria should fall to a man by the hands of the Boers than that aught should be done by us to bring about a war of races.”—‘A Soldier’s Life in South Africa,’ p. 154.

“3. That in 1876 he killed ‘many hundreds of girls and their relations,’ because they would not marry old men at his orders.

“4. That he was always killing people without trial, and for trifling faults or for none at all.

“5. That on account of these things he was disliked, and even hated, by the Zulu people,

* The name by which Sir Bartle Frere is known to the Zulus.

especially by the common people, who were always being killed; so that the Zulus obeyed him only from fear, and rejoice to-day at being freed from his bloodthirsty and cruel rule.

“These are not my words,” concluded Sobantu, “but those of the Governor of Capetown, which have weighed heavily upon Cetshwayo, and crushed him.”

“We deny it,” said they, “we deny it utterly.”

They then went through the charges one by one, denying or explaining them in the following manner.

1. The buying of guns—that was John Dunn’s doing. It was he who persuaded the king to arm his people in this manner; it was John Dunn who did this, who imported large numbers of guns into the country, and insisted upon the people purchasing them from him with cattle. Now that these guns are demanded from them, the people are crying against him. “Where are our cattle? We did not want these weapons of yours; we did not know anything about them: it was you who told us to buy them; give us back our cattle, and you can have the guns.”

It was John Dunn who armed the Zulus with guns; that was entirely his affair.*

2. The King never sent an impi against the Boers. When Somtseu (Sir T. Shepstone) went up

* Sir B. Frere states that Mr. John Dunn “has sent a letter admitting his past action in assisting the Zulus to get guns, and justifying it as a measure of defence against Transvaal aggression;” which letter, however, does not appear in the Blue Books.

to annex the Transvaal, the chief Sihayo brought a "word" to the king, which he had received from a "messenger," to the effect that "Somtseu was going up among the Boers, and it was feared that they might be stiff-necked, and that he might be in difficulty. Cetshwayo must, therefore, send a force to the border to be ready to help him if necessary." Cetshwayo said that "he did not wish to fight, he wished to sit still, and remain at peace with his neighbours, as he had been advised to do." However, he ordered the Abaqulusi, who lived on the border, to collect themselves, armed, at their kraals, to be ready in case they were wanted. And after some time a message came from Somtseu to say, that the force must disperse; so it dispersed, without having done anything. That was Somtseu's affair.

"But," said one of the two head-ringed men, who belonged to the Abaqulusi tribe, "if they accuse him because of the kraal which we were sent to build on the Pongolo, he did that to keep order on the Border."

"An ordinary private Zulu kraal, built simply to have a kraal in that locality, where many of Cetshwayo's people are residing without a head or kraal representing the king . . . the king having given instructions that neither the white nor the native subjects of the Transvaal were in any way to be molested or disturbed by the Zulus."—Mr. Rudolph, c. 2144, p. 186.

"It is being constructed that order may be kept amongst the Zulus here residing—who owe allegiance to the Zulu king alone—and in the interests of peace."—Lieut.-Colonel Durnford, R.E., c. 2144, p. 237.

"The Boers all went away of their own accord, and

we did not enter one of their houses, or touch anything belonging to them; for the king had ordered us to touch nothing, but to build the kraal and to come away the same day."

3. To the third accusation, that of killing "many hundreds of girls," &c., they replied that, so far from Cetshwayo having caused any such slaughter, he had endeavoured altogether to prevent the execution of the savage old marriage-law, and had entirely disapproved of the few (9) cases in which it was carried out, of only one of which, indeed, was he even cognizant, and had, in that instance, been reluctantly overruled by his councillors, of whom Hamu (afterwards one of the "appointed chiefs") was the most ferocious and determined.

4. The fourth charge against the king, namely, that he was in the habit of putting his people to death in great numbers and without sufficient cause, was entirely denied. It was false, they said: the very existence of his kraal *Ekubazeni* was a proof to the contrary. This kraal was a *city of refuge*, to which, even during his father Umpande's lifetime and reign, Cetshwayo had been in the habit of sending people accused of various crimes on the authority of the "witch-doctors," and for whose lives he had interceded. *Ekubazeni* consisted, in the first instance, of three or four huts only, but at the time of speaking it comprised four circles of huts, every inhabitant of which owed his life to Cetshwayo's personal intervention. Could they but come down to Maritzburg to testify to the king's merciful

disposition, they would fill the town, so many were they. If the authorities would only bring the king back, and set him and his accusers face to face here, in Maritzburg, all Zululand would appear to bear witness to his innocence. Indeed they, his people, would have done as much on his behalf before then, that is to say, they would have come down to entreat for him—only that their “hearts were dead at first at their (the English) taking him over the sea, for people said, ‘They have killed him, and thrown him into the sea!’” But now the Great Chiefs, beginning to recover from the stunning blow which they had received in the king’s capture and banishment, were determined to make every effort permitted to them to obtain an answer to the question which they had put to Sobantu, viz., *in what manner had the king offended against the “words” of the “book?”*

To this the Bishop replied, that as the Governor had now told them (through the Secretary for Native Affairs) that Mr. Osborne was appointed to hear all their complaints, and Mr. Gallwey had said to them, “tell me what it is that you Zulus really wish,” the Great Chiefs could now take all they had to say to Mr. Osborne, and answer for Cetshwayo, if they were able, as to these crimes which were laid to his charge. But he cautioned them against allowing their hopes (of Cetshwayo’s return) to be raised by anything he might say, since Sir Garnet Wolseley’s decision, “He is gone, and he will never come back,” still remained in force. Nor, the Bishop told them, did he himself know to what extent the Zulus

were really devoted to their king, or how much they were ready to endure for his sake. The principal messenger assured him that only John Dunn's people, and one or two individual chiefs, for their own private jealousy or interest, were opposed to Cetshwayo.* "But, in the rest of Zululand, is there anyone who does not lament for him, and long after him—not the men only, but the women also, and the very babe at the breast, and the old woman who is bedridden?"

Upon which, the Bishop repeated his advice that the Great Chiefs should appeal to Mr. Osborne, and the messengers took their leave, very grateful, and apparently satisfied with the result of their mission.

Gaozi, another of the appointed chiefs besides the two mentioned, was amongst those who sent this embassy, but he died before they started, and the messengers who were sent to report his death to the Natal Government said that he spoke as follows to the friends who were watching by his death-bed:

"Do not lament for me, or say that I have been killed by an *umtagati*! † It is well for me that I die to-day, for I should not have wished to remain when my king is dead. It is well that I should die

* See the very complete corroboration of this afforded by the recently published letters of Mr. Campbell, who paid a visit to Zululand shortly before Cetshwayo's death, bent upon ascertaining by personal investigation the real truth of matters.

† *Umtagati*, "evil-doer," here meaning "poisoner."

also." And so Gaozi died, lamenting his king to the last.*

This was the first attempt made by the Zulus to intercede for their king, but it produced no effect, and was ignored by the Natal Government, on the grounds that all complaints and appeals must be made through the Resident, who would, *if he thought proper*, forward them to the authorities. In obedience to this command, soon after the return of the first deputation, a number of Zulu chiefs and headmen went to Mr. Osborne, the Resident, and began to state their complaints to him. But he stopped them, saying that he was not put there to hear such complaints,† which they must settle among themselves; he was appointed only to hear and see whether Sir Garnet Wolseley's laws were carried out? Upon this—without entering further into the matters about which they had come—they asked leave to go down to the Natal Government, which was granted them in the form of a "pass" to Maritzburg, "in order to proceed to pay their respects to His Excellency."

Thus armed, a large company of Zulus, including two of Cetshwayo's brothers, and numbering altogether two hundred,‡ started for Natal, and reached Bishopstowe about sundown on May 24. They

* It does not appear whether this was told to the Natal Government officials, although known to their native subordinates.

† Concerning the ill-treatment of the King's family, with which they opened their budget.

‡ Including attendants.

were, of course, on their way to the Governor at Maritzburg (five miles beyond), but naturally came to the Bishop for welcome and protection in the strange and lately hostile country into which their doubtful pilgrimage was made. No such deputation had ever come from Zululand before, nor had any of Cetshwayo's brothers ever visited Maritzburg.

Next day they walked into town, but saw no one, as the offices were closed early in holiday time, and on the following morning they made a second attempt, and had an interview with the Acting Secretary for Native Affairs.

On the third day, however (May 27), when they went in again, they saw His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, and told him the business on which they had come, viz., to make certain complaints as to the treatment they received in Zululand, but especially to ask for "the bones of Cetshwayo," "their bone," according to native custom—in other words, to ask for his restoration to Zululand under any conditions which the British Government might think fit to impose.

It was now three-and-a-half months since the former party had been sent back unheard because they had not gone with their petitions first to Mr. Osborne. When they did so, Mr. Osborne refused to hear them, but gave them leave to go back to Maritzburg (about one hundred miles "as the crow flies,") on foot. Now that they had returned to the latter place, and were admitted, by virtue of the

Resident's "pass" to an audience with the Governor, all the satisfaction they obtained was this:—*They were referred back again to Mr. Osborne, who would be instructed to hear all such complaints, and report them to the Natal authorities; and with this reply they were forced to depart.*

Some acquaintance with Zulu habits and customs is needed for full appreciation of the faith and courage, the devotion to their king shown in these earlier embassies to Natal for his sake. It is not customary amongst them for members of the reigning family to leave their country, and make journeys into other lands. While all that the Zulus knew personally of the behaviour towards them of the British must have combined to make them feel that neither rank nor innocence on the part of a black man would avail to save him from insult, torture, or death, if it should please an angry white *Inkos* to inflict the same. Mbopa, who was tortured (in vain) by Lord Gifford's party to make him betray the king's retreat after the fall of Ulundi, was an uncle of Cetshwayo's, one of the great Zulu chiefs; the king's own family were being treated as people of no account, while even the captive king himself, at first (that is to say as long as the Zulus knew anything about it), had received insult from his captors, and, worst insult of all in their eyes, the old king's grave had been desecrated, and his bones carried off as a joke. If such things were done by the white men in Zululand itself, where at least there was some chance of resistance, what might not happen to this

little band of two hundred who had put themselves, for Cetshwayo's sake, at the mercy of a people whom they had as yet known only as a ruthless foe? And in point of fact, on this occasion, the old prime minister, Mnyamana, and Ziwedu (brother next in age to Cetshwayo) were preparing to join the embassy, but were dissuaded from their project by what they heard from a Natal native (or, rather, Basuto), who warned them that they would be severely punished if they persisted.

Nevertheless, two of the king's brothers, Maduna and Shingana, headed the party, and were accompanied by a considerable number of men of rank, amongst whom were representatives of three of Sir G. Wolseley's thirteen kinglets, one of whom (Seketwayo) sent down by his messenger his *Letters Patent*, or document appointing him chief, to bear witness to his sincerity. And they informed the Bishop that two others of the appointed chiefs had intended to be with them, but had not been in time for their start, while two more were heartily in sympathy with the object of the deputation, but were afraid to join it. Thus, already seven of the men between whom Sir G. Wolseley had divided Zululand, were known to desire the king's return. All the inhabitants of the "city of refuge" before mentioned had wished to come down to testify in person to the fact of Cetshwayo's having saved their lives, but they were stopped by Mr. Osborne, as making the party too large, and others were turned back for the same reason by the border agent.

This embassy was detained through illness for some days after receiving the above disappointing answer from Government, upon the land at Bishopstowe, which circumstance afforded a good opportunity for making inquiries from persons of rank and likely to be well-informed, as to certain points on which Sir B. Frere had brought repeatedly the grave charges against Cetshwayo already mentioned. Accordingly the chief men, assembled together, and hearing and confirming, or correcting each other's statements, gave information which entirely supported the opinion already formed on the authority of the former deputation, as well as from other sources, of the groundlessness of the said charges. In addition to the five points previously discussed they were questioned concerning the supposed "formidable reply" to Sir H. Bulwer's message about the killing of girls, of which so much has been made by Sir B. Frere in his indictment against the king.

The story was that Sir Henry Bulwer, having heard (exaggerated) reports of the executions under the Zulu marriage law, already mentioned, and having sent to remonstrate with Cetshwayo on the subject, had received a violent and brutal reply from the king by the mouths of the two Government messengers. One of these two men chanced (!) to be a Zulu refugee, who had escaped some time before as a criminal, and the whole story of the reception of the Governor's message, and of the purport of the king's reply *rests solely on their unsupported statement*. They asserted that they were received by the king

alone, and that no witnesses were present when he gave them his reply—a thing which with one voice the members of this deputation declared to be incredible and impossible, although this would, of course, not be immediately apparent to Englishmen unacquainted with the etiquette and strict decorum of the Zulu court.

It was impossible to hear the protests and remarks with which the account of this matter, translated from the Blue Book, was received by the assembled chiefs, without coming to the conclusion which they themselves announced at last in these words, “No! if you ask us about that message we say that to us it is pure invention, and that the people who carried it were, as it were, ploughing in winter, preparing the ground for the crop to be sown in the spring—preparing for *this!*”

And as, upon a subsequent occasion Cetshwayo himself altogether denied the whole transaction, it is surely much more reasonable to suppose that the Zulu refugee, afraid to carry the message confided (most carelessly) to him by the Natal Government, never went to Ulundi at all, but returned after due time with a reply invented by himself, than to insist upon such a string of improbabilities as a belief in the “formidable message” involves.

Whatever hopeful expectations this embassy may have taken back with them to Zululand they were destined to be disappointed. The first deputation in February, 1880, had been told by the Natal Government that “any complaints which the chiefs wished

to make they should take to " Mr. Osborne, " and he, if he thought proper, would send them on to the authorities." Apparently he did not think proper even to hear their complaints, much less to send them on, and it is reasonable to suppose that in thus acting he was fulfilling what he knew to be the real wishes of the said " authorities," whatever pretence of fair dealing may have been made to keep the Zulus quiet for a while. The answer to the second, and more important embassy, in the following May, had a better sound, and it was natural that the Zulus, crediting Mr. Osborne with the whole of what appeared to be his own neglect, should be satisfied when they were told that he would be "*instructed* to hear" all their complaints, and also to "report them in writing to the Natal authorities," this time without the saving clause "*if he thought proper.*" However there were more ways than one of cheating the simple Zulus out of the promised attention to their complaints and prayers. During the next twelve months repeated efforts were made by them to obtain interviews with the Resident, who, although certainly not overwhelmed by stress of business, was unaccountably inaccessible for their purpose. Five several times did they endeavour to obtain at least a "pass" from him to take them to Maritzburg, once in order to report the death of one of Cetshwayo's wives, and four times for the purpose of giving thanks for the return of Mkosana, one of the Zulus who had accompanied the king to Capetown, and had been permitted to come back. Not that

Mkosana was of any importance in himself, but that they regarded his return in safety as an earnest for the future restoration to them of their king, having, indeed, hardly dared to believe that the latter was still alive until Mkosana came back amongst them. Only once out of those five times was the Resident to be seen, and then he found an excuse for dismissing them without the desired pass, by sending them back to inquire the *name* of the deceased wife, whom they had described, in Zulu fashion, only as her father's daughter. So when, upon their fifth application, they found the Resident again "absent" (having also been told on their last futile visit to him that a "letter had gone to Natal to thank for Mkosana,* and to report the death"), they made up their minds to follow the said letter, and, as they could not obtain a pass, to go down to Maritzburg again without one.

They reached Bishopstowe about sundown on July 11th, their arrival being wholly unexpected; the party including Mfunzi and Sindindi, both well-known

* An attempt has been made to show that this deputation had no further object in waiting on the Governor in Maritzburg than that of giving thanks for Mkosana's return, but, as the Bishop of Natal remarks in a letter to Sir E. Wood, dated October 14, 1881, "it would be simply preposterous to suppose that so many Zulus of good position would have travelled on foot a long and wearisome journey merely to give thanks for Mkosana, a subordinate chief of no particular importance in himself, which they could have easily done by sending a couple of messengers to the Resident, or indeed to suppose that any but his own family would have cared at all to give thanks for his return to Zululand, except in connection with Cetshwayo's return."

messengers from the king to the Natal Government. They told the Bishop that they had been sent on behalf of eight of the appointed chiefs, namely, Siwunguza, brother and successor to Gaozi (lately dead); Seketwayo (who had sent his "letters patent" on the former occasion, to prove his sincerity); Ntshingwayo, Mlandela, Somkele, Mgitshwa, Faku, and Mgojana. Their errand, they said, was to thank the Government for the return of Mkosana from Capetown, and also to pray again for the restoration of Cetshwayo—using the well-known figurative expression *telani kugcwale*, i.e. "pour on that it (the vessel) may be full," equivalent to "fill up the measure of your kindness" by sending back the king. The Bishop asked them whether they had any letter from the Resident to the Government, and their explanation of how they had come without one, after repeated attempts to procure it, as already described, shows plainly enough how little faith had been kept with them, but gave small hope of the present embassy producing any good results.

However they went in next day to the office of Mr. J. W. Shepstone, the acting Secretary for Native Affairs, and delivered their message to the native headman, according to the custom of that office.

This was one of the two * now famous figurative messages, concerning which such far-fetched and insincere efforts have been made to deny the self-evident intention of the words.

* The other being that in which Cetshwayo is asked for under figure of the "*bone*."

Translated it ran thus :—

“ We are sent by the Zulu chiefs to return thanks for Mkosana, who was the skin in which Cetshwayo was wrapped ” (meaning that, having got back the skin, they hoped to get back the child also).* “ The chiefs say ‘ the English are *amakosi* (chiefs) indeed, since a man may live again after they have killed him.’ We see that we have been chastened by our friends, by those to whom Tshaka, Dingane, and Mpande belonged, who were the children of the English, as was also Cetshwayo. For surely a man’s father strikes him, not on the head, but on the loins only, as a warning, saying, ‘ Let me see whether you will do it again!’ so the chiefs who send us pray the *amakosi* to pour-on and fill-up for us of the same!” (meaning “ to go on as they have begun and send back Cetshwayo after Mkosana.”)

There have been some attempts to make capital out of the implied confession of the king’s (supposed) faults, in the words “ Let me see whether you will do it again,” &c., but any such phrases on the part of the Zulus mean no more than a half-courteous, half-suppliant manner of assuming our (English) point of view. Let one of the speakers be asked “ what fault is the king not to repeat,” and the reply would assuredly be that the English know, since they have punished him; but that, for their own part, they know of nothing in which he has deserved blame.

* This expression alludes to the universal native custom of carrying young infants slung to the mother’s back in a wrapper of prepared skin.

The headman received their message at the office, went in to report it, and on his return dismissed them, saying that Mr. J. W. Shepstone would see them himself on the following day. However when they came again, as directed, they were received not by Mr. Shepstone, but by another white man, who questioned them, but reproved them for putting the Prince Maduna's name, with that of the old "Prime Minister" Mnyamana, first, in saying who had sent them with this message. Indeed they were told at first to leave those names out altogether, but, when they insisted that that was impossible, since they were amongst those who had sent them, they were ordered to put those two last, and to begin with the appointed chiefs. This they did, repeating their message as before, upon which their interrogator asked them, "Do all these eight chiefs, then, say 'Pour-on and fill-up for us?'" They replied that all the eight said so, and their words were then written down.

Again, on the following day they went in for the third time, and on this occasion they had, at last, an interview with Mr. J. W. Shepstone, to whom they repeated what they had said on the previous day, and who dismissed them, saying, "I shall see you again." Two days after, however, when some of the party again attended at the above-mentioned office for Native Affairs, they were told that as they brought no letter from the Resident their journey was in vain, and they must return to Zululand, without any further reply. They could not but obey, so took their leave, and started for Zululand on July 28, 1881.

On their way they met another party who were to have accompanied them but had been delayed in starting. This party was composed of men of equal importance, and personally, of much higher rank, and they bore the same message, with an additional request that three of their number, Ngcongwana, a cousin of the king's, Ngobozana, brother of the late (appointed chief) Gaozi, and Posile, son of a former prime minister, might be allowed to go to Capetown to set their eyes upon Cetshwayo, and see for themselves that he was really alive, and to stay with him, and help and comfort him. When they paid their visit to the S. N. A. office and delivered their messages, they were of course told that, as they had brought no letter from the Resident, they must go back to Zululand.

Meanwhile "the complaints of undue severity on the part of the appointed chiefs" had produced this effect at least, that Sir Evelyn Wood, with the approval of Her Majesty's Government, proceeded to Zululand to "inquire into the circumstances, and decide them." These are Sir E. Wood's words, but the only chiefs against whom complaints were laid were Hamu, Zibebu, and J. Dunn, who, with one other (Fanawendhlela), were the four (out of thirteen—Hlubi being neutral) opposed to Cetshwayo's return.

Zibebu's treatment of the king's family has already been described, and of his and of J. Dunn's character a few native statements may give some idea:—

1. Part of the story of Mfutshane, who with Mlilwana reached Bishopstowe on Sept. 10, 1881,

having been sent by the princes to report their meeting with Sir E. Wood at Inhlazatshe, to *Sobantu* (the Bishop), Mr. Gallwey (Attorney-General), and Mr. Fynney.

“But even as Lukuni* (General Wood) was arriving with his *impi* Zibebu ate up more cattle, because, he said, ‘what business had they to go and greet Mkosana without his permission?’ He ate up those of Makedama, and Mbopa, and others, and indeed of the whole tribe [the Usutu, Cetshwayo’s own tribe]; we cannot count all the cattle. And his people defiled the stores of corn, and mixed dung with it, and scattered it under foot on the roads.

“Maduna and Ziwedu have sent us in haste—we have been nine days only on the road—with orders to go day and night and tell all this trouble to Sobantu and to their other friends in Natal, praying that they would send up a man of their own to be their eyes, and to see for them the *amabele* (corn) strewn in the road, before the rains remove it, that it may not be said ‘you have been deceived.’ They (Maduna and Ziwedu) say that they have been reporting this sort of thing for so long that it must be that they are not believed, since even they, the family of Senzangakona (the Royal House), are now said to be liars. They pray also that Sobantu would inquire of the White Chiefs, as soon as they return to Natal, in what manner they have set right the affairs of Zululand.”

Attention may be directed here to the fact that Sir H. Bulwer, writing in May, 1882, with reference to the condition of Zululand in 1881, could recommend the rule of the appointed chiefs under Mr. Osborne’s advice, as affording something more like “the security and protection of a well-ordered Government” than “the more uncertain rule of native chiefs.” (Blue Book 3466, p. 20.) But, so far from there being peace, “security and protection,”

* From “*ukuni*” = a log of wood. Applied to one of a seemingly hard, unyielding nature.

in Zululand in this year, 1881, we find that on May 31, only a fortnight after the above words were written, Mr. Osborne himself reports as follows:—“The acts of oppression complained of commenced after Ndabuko’s visit to Maritzburg (May 1880), and his intentions becoming known to Zibebu” (3182, p. 37). These “acts of oppression” continued until the princes were ordered to leave Zibebu’s territory by Sir E. Wood on August 31, 1881. Again, on June 1 (3182, p. 39), Mr. Osborne reports the ill-feeling between Hamu and the Abaqulusi, which led to the frightful massacre of the latter by the former on October 2, 1881 (*ib.* p. 96). And in July occurred the slaughter by J. Dunn of some hundreds of Sitimela’s fugitive people—J. Dunn himself admits “over 200” (*ib.* p. 144)—including 38 women and children of men of note, besides those of lower rank. All this took place under leave given by Mr. Osborne to attack Sitimela.

Sir H. Bulwer, it is true, writes of the Sitimela affair as follows (3466, p. 23):—

“The two forces met near the Inseleni river; but the engagement was scarcely begun when Sitimela’s force broke and gave way, and were completely routed by the force under Chief Dunn, over 200 lives being lost on the occasion. Now this clearly was an occasion when arms were taken up in defence of lawful authority, and where human life was lost in the attempt on the part of an impostor to set up a wrongful claim, and to support that wrongful claim by means of an armed force, which attempt it was necessary to resist and suppress by means of another armed force.”

But the Bishop of Natal criticizes this view as

follows :—“Sitimela was a ‘pretender,’ but hardly an ‘impostor,’ as his claims were recognised by the appointed chief Somkele, who lent him support. Nor was there any ‘engagement’ between the two forces; it was merely the butchery of unresisting fugitives by J. Dunn’s force, assisted, on Mr. Osborne’s advice, by Zibebu’s. Two of J. Dunn’s men say, ‘When we appeared they were in the act of leaving the kraal, flying: we did not see their faces, and two of Sitimela’s say, ‘We tumbled out of our huts, just as we had been sleeping, and fled, leaving the cattle, just as J. Dunn’s *impi* fell upon us.’”

Sir H. Bulwer has merely adopted, as correct, the statements of J. Dunn himself. The present case is indeed a striking instance of the lamentable fact—a fact that a close examination of the Blue Books forces upon one’s mind—that the Governor of Natal has throughout been made the mouthpiece of Zululand’s most bitter and unscrupulous foes.

Further evidence of J. Dunn’s proceedings in the Sitimela affair may be found in the following native accounts. The report may be mentioned here that when an attempt at usurpation on Sitimela’s part and its suppression by J. Dunn were announced to Cetshwayo, the latter, with his usual frankness, expressed his approval of J. Dunn’s accomplishment, pronouncing Sitimela’s claims to be worthless.

Statement made by Ntsaba, a native of the Umtetwa tribe and now living in Natal :—

“I went into Mgitshwa’s district in Zululand about a month ago, to get a beast of mine from a native named Mcondo, at whose kraal I arrived on Saturday.

“I found on arrival that there had been a fight on that day between the people of the Umtetwa tribe and those under Chief J. Dunn, who had headed a command against the Umtetwa. I saw some of the Umtetwa fugitives, who told me that they had been attacked that morning by Chief Dunn and his people, who had slaughtered all before them, men, women, and children; and further, that Sitimela had ordered them—his people—not to fight, but run away, as he had not come to Zululand to fight, and that therefore the people were killed running away.

“Dunn took all the cattle.”

“Witnessed by me, NTSABA × his mark.

“(Signed) R. W. CLARENCE, (Signed) FRED. B. FYNNEY,

“Maritzburg, August 30, 1881. Sworn Govt., Interpreter.”

Statement made by Manxele of Mgitshwa’s tribe in Zululand :—

“I remember the fight which took place last month—or nearly a month ago—in Mlandela’s district.

“On the morning of the fight I was sitting on a ridge, together with other people of my tribe, near the Imseleni river. About 10 A.M. I heard the report of fire-arms. I ought to say that the chief of our tribe, Somhlohla, was also sitting with us. While we were sitting, some fugitives came up to the chief, and asked for his protection. One of the fugitives was named Mudwa, another was the Induna Somopo. These people informed Somhlohla that Dunn had attacked the Umtetwas and killed all before him, men, women, and children. The detailed account they gave of the fight was as follows :—

“A number of the Umtetwa tribe had congregated under Sitimela, a son of Somveli, son of Dingiswayo, who was the rightful chief of the Umtetwas (a disputed point) and who had gone to Mlandela to talk about tribal matters. There were great numbers of the Umtetwas with Sitimela, who had been informed that Chief John Dunn was advancing against him with a large force. Sitimela had told the people that he had come to Zululand to talk, and not to fight, and that, in the

event of Dunn attacking him they were to run away, and not attempt resistance. On the morning of the fight Sitimela with his followers was at a kraal named "Uyengo" near the Nongidi hills. When Chief Dunn rode up followed by his *impi*, as soon as he got within range, he dismounted and fired into Sitimela's followers, and then other white men who were with him, five in number, fired also. Sitimela again ordered his people to retreat, as he did not want to fight. The people retreated accordingly, followed by Dunn's men, who drove them across the Imfolozi, killing all before them. Dunn sent a message to Somhlohla to send an armed party in pursuit, which he refused to do. Dunn took all the cattle to his place. Translated to Manxele by me, and adhered to by him in my presence.

"(Signed) FRED. B. FYNNEY,

"Sworn Govt. Interpreter.

"Maritzburg, August 30, 1881."

Statement made by Mjiba, a native of the Biyela tribe under the chief Mgitshwa, Zululand:—

"I have heard the statements made by Ntsaba and Manxele, and declare that what they have stated is the truth.

"Witnessed by me,

"UMJIBA × his mark

"(Signed). R. W. C. CLARENCE.

"Read over and interpreted by me, and adhered to in my presence by Mjiba,

"FRED. B. FYNNEY,

"Sworn Govt. Interpreter.

"Maritzburg, August 30, 1881."

Additional statement of Mfutshane:—

"When I was at home in Northern Zululand, I heard that John Dunn had attacked Sitimela and had killed, sweeping off everything alive. For his *impi*, in chasing them, fell upon the women too, stabbing always, and sparing nothing. I heard this from a man who had been at Hamu's, when a messenger came from Zibebu to Hamu, to tell him that blood had been spilt of the people of Sitimela. The man insisted upon it, that they had stabbed and flung down the children as well as the women."

It is plain enough, from all native accounts, that the bloodshed in this case was entirely J. Dunn's doing, and this is also borne out by the fact that it was *all on one side*—a slaughter, not a fight. Yet Sir. E. Wood, commenting on the proceedings above mentioned, speaks in commendation of “the vigour and decision shown by Chief John Dunn in carrying out the advice of the Resident.” It is to be hoped that this approval was expressed in ignorance of the real facts, although in that case it is somewhat singular that after the full information subsequently supplied, those officials through whom Sir Evelyn Wood must have been deceived, if deceived he was, were never called upon to answer for their conduct, nor in any way punished for their conduct.

It was just at the time of the arrival of the 2nd half of this third deputation that Sir E. Wood visited Zululand, and they were advised by their friends, including the Bishop—but, singularly enough, *not* by the authorities—to hasten back and attend, if possible, the meeting fixed for a certain day, between General Wood and the Zulu chiefs at Inhlazatshe, the Resident's head-quarters. They started from Bishopstowe on August 15, 1881, most anxious to be in time, especially as there was every reason to expect that the request of the three chiefs to be sent to Capetown would be granted, as Cetshwayo had no wife or child or fitting companion to share his captivity. At this very time a telegram was received from England, reporting the Prime Minister's assurance

that "much greater liberty" would be allowed to the king, and great hopes were raised that this visit of Sir Evelyn Wood's might prove the beginning of better days for the Zulus, and that "Government" was at last inclined to exercise justice and mercy towards this people who, it was freely acknowledged, had received cruel and undeserved injury at our hands. The three went off eagerly, hoping soon to return with the desired permission to go to Capetown; indeed so great was their confidence, that they left a portion of their baggage behind them at Bishopstowe in charge of two others of their number. There was but just time for them to reach Inhlazatshe by August 31, the day fixed for the meeting, with favourable weather; unfortunately several days' heavy rain occurred, and the heaviest fall of snow that had been known in those parts for many years, in consequence of which the three chiefs were just too late to see Sir Evelyn Wood.* The latter had, indeed, put off the meeting from the 29th to the 31st August, because, owing, as he stated in his speech at the opening of the Legislative Council on October 6, to the extraordinary severity of the weather "all those who had to attend were delayed for at least forty-eight hours." He continued:—"I therefore postponed the meeting to the 31st, on which day nine of the appointed chiefs

* In speaking of bad weather as the cause of their delay, the Zulus referred, of course, to what they had encountered during their seventeen days' journey, and not, as Colonel Mitchell implies in his speech to the Legislative Council, p. 48, to the *day of the meeting*, which was, as he says, very fine.

were present, either personally or by deputy. The remaining four appeared within the next few days before the British Resident, and expressed their regret at the unavoidable delay which caused their absence.

Thus it is incontestably plain from Sir E. Wood's own account that some even of those chiefs who were at their own homes in Zululand were "unavoidably" prevented by the weather from attending the meeting; yet, as will be shortly pointed out, "the authorities" tried to turn the failure of these men to reach Inhlazatshe in time—although they had had a long journey to make and had shortly before travelled for twenty-one days on foot to reach Maritzburg—into a proof of their insincerity, and desire to avoid a meeting with Sir E. Wood. In point of fact, they were just able to send forward a message to the effect that they would reach Inhlazatshe on the following day, which message arrived on the very day of the meeting.* No attention, however, was paid to the circumstances of their delay, and Sir E. Wood started early next morning for Delagoa Bay. Two months after these occurrences a member of the Legislative Council asked the Colonial Secretary at a sitting of the said assembly whether the Government knew anything of the alleged desire on the part of some of the appointed chiefs in Zululand for the king's restoration, statements concerning which had appeared in the London Press, and had, he said, very considerable influence at home.

* Reported by a European present, as well as by Zulus.

The Colonial Secretary, Colonel Mitchell, read written reply, as follows :—

“Two so-called deputations, stating that they came from eight of the appointed chiefs of Zululand, visited Pietermaritzburg in July and August of this year. The latter said that they belonged to the former party, but had been delayed. Neither of the parties were, as they should have been, accredited to this government by the Resident in Zululand. And they were therefore told to return, and represent to him anything that they might have to say. The message brought by the first deputation was that the chiefs thanked the Government for the return of Mkosana (an attendant on Cetshwayo) from Capetown. The message of the second was to the same effect, but they added that they were desired by the chiefs to ask if they might be permitted to visit Capetown in order to ascertain if it were true that Cetshwayo was still alive. Neither deputation said one word about the ex-king's return—at least to the Government. *

“The second deputation was told† that Sir Evelyn Wood was about to visit Zululand, and that they should attend the meeting and speak to him there. They did not do so, although they are known to have been close to the place for two days—one of which was the meeting day—and they allege that they were prevented by bad weather, when, in fact, the day of meeting was very fine. Each of the eight appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation.”

“They are known to have been close to the place for two days,” is a very unfair account of the case, viz., that they reached, by forced marches, a place within a day's journey of Inhlazatshe on the day before the meeting, and sent on a messenger from

* These words (italicised) appear in the *Natal Witness* of October 12, but not in the copy of the written reply which is given (as above) in the *Natal Mercury* of October 13.

† The implication of this is that they were told by Government, that is *officially* told, which was *not* the case.

thence to report that they were coming. Their special errand had nothing to do with the general business of the meeting, and having got so near they felt secure of an audience before Sir E. Wood departed. The General might choose to insist on military punctuality to the hour, and refuse to allow the least "law" even for unavoidable delay, but all the officials concerned were well aware that such prompt action would not be understood by any of the Zulus, whose affairs were far too serious to be settled in such an off-hand manner in one day, and who are accustomed to very lengthy debates on all matters of importance. Colonel Mitchell's absurd endeavour to show that there was unwillingness or indifference on their part can only be accounted for by the too apparent readiness of the Natal Government officials to ignore the loyalty of the Zulus towards their King.

Sir Evelyn Wood's careless proceedings and hasty departure plainly showed that he had no sincere desire to understand the Zulu national sentiment, or to gratify it in any degree. What these proceedings were we will now relate, and in them we shall find some explanation of as much as may be true of the Colonial Secretary's last-quoted sentence, "Each of the appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation."

The meeting appears to have opened with some explanations concerning the affairs of the Basutos and the Boers. After this the "white chiefs"

addressed the assembled Zulus upon their own concerns, informing them that they should pay taxes to the thirteen appointed chiefs, part of the proceeds of which must be given to the Resident, and part paid in salaries to policemen, who were apparently to act as a Border-guard between the Boers and Zulus. Roads must also be made—though this command was given generally, no direction being named,—and other methods of raising a “Revenue” pointed out. All which, whether as command or advice, would have been very suitable had the country been at rest, and had the thirteen kinglets taken firm hold of the reins of office with the approval of the majority in the nation, but was altogether thrown to the winds under the existing circumstances of anarchy; and while not only the nation as a whole was longing for Cetshwayo’s return, and was unwilling therefore to render obedience to other rulers, but eight of the thirteen new rulers themselves asked nothing better than to abdicate their share of power in favour of the King. To draw up a scheme of magistrates, constabulary, public works, and taxes for the benefit of the Zulus at this time was about as wise and useful an enterprise as the drawing of plans for imaginary cities in desert places would have been.

At this point several of the appointed chiefs began to make replies indicative of personal discontent on the subject of their individual boundaries, when one amongst them,* named Dilikana, exclaimed,

* Not an appointed chief.

“ Oh, Zulus, is it possible that you are wasting the time thus over your separate affairs? Why do you not speak for the King's family? Have they offended you in any way, that you do not speak for them in their distress? And your King? I thought that your intention in coming here was to pray for him? What wrong has he ever done?”

But many of the appointed chiefs had been privately threatened and frightened beforehand, so that, without some word of encouragement from the “ authorities,” they dared not speak out their heart's desire. The Prince Maduna, however, with his brother Ziwedu, and Dinuzulu, the young heir to the throne, were present definitely and openly as suppliants, and the words addressed to them were of a nature to discourage all but the boldest.

“ You, Maduna, Ziwedu, and Dinuzulu,” said Mr. Rudolph, the interpreter, speaking in the name of Sir Evelyn Wood, “ we give you to John Dunn [the man of all others who had most injured the king and country, and whom they had deepest cause to hate]. As for your cattle, if Zibebu has eaten up 30, he shall give you back 10, or if 40, he shall give you 20, and keep 20 in any case. But this is only on condition that you go to John Dunn: if you do not go to live under John Dunn, Zibebu shall return to you none.”

The Princes asked leave to answer, but the white chief refused, saying, “ What answer can you have to give? We turn you out, Maduna, and Dinuzulu, and Ziwedu, because you are always saying that you

want the 'bone' of that scoundrel (*ishinga* *), whom we have done away with. You are always saying that you are going to [pray] the authorities about that. We forbid you that road. What business have you there?" To which they replied: "That is just the point on which we wish to speak." But the white chiefs forbade it, and they were allowed no reply. And to Mnyamana they (the white chiefs) said, "As for you, you have no voice [you cannot speak] here. You refused a chieftainship,† we then told you to go to Hamu; you refused that also. Now we say that of your cattle, which Hamu has eaten up, he shall give you back 700, and he shall keep 600." And, when Mnyamana asked leave to speak, he was told, "We do not wish you to answer; we are laying down the law to you; how should you answer?" [how should you venture to make any objections?] In fact the same words were spoken to Mnyamana as to Maduna and Ziweddu, "We will not have you answer."

There is not the smallest apparent reason for this arbitrary decision that Zibebu and Hamu should retain a portion of the cattle of which they had robbed the Princes and Maduna. It was understood by the Zulus, and was apparently *intended*, as a punishment

* This account was given to the Bishop by messengers sent expressly for the purpose by the Princes. Compare the report in the *Natal Mercury*: "Not half the chiefs were present, and many of those that went were very cross and threatening after the language used towards Cetshwayo, he being called '*ishinga*.'"

† Mnyamana refused the position of "kinglet," looking upon it as an honour *at the expense* of his King.

for their incessant petitions for Cetshwayo's return, and the whole proceedings of the day had no other effect than that of a spur to the growing tyranny and insolence towards the captive King's family and special adherents, upon which Zibebu and Hamu at least would not have ventured but for [what was virtually] British support, whatever the renegade J. Dunn might have done. Immediately after the meeting, Zibebu hurried home, and at once sent out an *impi* to eat up the cattle of his brother Haijana, who had put them for safety at Maduna's kraal "Kwa' Minya." The King's brothers, Maduna and Ziweddu, had not yet reached home, having been summoned by Mnyamana to come to him; but their people turned out, and Mgojana (one of the appointed chiefs) brought men of his own, and led the *impi* to rescue the cattle. Zibebu's people resisted, and they fought, and Zibebu's *impi* was beaten and driven to his kraal, he himself escaping with his life, while Mgojana recovered the cattle.

The *Natal Mercury* of October 22, 1881, furnishes additional evidence of the impression made by Sir Evelyn Wood's visit, and supports the view that the bloodshed which followed on all sides was its direct and logical consequence.

"We have received," says that notoriously anti-Zulu publication, "the following from a trustworthy Zululand correspondent:—

“October 13 [1881].

“I send a line at the last moment to say that things are going from bad to worse, at railway speed. Up to the arrival

of Sir Evelyn Wood the chiefs did not fully realise that they were really independent at all. Now they do, and, if I mistake not, like a beggar on horseback will ride to the devil sharp. Hamu has begun by killing a large number of the Aba Qulusi people. My information is derived from native sources, and may be somewhat exaggerated. It is, that the killed at Isandhlwana were few compared with those killed by Hamu a few days ago.

““ Zibebu also, and Ndabuko are, I am told, on the point of coming to blows; and if they do, that will be worse still [?], for Ndabuko will find supporters throughout the length and breadth of Zululand.’”

The above confirms other evidence on two important points besides the one for which it is quoted, namely, the deplorable results of Sir E. Wood's visit. The appointed chiefs mentioned as turbulent are just the two (Zulus) unfriendly to the King, and the *Mercury's* own correspondent helps to prove that King's popularity by reporting that Ndabuko (Maduna, the King's full-brother and warmest friend) would “find supporters throughout the length and breadth of Zululand.”

CHAPTER III.

It was after the visit of the First Deputation that the Bishop of Natal and his eldest daughter went to see Cetshwayo at the Castle in Capetown. The Bishop had made no previous attempt to visit the King, since Sir Bartle Frere's refusal to his (the Bishop's) second daughter and two sons showed that it would be useless. They, however, had laid a complaint in the matter at the Colonial Office, in consequence of which, Lord Kimberley directed that the King should be allowed "personal liberty and intercourse with his friends,"* and after this the Bishop and Miss Colenso arranged to pay their visit. Their account of it may be given in their own words:—

"We landed at Capetown on Monday morning, Nov. 1, 1880, and were met at the docks by a note from General Clifford, saying, 'I have informed Cetshwayo that you will be here shortly, and he is looking forward to your visit. Will you send me a line some short time before you wish to see him, naming the hour, so that he may be prepared?' We fixed three o'clock that afternoon, and at that time went to the 'Castle,' a large stone building surrounded by ramparts, within the city boundaries. We drove in through the gloomy stone arch, past sentinels, into

* 2695, p. 55.

a square court, with one or two imprisoned-looking trees in a corner. The 'Castle' contains all the officers' quarters, and we soon found those belonging to General Clifford, and the General himself, who was looking out for us, and, with Major Poole and Captain Westmacott, led us on at once to Cetshwayo's quarters—across one side of the court, up and down stone staircases, past a sentinel, through a stone passage, where Cetshwayo, we were told, took his daily bath (as he always did at home, only then it was after an eight or ten miles walk), past three Zulus, Cetshwayo's attendants, two men and a youth, who saluted us eagerly, into a long large room, the further end of which is boarded off for the King to eat in, while what remains is partly filled up by two small apartments, also boarded off, one the sleeping-room for Cetshwayo, the other for the women, his attendants. There is about space for a third apartment of the same size on that side of the room; but in this space were sitting, on a coloured blanket spread on the floor, the four women—not *wives*, but women of the royal household—dressed in print gowns and coloured shawls—and there is a fifth younger girl belonging to the party. These are all who are in captivity with him. There remains a long narrow strip of room, lighted by three small windows, with dull glass and iron bars, through which nothing can be seen, 'air and exercise' being supposed to be provided for by his being allowed to walk on a portion (one angle) of the ramparts, which is boarded off from the rest. The only furniture consists of a large engraving of the Queen, presented by Colonel Hassard, three photographs of Cetshwayo's two brothers, and other members of the deputation,* which we had sent him, and which General Clifford had kindly had framed and glazed, two or three towels hanging from a peg or string, and—three bare old wooden chairs in the further corner, on one of which sat the King, in European clothing, waiting for us, and looking eagerly to the door. He rose to welcome us, and clasped the Bishop's hand as if he could not let it go. General Clifford, knowing that we needed no interpreter, kindly left us three alone together.

"His first question was 'His wives and children—were they alive? where were they?'—he had been separated from them all for a year and two months—and he gave a great sigh of relief when we said that at the time when the deputation came down

* The first deputation. See p. 17.

his brother Maduna (Ndabuko) had told us that the children, with their mothers, were with him, though we did not know if all of them were there, and also that he was the father of a new baby, a girl, six or seven months old, of whose birth he had not been informed. This news appeared to give great delight to him and his chief attendant Mkosana, who had now come near, and to the women to whom Cetshwayo at once imparted the fact. We asked him to name the baby, and, after thinking for a few moments, he said, 'Tell them to call it Untombiyolwandhle (girl of the sea), and Unomdhlambi (mother of foam).' 'Ah!' said Mkosana, 'these names will make them weep when they hear them.' This is his eighth child, and he asked eagerly after the other seven by name, saying that Dinuzulu, the eldest boy, with his sisters Simiso and Siyile, were old enough now to 'have eyes'—be reasonable. On being told that Dinuzulu's uncle, Maduna, had, we heard, given him a horse, he said:—'Ah! and he'll soon ride it too, he's a sharp boy.'

'Then he asked for his brothers. 'Had the two in the photograph really come down to Maritzburg? And Dabulamanzi—had we seen him?'—for he had heard that he had been in Natal. 'And his elder brother, Ziwedu, did we know anything about him? And the indunas, Mnyamana, and Ntshingwayo, and Sitshaluza? And the Zulu people—what were they saying? Did they not care enough about him to give up some of their cattle, and try if the Queen would not accept a ransom for him?' 'Yes,' we said, 'they are quite ready to do that, for they have told us so; but it is not the offering of a ransom that would help at present. For what is said is that it would unsettle, disarrange, the land, if Cetshwayo were now sent back there.' 'How can that be,' said he, 'when the land would belong to the Queen, and I too belong to her, and should only be obeying her orders? I am not asking to be sent back as king, but just to be allowed to live with my wives and children as a private individual. *This* is not being alive—although my neck is spared—separated from all my family.'

'He then went on to ask for his half-brother, Hamu (Oham), saying, 'Lukuni (General Wood) came to see me here twice, and on the second visit he told me that when he was in Zululand (with the Empress), there had come to him Hamu,* Seketwayo, Sihayo, and

* Hamu, who is generally allowed to be a worthless fellow, would, however, never have turned against the King had he not

the Umsebe and Umbangulana kraals, and all the people of Northern Zululand, praying for their Bone,' that is, for the restoration of Cetshwayo as one dead, that he might be buried in Zululand. We said 'Yes—but did he not understand that it was for that purpose the deputation had come down, viz. to pray that their "Bone" might be given back to them?' 'Ah, no!' said he, 'who is there that would tell me here? But was not Ziweddu with them, nor Mnyamana, nor Ntshinywayo?' 'Yes,' said we, 'they too pray for the Bone, and they sent their words by Maduna. They also were on the point of starting with him, when there came a Basuto [one of Hlubi's people], and warned them saying, "What were they thinking of, in going to Maritzburg? It would be very displeasing to the authorities, and they would certainly be killed." So they remained behind, but Maduna, Shingane, and the others persisted and came down, though, as Shingane told us, they felt that "they were throwing themselves over a precipice, not knowing what they might find at the bottom"'—at which Cetshwayo seemed amused, though pleased that they should have ventured so much (as they thought) for his sake. And, as he continued to ask, 'Was so-

been encouraged to do so by white advisers, nor has he ever done so consistently, but curries favour with each party in turn. And it would seem that even Zibebu might have been brought to meet Cetshwayo, i. e. receive him as king, had he been in the least encouraged to do so by the white authorities. His speech, reported by the special correspondent of the *Natal Mercury*, that *he would not receive the King unless Mr. Osborn* [the Resident] *told him to do so*, certainly implies that Mr. Osborn's influence [i. e. that of the Natal Government] would have induced him to submit. It was precisely this official determination not to give Cetshwayo the assistance even of a good word which was at the bottom of all the bloodshed that has followed. A little moral influence only exercised by the Government in the King's favour, and the whole country would have returned quietly under his rule. Even honest neutrality would probably have produced nearly the same effect; but, instead of that, by cutting off half the King's territory and people, and thus lessening him in the eyes of the Zulus, by fomenting every seed of discontent sown during four years of anarchy, and by fettering him with promises, while his enemies were encouraged, the good intentions of the Home Government have been brought to nought.

and-so there? and so-and-so?' We read over to him a list of those present, with which we were fortunately provided, at the end of which he called Mkosana, saying, 'They know all about us, and all the tribes of Zululand, and they all want to ask for the Bone, all the northern Zulus! Ah! these are pleasant tidings.'

"Next he asked—and very kindly—for J. Dunn. 'Was not he of the same mind as the Zulu chiefs in this matter?' We said, 'No, he had nothing to do with it that we knew of.' [We did not tell him that J. Dunn had written to the *Natal Mercury*, saying, 'I intend punishing any of my subjects I find negotiating with the Bishop without my knowledge.'] 'Well,' said he, 'I have heard nothing about him all this time; but lately I heard that he was very ill.' We said, 'He has recovered.' We heard afterwards that Cetshwayo had quite recently dictated a long and very kind letter to J. Dunn, asking after his health and welfare, and we have since seen mention made of this letter in the *Natal papers*.*

"Cetshwayo having stated that the new Governor (Sir G. Strahan) had come to see him a few days before, we asked if he had seen the former Governor, Sir Bartle Frere. 'Oh, yes,' said he, 'I knew him. He was a very kind, friendly man. He sat and spoke with me just as you are doing; his voice was as kind as yours is. I told him that I did not know what I had done—in what way I had offended the Queen, that I should be so destroyed; for we had always been friendly with the English, and, indeed, we were preparing to help them when Somtseu (Sir T. Shepstone) went up to the Boers.† For, on his way up, he sent a messenger to me to

* This was, of course, before the King had heard how anxious J. Dunn was to prevent his return. The feeling here expressed by the King that Dunn would be "of the same mind with the Zulu chiefs in this matter" was at first largely shared by the Zulus, who knew how much Dunn owed to Cetshwayo, and expected him to do him a good turn, which accounts for any of them having submitted to Dunn.

† In a Despatch from Sir Bartle Frere [2740, p. 49], dated September 4th, 1880, the following passage is quoted from an article written by Major Poole, which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for February 1880:—

"When Mr. [Sir] Theophilus Shepstone went to the Transvaal he sent word to Cetshwayo to say he was going to try and settle the affairs there. Cetshwayo knew that the Boers were at war with Sikukuni, but did not know much about their

tell me to be on the look-out. We have always been friendly; before then, from Tshaka's time, and since, to the last. I do not know what we have done, and I pray the Queen to let me go back just to live among my children, and let the country belong to the Queen; for though a man be allowed to breathe, he is not really

affairs, except that they were continually having rows with the border Zulus. He sent two messengers to Mr. Shepstone to offer his alliance with the English, in case there should be a war. Mr. Shepstone sent back to say he did not require any help, that the Transvaal had been annexed by the British Government, and that all was quiet. He also told Cetshwayo that he must not go to war with the Swazis, as they were allies to the British."

Captain [afterwards Major] Poole adds, "You will see it corroborates what Cetshwayo now states. He says, '*When Mr. Shepstone went up to the Transvaal on the annexation business, he sent a message to Cetshwayo to inform him of his movements, that he was going up the Transvaal to put matters right there.*' He did this, Cetshwayo says, in the ordinary way, out of courtesy to an ally. The message included the usual complimentary allusions to their being allies, and Cetshwayo sent a message to Mr. Shepstone to offer his assistance, should he require it, and said he would, if Mr. Shepstone liked, call up his army. The messenger followed Mr. Shepstone, and caught him up in the Transvaal. Mr. Shepstone sent back to say he required no help, and added that the Transvaal was now British territory, and everything was quiet."

But Sir T. Shepstone [2482, p. 47] denies that he sent any such message, and says, "In consequence of Cetshwayo's unfriendly reply to the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal's remonstrance against the slaughter of the girls [the supposed "formidable message"], which reply had been received shortly before my return to Natal from England in 1876, *it was judged advisable that I should make no communication to him on the subject of my mission to the Transvaal, and I made none.*"

It would seem as if Sir B. Frere, in publishing the statements received from Major Poole, had not perceived how completely they are at variance with those made by Sir T. Shepstone, while agreeing substantially with the account given by Cetshwayo, and with other Zulu statements, as, for instance, that of the first deputation, which was as follows:—

"The King never sent an *impi* against the Boers. At the time

alive if he is cut off from his wives and children. And the Governor listened, and said that he would ask Major Poole to write down all my words. I told them all over again to Major Poole, and he wrote them down, and sent them to the Governor, who called together all his councillors to consider the matter. Then they sent my words across the sea to the Queen, and she collected all her great men and chiefs, but they refused my prayer, and said that I should not go home, and the Queen said no word of objection to them, but just consented. And the Governor came to tell me this, and that my prayer was refused. "However," said he, "I do not see it stated that you are to be kept here a prisoner always." And he gave me the paper which had come from England about this matter. Here it is, written in your own language, I believe.' And he fetched from the next room a copy of a Despatch to the effect that the Queen had been advised not to grant the petition of Cetshwayo.

"We heard, on the authority of an eye-witness, that on this occasion, when told that his prayer was refused, Cetshwayo was evidently greatly distressed. The sweat stood in drops on his face, and the beating of his heart could be plainly seen under his tightly-buttoned coat, although he would not allow any other signs of emotion to escape him. Also, from the same source, we heard that Sir Bartle Frere urged him to practice resignation, saying, 'I, too, am obliged to stay here because the Queen wishes it, an exile from my own country, to which I am longing to return;' to which Cetshwayo replied, 'Yes, but you have your wife and children with you, and you are not shut up as I am, and I should

when Somtseu [Sir T. Shepstone] went up to the Transvaal, Sihayo brought word to the King, which had been brought to him by a messenger, saying that 'Somtseu was going up among the Boers, and it was feared that they might be stiff-necked, and that he might be in difficulty. Cetshwayo must, therefore, send a force to the border to be ready to help him, if necessary.' Cetshwayo said that 'he did not wish to fight—he wished to sit still and remain at peace with his neighbours, as he had been advised to do.' However, he ordered the Aba Qulusi, who lived on the border, to collect themselves, armed, at *their kraals*, to be ready in case they were wanted. And after some time a message came from Somtseu to say that the force must disperse; so it dispersed, without doing anything. That was Somtseu's affair."

not wonder if the Queen pays you besides for staying here'—which was unanswerable.

"We felt obliged to dispel his pleasing illusion as to Sir Bartle Frere's friendliness, by mentioning that it was he who prevented Mr. F. E. Colenso from seeing him on his way to England. [Cetshwayo had heard that he had passed through Capetown, and wondered that, having been formerly employed as a lawyer to act for him, and having visited him at Ulundi, he had not called to see him.] We felt it necessary also to question him as to some of the accusations brought against him by Sir Bartle Frere, e. g. that he had ordered 'hundreds' of young women to be assegaid, as well as invalids in his regiment and people generally. At first he would hardly believe that he understood us aright; but on our assuring him that we were neither exaggerating nor joking, he gave an unqualified and indignant denial on all these points, and, turning to Mkosana, with a shrug of his shoulders, he ejaculated, '*Abelungu!*' meaning 'these white (= English) men!' He then said that he knew only of four girls who were killed, and that these were killed without his will, though he was responsible in that he had consented to the advice of the indunas that an *impi* should be sent out to frighten the girls into obeying the marriage law, which *impi* had exceeded his orders and killed these four. We said that his brothers had told us of four other girls who were killed without his orders, besides the four whom he mentioned; and he said, 'No doubt they were right, but he had only been told of those four. The bodies of the girls near the Pongolo were left where they were killed—not exposed upon the road as far as he knew, and certainly no order had been issued for such exposure.'

"We then asked him about the 'formidable' message of November 2, 1876,* reading it over to him in Zulu. He said at

* This was the message *supposed to have been* sent by Cetshwayo to Sir H. Bulwer in 1876, which appears never to have been forgiven by that Governor, and which was raked up again by Sir Bartle Frere in 1878, to serve as one of his excuses for invading Zululand. The message, as reported, was a very angry one, resenting interference in Zulu affairs, announcing the King's (supposed) intention to "kill" freely in his own country, and placing himself and the Governor of Natal on an equality. It was always a puzzle how Cetshwayo came to send a single message, diametrically opposed in tone and spirit to all his others, before or since

once, 'Those are no words of mine. What indunas is it said were present?' We told him, 'It is said that no induna (Government official) or innceku (Household official) was present, but only some youths in attendance on the King.' 'It is not allowed,' he replied, 'to the Zulu King to speak alone with strangers. They are always taken first to the indunas, and they, if they think fit, bring them on to the King, or perhaps send them on, but never without a head-ringed innceku, who speaks their words for them while they sit at a distance. How could we have spoken face to face? Who is it said were the messengers?' We answered 'Bayeni and Mantshonga.' He said, 'I know Bayeni, a tall black man; but I know no Mantshonga as a messenger.' We said, 'He was a refugee, and is now one of Umkungo's people in Natal, having left Zululand for some crime.' 'Listen now to that!' said Cetshwayo to Mkosana. 'Would such a person have been allowed to come near me? I know nothing about any words of mine quarrelling with the Governor of Natal. I never had any quarrel with him; he always treated us kindly. No, these are not my words; they are those of the messengers [invented by them].'

"We read to him in Zulu the statements of his two brothers, defending him on these points, which gave him great pleasure. 'Ah!' said he, 'truly they spoke to the purpose.'

"Cetshwayo asked kindly also after his brother Umkungo, a younger brother of Umbulazi, who fled to Natal after the great battle in 1856, and is now living with his people as a Natal chief. 'Was Umkungo well, and as stout as ever?' [he is enormously stout] 'And had many of his people been killed at Isandhlwana?' —'our people,' Cetshwayo said, adding, 'I heard of one whom I knew; his body was recognised.' We told him that many, but not very many, of Umkungo's were killed on that day, and none of those of the other refugee brother, Sikota. We then asked, 'Were any white prisoners taken by the Zulus during the wars?' 'Yes,' he said, 'there was one white man (Grandier) brought to me after

(for this is the only one ever reported, though Sir Bartle Frere made it do duty for many), but it is plain from the above that this message never came from Cetshwayo at all, and, if it was brought to the Native Office in Maritzburg, must have been concocted by the messengers, which is not an unlikely thing, seeing that one of them was an escaped criminal, who ought never to have been sent on such an errand.

the fight at Hlobane.' 'And what did you do with him?' 'I kept him for three days, and then I sent him back.' 'Did he go on foot or on horseback?' Cetshwayo turned to Mkosana, who said, 'He went on a horse.' And Cetshwayo added, 'I gave him meat for the journey, which was carried for him wrapped up in an eating mat, and a large piece of tobacco, and a bottle that size [a large flask] of gologo (grog), of that stuff of yours, gin.' [We had heard independently from Zulu messengers that the King had given such supplies for the road to Grandier. No wonder that, when found, he was a little off his head!] 'I have heard that that white man is now here in Capetown, and I asked them to bring him to see me, but they have not done so.'*

"We had heard that Major Poole had taught Cetshwayo to sign his own name, and we asked if that was true. 'Oh, yes,' said he, and pulled out a sheet of paper, saying, 'Here is what I was doing only yesterday to amuse myself.' The amusement consisted in printing his own name, 'CETYWAYO,'† some eight or ten times in capital letters, and, as our native schoolmaster remarked the other day, when exhibiting this 'copy,' which Cetshwayo, at our request, had given us, to an admiring audience, 'You observe, boys, the King never goes above nor below the lines.' On the

* Grandier. A white man, taken prisoner by the Zulus at Hlobane, and released by Cetshwayo. When he got back to camp he was, as the officer who saw him stated, "quite off his head," and told a sensational story of his adventures, his danger, and escape through his own prowess, which story was believed at the time, but was afterwards proved to be imaginary, and which contained such inaccuracies as that "the two guns captured by the Zulus at Isandhlwana were at the King's kraal (where Grandier had been taken), *but were both spiked*," which, though stated at the time in one of the Natal journals, is now known to be untrue.

Civilisation seized upon a fiction that was founded upon the incident of Grandier's release, and a horrible effort of imagination appeared in a leading London illustrated journal, in which he was represented as a prisoner at the torture-stake, and Cetshwayo, as a gorilla-like monster, gloating, with a circle of chiefs, over his captive's agony.

† The King learned to spell his name in this way, the Zulu sound, more accurately represented by tshwa, tshwe, tshwi, &c., having for many years been spelt tywa, tywe, tywi, &c., by Zulu scholars.

other side of the page he had written 'MAJOR POOLE.' But this, we believe, is the extent of his knowledge at present, either of writing or reading, though he looked attentively at the large 'ZULULAND,' in the corner of a map which we gave him, as if he meant to try his hand on that. And this, too, seems to be the extent of his indoor 'amusement,' except that we were told General Clifford kindly brings him sometimes to his own rooms to watch a match at lawn-tennis, played in the court before mentioned, his outdoor being the monotonous walk upon the angle of the rampart, as above mentioned. We left with him some photographs and Zulu books, which last he might get Mr. Longcast to read to him, if he would not learn to read them himself, and suggested that he might teach him to play a game at draughts, so as to lighten, in some small measure, his dreary captivity. Cetshwayo said, 'Truly, you give me many things; I shall be at no loss for amusement now.' He produced also, for our inspection, a large English Bible, which Archdeacon Lloyd had given him, but of which, of course, he was unable to read a line, any more than of the Ultimatum, which first Sir Bartle Frere, and then Bishop Schreuder, sent him. An English prisoner might amuse himself with reading and writing. But, how wretchedly must be spent the hours of such a captive as this!—morning, noon, and night!

"It might be supposed that his life is varied by his receiving many visitors. This was no doubt the case while the troops were returning to England, since many of the officers saw him, and expressed themselves very kindly towards him. But when this was over it became another matter. A rule had been laid down by the military authorities, in order to prevent his being made a mere object of vulgar curiosity, that none shall be allowed to see him but those whom he wishes to see. Otherwise, 100 Australians, touching at the Cape, might come at one time to see him, as six Dutch people did while we were there, and were refused admittance. But this rule cuts both ways, for how is Cetshwayo to know who come to him as friends and who as foes? Accordingly, one of his bitterest enemies, the editor of the *Natal Mercury*, was admitted lately, through an order from Sir Bartle Frere,* to see him, though (we believe) against the wish of the military authorities, while a friend of ours, whom we wished to

* Who refused to allow Mr. and Miss F. E. Colenso to see him, in September 1879. Dr. R. J. Colenso was also refused permission a few months later by Mr. Sprigg.

take a personal interest in him, and see him occasionally when we should have left Capetown, was admitted at our request, but with the hope expressed that we would not bring any to see him out of simple curiosity. We ourselves, however, had every facility given us, both by the Governor (Sir G. Strahan), and the Commander-in-Chief (Sir H. H. Clifford), of seeing him as often as we desired; though leave was refused to take him one day to the friend's house where we were staying, and show him a little more than could be seen in his Castle quarters of English civilisation, which we could explain to him in his own tongue, lest it should be made a precedent for others making a similar request. The above will show how closely, after all, he is confined, and what very little relief is afforded to him in his gloomy captivity; though it need hardly be said that within the Castle precincts he has all along received from the military authorities the most kind and compassionate attention.

“When we arrived in Capetown, Major Poole was under orders to leave, and Cetswayo had also been told that he himself was shortly to be moved to a ‘farm’—save the mark!—in the neighbourhood of Langalibalele, some eight or ten miles from Capetown, where he would certainly be out of reach of almost all but official visitors. This, we were told, had made him very sad, as the only *friends* whom he knows in Capetown are General Clifford and Major Poole, and some of the officers and soldiers who have been kind to him. He had shed tears on taking leave of one of the latter, a non-commissioned officer. And indeed it must be impossible for any one to see much of him, and not feel kindly towards him, his whole demeanour agreeing, as it does, with his brother's description of him, ‘He never wronged any one; there is none like him, none so good, so kind, so merciful,’—he might have added, ‘so sensible and cheerful under all his trouble,’ which, however, was very visible at times to us.

“We, of course, comforted him as well as we could, for the loss of General Clifford, by telling him that we believed the new Governor (Sir G. Strahan) was his friend, and that, if he was sent out of town, it was at least with a kind intention on the part of the authorities in England, who knew that it must be hot and unhealthy at the Castle in summer time, and that such close confinement must be bad for him. However, before we left Capetown, we were told, on authority, that the ‘farm,’ on which he was to be placed was not yet bought, and that it was not settled where he would be placed, while Major Poole would stay with him for the

present. It would, indeed, be hardly a matter for regret should the purchase of the farm fall through; for we have been told that, though superior to Uitvlugt, the abode of Langalibalele, it is best described by its name 'Fig-tree Farm,' so called from the *wild* fig-tree, which grows where nothing else will. But, for any one who knows the Cape Flats, it is enough to say that it is within about two miles of the miserable waste of sand and scrub where Langalibalele is placed, and still exists, as he says, 'like a ghost and not a living man.'

"We paid five visits altogether to Cetshwayo, and on our last we said that we were now going away, and we could not tell what things might happen, nor when we should see him again, though he might rest assured that we should not forget him. But we wished, before we parted, to know what would be his own feeling, supposing he were sent for to England, to see the Queen and the authorities there? He looked distressed, and said, 'The sea would kill him.' But we told him, 'No; you have seen what is generally the worst part of the sea between this and Natal, it would probably be much easier to go to England, only a longer voyage.' 'Ah! yes!' said he, 'I have a notion of the time it takes, for that old clergyman (Archdeacon Lloyd), who came to see me, said that he was going to England, and I hear that he has just come back.' 'Well,' we said, 'the journey is not so bad really. And we, for our part, if we heard that you were sent for should be very glad, for we should say it shows kindness towards him, and is a step forwards, for he cannot be sent back, just as he is now, a prisoner.' 'Do you really think that?' said he; 'and you would wish me to go? I will agree then, at once, if am asked, since you advise it, although I have a great horror of the sea.' And again, after talking about other matters, he repeated, 'Yes, I will certainly agree to go to England if I am asked, since you advise it; and there is nothing that I will not do, if my Father Sobantu wishes it.'"

The Bishop, writing to the Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society, on January 9th, 1881, says:—

"I saw Major Poole in town last week, who told me that Cetshwayo is to be removed on the 15th January to a place about a quarter of a mile from Langalibalele's (Uitvlugt), where there is a good house, and (as he says) some ground that may be tilled.

I don't believe in the latter at all, from what I saw of Uitvlugt, which is a barren, miserable place. He has now lost General Clifford, Major Poole, and the interpreter, Longcast, for whom a young man, second son of Mr. Samuelson, one of the Church missionaries in Zululand, has been substituted. I hear that he is a good-natured lad, but this is all I know about him, and I hope that he will do quite as well as Longcast. But Cetshwayo will be badly off for friends. There will be some white guardian, like Langalibalele's, but not the same, and Major Poole says that for three months there will be two or three warders to prevent his being annoyed by visitors from Capetown. I doubt very much if he is likely to receive any, except perhaps an official visitor now and then; for the place can only be reached in a circuitous way, first by rail to Rondesbosch, and then by carriage (if you can get one, but there are none for hire at the Rondesbosch station) over a wretched road for two or three miles. Who will take the trouble to make such an excursion to see the poor exile? Is it possible that the Government can be so heartless as to sanction this arrangement for a man who has acted up to his lights so nobly, who has none of his wives or children with him, and no resources in reading or writing, except as a merely temporary measure while they are preparing to send him back to Zululand? Have you noticed his touching prayer in the last Blue Book, in which he promises to put his son Dinuzulu in our hands as a hostage for his good behaviour? What more would any generous statesman desire? Of course, Sir Bartle Frere and his henchman, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and John Dunn—all these are dead against his being restored to his country in any way, though not one of them touches the point of his son being put into the hands of the English Government as a hostage for his good behaviour."

The following letter, addressed to Sir George Colley, High Commissioner of South-East Africa, contains strong evidence of the desire of the Zulus to see Cetshwayo return to Zululand:—

"BISHOPSTOWE, JAN. 4, 1881."

"SIR,—In the Blue Book [C. 2695], which has just reached this colony, I observe that Mr. Osborn, the Resident in Zululand, has reported to your Excellency as follows:—

"With reference to the application lately made by Ndabuko,

Panda's son, for the release of his brother, the ex-King Cetshwayo, I understand that it has been alleged in some of the Colonial newspapers that several of the appointed chiefs joined in or supported the prayer. I wish to remark that I have reason to believe that there is no truth in the latter allegation, and I do not think that the chiefs desire to see Cetshwayo back in Zululand.'

"I believe that Mr. Osborn is under a mistake in making the above statement. I know that Nozaza came as the representative of Seketwayo, bringing with him Seketwayo's 'Letters Patent,' signed by Sir Garnet Wolseley, &c., and appointing him one of the thirteen chiefs in Zululand, as the voucher for his having been deputed by that chief to say that he heartily joined in Ndabuko's prayer, and also that he took the document with him, fixed in a staff, to the office of the Secretary for Native Affairs in Maritzburg and also to Government House. I am informed that he took it also with him to Mr. Osborn, and that Ndabankulu, representing Faku (ka'Ziningo), Voko, representing Mgojana, and Mfunzi and Sunduzwayo, representing Siwunguza (late Gaozi), who came down with the deputation to Maritzburg, also went to Mr. Osborn, and were present when Ndabuko and Mayamana were told to 'touch the pen' to the petition for their 'Bone,' and did this, as they doubtless supposed, in the name of the whole deputation.

"If Mr. Osborn did not see these representative men or the 'Letters Patent' of Seketwayo, it was, I suppose, because he did not inquire of whom the deputation consisted, and whom they came to represent.

"I am informed also that a fifth chief, Ntshingwayo, was coming to Mr. Osborn with them, but was delayed a day or two by the death of his wife, and certain ceremonies to be gone through in consequence. And as Mr. Osborn, being pressed for time, went off in haste the next morning to visit the chief John Dunn, Ntshingwayo, of course, was stopped from coming. Nevertheless, he expressed his concurrence in the prayer of the deputation by sending a beast to Ndabuko to thank him for what he had done.

"Moreover, I am informed that two other of the thirteen chiefs, Somkele and Mlandela, who would have been represented on the first occasion if they had had notice in time, were sending, more recently, Bubesi, Somkele's brother, and Masana, Mlandela's son, to represent them, when Ndabuko asked leave of Mr. Osborn for himself and party to go down to Maritzburg, to pray a second time for the 'Bone,' and was refused permission.

"I have reason also to believe that an eighth chief, Mgitshwa, in heart concurred in the prayer of the deputation, though he was

afraid to take part in it, lest the English authorities should be displeased. And I understand that Sir Evelyn Wood informed Cetshwayo at Capetown that Hamu also had expressed to him his desire that his brother should be released and sent back to Zululand.

“On the other hand, I am aware that chief John Dunn has fined one of the principal headmen placed under him for having sent a representative to join in the prayer for the ‘Bone’ without his consent, which, of course, would never have been given, and has announced in the newspapers, ‘I intend punishing any of my subjects I find negotiating with the Bishop without my knowledge.’

“As Mr. Osborn’s statement above quoted impugns my veracity, or, at all events, the credibility of ‘allegations’ made publicly by me, I respectfully request that your Excellency will be pleased to direct inquiry to be made through Mr. Osborn as to whether these things are true:—

“(1) That *Seketwayo* was represented in the deputation which waited on Mr. Osborn, by Nozaza, bearing his ‘Letters Patent’;

“(2) That *Faku* (ka’Ziningo), *Mqojana* and *Siwunguza* were also represented before him on that occasion by Ndabankulu, Voko, Mfunzi and Sunduzwayo;

“(3) That *Ntshingwayo* intended to come in person and join in the prayer of the deputation, but, being prevented by Mr. Osborn’s going off to John Dunn before he could arrive, *bonga’d* Ndabuko’s action with a beast;

“(4) That *Siwunguza* also intended to come in person, and *Somkele* and *Mlandela* had agreed to send Bubesi and Masana, as above, to represent them, when Ndabuko was refused leave to come down a second time to the authorities at Maritzburg to pray for the ‘Bone.’

“I have, &c.,

“J. W. NATAL.”*

* This letter was forwarded to Mr. Osborn, for report, by Sir George Colley, and on February 11th the latter writes to the Bishop that “without entering into any reasons which the British Resident in Zululand may be prepared to give in proof of the accuracy of the statements quoted by your lordship from the Blue Book [C. 2665] . . . the present is not considered a propitious time for making the inquiries requested by you, as the minds of the Zulus

The Bishop, writing on December 3rd, 1880, said:—

“One of the two Zulus who came down to announce that the Prince Maduna (as Cetshwayo also called him, though he appears as Ndaduko generally in our account of the deputation), with other representative men, had crossed into the colony, but were stopped on the frontier by Mr. Fynney while he telegraphed to Pietermaritzburg, finding that they did not arrive, went back a few days ago to ascertain the cause of the delay, and met on the way some men sent by Maduna, who arrived here to-day, and came to say that they were refused leave to come on by the authorities in Pietermaritzburg, and had gone back to Zululand. They had been promised a pass to come down with Zibebu, of whom they complained: he was allowed to come on, but not they. You may judge for yourself what is likely to be in the end the result of such repression of their cries for what they deem—rightly or wrongly—to be justice.

“Since my last words were written they have come into my study and told me Zibebu, Mfanawendlela, Hamu, and John Dunn have ‘eaten up’ all those in their districts who came down to ask for their ‘Bone,’ e.g. John Dunn has taken twenty head of cattle from Qetuka. They say also that Maduna will go and apply for a pass from Mr. Osborn, but they don’t at all expect that he will get one, as he has been refused before. Mr. Osborn told him to go and settle matters with Zibebu if he could, and after that come back for a pass; and he did so, and was refused, though Zibebu got one. Of course I cannot answer for the strict accuracy of the above statement. Thus Mr. Osborn may have meant that the same pass should cover Maduna as well as Zibebu, if the latter condescended to take the former. But it is clear that an unpleasant state of things exists in Zululand which some day or other may end in fighting and revolution.”

are very much unsettled by Boer emissaries making certain statements relative to the return to Zululand of the late king.”

Apparently the “propitious time” never came, for the inquiries were never made. However well prepared Mr. Osborn “may” have been to give proofs of the accuracy of his statements, he never gave them: the Bishop’s challenge was never met, and remains without disproof to this day.

It was natural for the Aborigines' Protection Society to ask for what purpose obstacles were placed in the way of the Zulus entering Natal, and making known their grievances to the authorities. It seemed to that Society as mischievous as it was unquestionably high-handed that they should be subjected to such treatment.

CHAPTER IV.

WHATEVER may have been the ostensible object of Sir E. Wood's mission, the practical convenience gained by the Natal Government was the possibility of making the closing assertion of Colonel Mitchell's speech, "Each of the eight appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation."

What was the worth of these denials, by what means they were obtained, and how much credit those means reflect upon the Natal Government, must now be considered, and the story cannot be better given than in the words of the Inhlazatshe Zulus themselves. Some men of the chief Siwunguza relate as follows after the meeting at Inhlazatshe:—

"The Amakosi (English authorities), and Malimati (Mr. Osborn, the Resident), and John Dunn, having agreed together, Malimati asked Siwunguza if he had sent down to Maritzburg to pray for Cetshwayo's return, making use of the expression, 'In company with whom do you pray' [equal to telling him that he stood quite alone in making such a prayer]. Siwunguza denied that he had done so, whereupon Mr. Osborn said, 'By whom, then, were Mfunzi and Sidindi sent, who have been down to Maritzburg about that affair? If you had nothing to do with it, you must eat up their cattle as a proof thereof.' So Siwunguza ate up the cattle of Mfunzi. But Mfunzi went to him, and

remonstrated, saying, 'Why are my cattle to be eaten up? Did I go down, then, on my own account? I, an old King's messenger? And how, then, did Sidindi come to go, your brother's [the late chief Gaozi's] own official messenger? Did we trump up a message ourselves?' But Siwunguza answered, 'This is not my doing, but the doing of the White Chief over there'—indicating Mr. Osborn. Mfunzi then went to Malimati—Mr. Osborn—and asked why he had ordered Siwunguza to eat up his cattle. But Malimati also denied, saying, 'It is not my doing, Mfunzi; you are just eaten up by your own chief. Sidindi had also been eaten up; but Siwunguza's men did not tell me the result in his case.'

Another Zulu, of Mnyamana's tribe, stated as follows:—

"Seven days ago, when I was in John Dunn's country, I heard that the three Zulu chiefs (Ncongwana, Ngobozana, and Posile) who came down to Natal, asking to be allowed to go to Cetshwayo, when they reached Inhlazatshe, found the Zulus still gathered together. They were asked by the Amakosi [the 'authorities,' i. e. the Resident or his representative] what they wanted. They said 'a pass to go to Maritzburg.' 'Where do you come from now?' they were asked. 'From Maritzburg,' they replied. 'We do not wish to conceal it; we went to pray for the "Bone," and for leave to go to it.' But all the answer they received was, 'Who told you that there was any such "Bone" left? What do you mean by going after it? We won't allow it.'

"When they got home, Ngobozana found that his cattle had been eaten up by the chief of the district, his brother Siwunguza, under John Dunn's influence—to punish him for praying for the release of Cetshwayo. But he remonstrated with Siwunguza, and the cattle were returned to him." For the same reason Posile's cattle were eaten up by order of Mfanawendhlela, the (appointed) chief of his district, but they were rescued by Posile's brothers [sons of Manyosi, a chief induna in the days of the King Dingane, of a powerful family], assisted by some of Mnyamana's people.

As to Ncongwana, he had been "eaten-up" long

before (by Zibebu), when he went down with the first deputation to pray for Cetshwayo's return.

It will be observed that of the three appointed chiefs who punished men in their districts for praying for "the Bone," two—Zibebu and Mfanawendhlela—were amongst the three (Zulu) kinglets who were traitors to Cetshwayo before their rise to power, and averse to his return thenceforward, while Siwunguza, although amongst the eight faithful ones, was weak-kneed, and had been persuaded to forswear himself, plainly acknowledging to his brother and friends that his conduct was not voluntary, and that he acted under pressure, in fear of the white authorities.

The account given by two of the three chiefs who were so anxious to join the King in his captivity, of their reception by the Resident, to whom they went after failing to reach Inhlazatshe in time for the meeting, deepens the impression of unfair dealings in official quarters.

After relating how they journeyed from Bishopstowe and were delayed by the weather, as already described (p. 45), they continue thus:—

"On the 13th [day of their journey, the 1st of September] we arrived at Inhlazatshe, and found there Mnyamana and the Princes, the sons of Mpande and some of the chiefs; others were still arriving, or on their way, and Mgitshwa (one of the appointed chiefs) came with us; but Lukuni* was gone, the meeting was over, and there had been no talking whatever.

* It cannot be concealed that—if the "Meeting" was really intended to do the Zulus any good—*Lukuni* [Sir Evelyn Wood]

“On the day of our arrival a policeman of Malimati (Mr. Osborn) had come and told Mnyamana that Ngobozana and Posile were to be eaten up, because it was said, ‘What business had they to go down to Maritzburg?’ When we heard this, Ngeongwana said, ‘Let us, however, deliver this letter which Ofi [Mr. Theoph. Shepstone, M.L.C.] has given us to take to Malimati; for, in fact, we were not refused by the authorities at Maritzburg; only it was said that we had gone without a letter from Malimati, and must return and fetch it.’ Mnyamana was somewhat revived by the sight of this letter; but still he said, ‘What is the use? Letters from the authorities have been beforehand with you; the (appointed) chiefs are said to deny having sent you; you will only be punished (Botshiwe),* from what I hear from Malimati’s policeman.’

“Next day (September 2), Posile and Ngobozana went to their homes, as they had heard that they were to be eaten up. But Ngeongwana insisted on delivering the letter to Malimati, and took with him Siziba, to explain how we had gone down supposing that our ‘letter’ had gone before us. And Siziba told Malimati that, when he went last to ask for a ‘letter,’ the Inkos’ (Mr. Osborn), was away, and the induna Sotondose said, ‘The letter has gone;’ and so (said Ngeongwana) ‘we went down after it’ (see p. 39). Malimati then questioned Sotondose, who confirmed Siziba’s words. When Malimati had read the letter of Ofi, he said, ‘By whom were you sent down [to

made a most serious mistake in ignoring all the habits, customs, and ideas of this half-conquered race, and trying to force upon them at a stroke the military precision implied by his fixing a single day, on which all must be present, and all complaints must be heard, then or not at all. Such an arrangement would be absolutely incomprehensible to the Zulus, whose counsels and “parliaments” of all kinds are well known to be of the most lengthy description. They would not believe it possible beforehand, and when it was carried out could but regard it as a farce, intended to cheat and ruin them. That this was the impression actually left upon the minds of the people is shown by their every allusion to this unlucky meeting, and to Sir Evelyn Wood.

* *Botshiwe*, literally *bound*, the word commonly used by Natal natives for imprisonment in gaol.

Maritzburg]?’ Ngcongwana replied, ‘I was sent by Maduna (the Prince Ndabuko), Ziweddu, and Mnyamana.’ But he would not receive that answer, and said, ‘Tell me which of the (appointed) chiefs sent you.’”

They then gave the same list of men representing such and such chiefs as they had given on several previous occasions, which Mr. Osborn made them repeat over again several times, as though he doubted the truth of their statements. At last Ngcongwana, after the fourth repetition, remarked,

“Are you, then, deaf, that you do not hear my words?” whereupon Mr. Osborn’s policeman interposed, exclaiming :

“Is that the way you speak to the master (Inkos’)? * You are saved by that letter of Ofi ; † if you had brought one merely from Sobantu (the Bishop), we should have flogged you.”

Then said Malimati, “You are telling lies ! All the appointed chiefs deny that they sent you.”

Ngcongwana replied to this insult, “I am not telling lies, for the money sent by those chiefs (as earnest) reached Mr. John Shepstone (acting S. N. A.).”

“How much was it ?” asked Malimati.

* It is noticeable here how, while demanding almost servile respect from these men—no common Zulus, but chiefs of rank—the British Resident saw no necessity to preserve even common courtesy towards them.

† A son of Sir P. Shepstone’s, commonly known as “Offy Shepstone” by Natal Colonists, a colonial lawyer, but without any political position to account for Mr. Osborn’s permitting this singular language from his subordinate in his presence.

Siziba replied, "There was £6 from *Ntshingwayo*"—

"Go on," said Malimati.

"And £3 from *Seketwayo*"—

"Well?"

"And £5 from *Siwunguza*"—

"Any more?"

"We are speaking of the appointed chiefs," said Siziba; "but, if I am to name the others, there was £5 from Mnyamana, and £5 from Sitshaluza."

"You are telling lies," said Malimati again. "Over there in Natal in whose company were you supposed to be? In that of Ngobozana and Posile? [meaning "why do you, Ngcongwana, come here alone?"] What did Mr. John [Shepstone] say to you?"

"He said," was the reply, "'Is Malimati, then, a mere peg stuck in the ground? We ought to hear of this matter through him.'"

Ngcongwana then asked Malimati to give him a letter to the Governor [Sir E. Wood], and to get him and his companions sent on to the Governor.

"I will not," replied Mr. Osborn, "lest you should go and tell lies at Maritzburg."

After this unsatisfactory interview, Ngcongwana allowed a day to pass, but upon the next he went again and asked the induna Sotondose to announce him to Mr. Osborn; but Sotondose answered, "No! I cannot take in your name, since the Inkos' refused you to your own ears."

A third time Ngcongwana went, accompanied on this occasion by Posile, and, when they asked for a

pass, Malimati said, "Well! and this time by whom are you sent?" They replied, "It is always the same chiefs by whom we are sent—give us now a letter that we may go."

But Malimati refused it, saying, "Go and tell your lies in your own way!" [that is to say, "without my help."]

"On the day after the meeting, viz. the day of their arrival at Inhlazatshe, Ngcongwana was in Mnyamana's hut with him, when Sotondose, Malimati's induna, came and whispered to Mnyamana to come outside with him, which he did. On the following day he told Ngcongwana what had passed between him and the induna. The latter had advised him to 'deny having had anything to do with these fellows (Ngcongwana and party), saying that 'among the English things are denied falsely, no one speaks the truth: the man who can tell lies well is the one who gets on with them. And what do you want with the "Bone"? You had better positively deny (*funga*, swear) before Malimati that you never sent to ask for the "Bone," or ever said that you wanted it. If you do this you will please the English authorities. But, if you say that you do want the "Bone," you will be worthless in their eyes.'

Mnyamana said that he made no reply to this advice, after giving which Sotondose left him. But, said the former to Ngcongwana, "Be sure that you report this for me emphatically to Sobantu (the Bishop of Natal), and say that this is what hampers me, that, when we have prayed with all our hearts for the 'Bone,' when we have spoken all these words plainly and openly, orders should come back to us from the white authorities that we are to deny all this! For me, I cannot do so, and I shall say to Malimati himself that I cry for the 'Bone,' and

cannot leave the children of Mpande to be turned out of their homes on the hill-side."

And on the day of meeting, before Lukuni (Sir E. Wood) spoke to the chiefs, Sotondose took them aside and spoke with them. "It appears to us," said the narrators, "that he must have said the same thing to them, since he went and warned Mnyamana, so great a man among us all, with all those wicked words about lying, and was not ashamed." *

Mnyamana said, "How can the (appointed) chiefs send men to pray for the 'Bone,' and to see the King for them, and then leave them in the lurch, to be eaten up in this way?" and he sent Ngcongwana to say to the Prince Maduna (Ndabuko), "I, Mnyamana, complain of this. I ask when will Sobantu interfere on our behalf, since things here come to this pass?" And Maduna said, "Indeed I agree with my father † there. For even up to this time, when we are turned out upon the hill-side, while we have kept sending to Sobantu and telling him of all our troubles, he has

* It is of course open to the Resident to deny that he knew anything of these frequent instances of duplicity, &c., on the part of his subordinates. But in that case at least it cannot be denied that a very great mistake was made in the appointment of a man who, although he understood the language and could therefore look into matters for himself, could be so grossly and frequently deceived by his own men, through so long a time—nearly four years—during which every effort was made both by the Zulus themselves, and by their few white friends in Natal, to bring the truth to the surface. Nor is it possible to avoid the observation that the conduct of the subordinates chimed in most conveniently with the known policy of their superiors.

† A term of courtesy used by the Prince in deference to the old Prime Minister's age and rank.

never yet sent any one to us, to see how we are troubled, and that we have only spoken the truth." *

"The second time that Ngcongwana went to Malimati, when Sotondose refused to report him, he heard Ntuzwa, the appointed chief Seketwayo's brother, speaking with the Resident. Ntuzwa had been summoned together with the other chief; but, when he arrived, he found that Sir E. Wood was gone, and followed after him on horseback and caught him up. He asked him, 'How, then, have you settled Zululand?' [meaning 'what sort of settling is this?'] to which Sir Evelyn Wood replied, 'I hope that the sky will give rain enough for there to be a plentiful harvest.' †

"So Ntuzwa returned to Malimati, and Ngcongwana heard them, as aforesaid, speaking together quite distinctly, for he was sitting with (the Prince) Shingana outside, while inside were Ntshingwayo and Sitshaluza also. Malimati asked, 'Have you anything to do with this affair, Ntuzwa, since you represent your brother (Seketwayo)?' Said Ntuzwa, 'What affair?' 'This of Ngcongwana.' Said Ntuzwa, 'Yes, we have to do with it. How should it be denied? But here is Ngcong-

* Compare the above natural, but most undeserved, reproach with the frequent false accusations brought against the Bishop, by both Government and colonists, of sending messengers to Zululand. It need hardly be said that he would have spared no pains in sending such could he have seen any hope of doing good thereby, but the intense official jealousy against him which existed in Natal, made even the most wise and helpful interference on his part impossible, and, what the Zulus at this time felt to be neglect, was in reality due to the sincerest desire for their welfare. They understood this, themselves, a little later. Nevertheless, although under the circumstances the Bishop of Natal judged it best to refrain from using his undeniable influence with the Zulus, it cannot be doubted that great good would have resulted had his willingness to be of use been met by the Government in a generous and sensible spirit, and not with cold repulse, and jealous suspicion.

† Such jesting with the people's misery after the downfall of all the hopes founded upon the meeting beforehand must have had a bitter sound, indeed, in their ears.

wana himself: call him in.' This he said because Ntshingwayo, one of the eight (appointed) chiefs who had sent, or agreed to the deputation, and who was then present, had denied to Malimati that he was concerned in it. 'But as for us,' said Ntuzwa, 'no denial is possible. You had better ask the chiefs themselves, as we who are mere people (i.e. not appointed chiefs) are considered of no account.'"

When the interview was over Ntuzwa came out and told those outside what had passed, saying, "We have had warm words, the whiteman and I, because he wanted me to agree that I had nothing to do with you. But I refused and said that I was in it, and that he had better ask the appointed chiefs (if he did not believe me)."

One day after this a messenger of Malimati stopped at Mnyamana's asking for a draught of beer, and said to Ngcongwana, "We have just come from Seketwayo, who refuses to deny that he had sent Nozaza [on the deputation]; he said, "I have nothing to do with Ngcongwana, &c.;* they were not my messengers; but the man I had to do with was Nozaza, who went with Mfunzi."

Whether the stauncher conduct of Seketwayo and his men arose from a more resolute spirit on the part of that chief, or from the knowledge that, in the face of his letters-patent sent down with his messenger on the first deputation, denial on his part would be useless, he certainly proved an insurmount-

* Ngcongwana, &c., were sent by Mnyamana, Maduna, and Ziwedu, together with Mfunzi and his party, who came expressly to represent the eight appointed chiefs.

able obstacle in the way of those who were so anxious to suppress the "prayer for the Bone," or at least to make out that it emanated only from a few malcontents, not from the people in general or from the appointed chiefs. Colonel Mitchell's assertion, "Each of the eight appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation," could only have been made by taking note of the first part of Seketwayo's reply, "I had nothing to do with Ngcongwana, &c.," and ignoring its close, "but the man I had to do with was Nozaza, who went with Mfunzi [and carried the letters-patent]." But the matter is put in its true light by a letter to the local papers from the Bishop, dated Oct. 23, 1881, in which, after contradicting a report published in the said papers of his having sent "agents" to Zululand, calling for deputations,* he continues:—

"Further, I observe that you published recently in your columns a letter from Chief John Dunn, in which he states that 'there is no truth in the statement about eight of the (appointed) chiefs praying for Cetshwayo's return. This the British Resident can attest.'

"In reply I beg to state that on the first occasion (May, 1880), when a deputation came down to make the above prayer, one of them, Nozaza, brought with him his chief Seketwayo's Letters-Patent,' that is to say, the document signed by Sir Garnet Wolseley, appointing him to be chief, as a guarantee that the man in question was a confidential messenger, and that the chief was a party to the prayer. And, as he certainly would not have come forward *alone* to make such a petition, this fact

* The deputations came entirely of their own accord, and were as wholly unexpected by the Bishop as they were by the Government.

by itself guarantees the *bonâ fide* character of that deputation as having been sent, as they stated, by five of the appointed chiefs, afterwards increased to eight, to make the prayer in question.

“And the fact, that the same confidential messenger, Nozaza, was sent with the recent deputation, shows that this also came to express the genuine wishes of the eight chiefs, as they stated, whatever attempts have been made to discredit it.

“I will add that, if the chiefs under pressure have been brought to deny that they sent such deputations—Seketwayo among the rest—it only shows how unmeaning are such denials.

“I have taken the proper measures for setting the true facts before the authorities. J. W. NATAL.”

Yet it is hardly possible to blame those chiefs who flinched and gave way to their powerful white conquerors, especially after reading the sad accounts of how they were frightened, and forced to eat their own words, and even to inflict punishment on their own relatives and friends for having carried their messages faithfully, when it became plain how greatly those messages had displeased the “white authorities,” who, in truth, were far more responsible for the falsehoods told, and the injustice perpetrated, than were the untaught savages, amongst whom “to lie like an Englishman” has of late, unhappily, become a proverb.

One or two instances of the above-mentioned punishments, inflicted on the returned messengers, will be enough to show the means which were taken to stifle any expression on the part of the people for their king's return. There are many such stories, and from amongst them may be selected, The story of Ngobozana, one of the three chiefs who prayed to join the king.

“When Ngobozana hurried home from Inhlazatshe (as already mentioned) he found that Siwunguza—his appointed chief—had ordered that all his cattle should be eaten up, and had called together the headmen of the Tribe to enquire of Ngobozana how he came to go down to Maritzburg. But Ngobozana said, ‘Since it is you, Siwunguza, who ask the question, what can I answer? For it was to you that the princes sent, and it was you who called me from my kraal, and told me to go; and when I suggested that the headmen should be informed, you agreed and told them. And it was you who gave me a beast to offer to the *amadhlozi* (ancestral spirits) that I might be fortunate in going among the English. Moreover, with whom among all the Zulus did the prayer for the “Bone” begin? Was it not with your house, when our brother Gaozi (late appointed chief) sent Sidindi and another, soon after the king was carried away, to pray for him to the Natal Authorities, which prayer was made through Mxakaza (Mr. Fynney, Border Agent)?’”

The headmen all agreed that Ngobozana spoke truly. And in the end he was let off on paying a fine of five head of cattle only. But it is a fact, nevertheless, that Siwunguza sent privately to the Prince Shingana, saying, “In spite of all this that you see happening to my father’s son (Ngobozana), if you, princes, should be going down again to Maritzburg [on this errand], do not, I pray you, pass me by; I shall always have a beast to kill for you.”

And again the story of Mfunzi, the old messenger who had made so many journeys to and fro for the king:—

“Mfunzi’s cattle were also eaten up by Siwunguza—all of them, 70 head. Mfunzi made no resistance, but himself helped Siwunguza’s men to take them, turning the calves out of the huts for them. When Mfunzi came to Malimati (Mr. Osborn) about this, he had tied 70 knots in a string, to show the number of his cattle, and that Malimati might count them for

himself. Malimati said, 'Well, Mfunzi, you see what has happened through your going down to Maritzburg without reference to me.' Said Mfunzi, 'When did we go down without reference to you? We are always asking you for a pass, and you are either absent or you refuse it; and this time Sotondose (Mr. Osborn's Induna) told us that you had sent our letter on, so we went after it. I wish that you should give me a policeman to go with me to Maritzburg, that I may learn by whose order this is done.'

"'Stop now, Mfunzi!' said Malimati, 'and tell me—when you were there, by whom did you say that you were sent?'"

Upon this Mfunzi cast upon the ground a handful of mealie grains, equal in number to the pounds of money which he had carried down to the authorities at Maritzburg from three of the appointed chiefs and others, which was presented to Mr. John (Shepstone) as a thank-offering for Mkosana's return, and with the prayer that the authorities would "pour-on and fill-up;" but Mr. John said that these did not wish to be thanked with money, and told Mfunzi and the others to take it again, saying, "We give it to Maduna for Cetshwayo's children." Mfunzi cast down the grains, naming the eight chiefs who had sent him; and although Malimati contradicted him, saying, 'the chiefs deny it,' he insisted on calling the money to witness that he had been sent by them.

In the case of Posile, another of the three who petitioned to share the king's exile, he was plainly told by the *impi* which attacked his kraal that it was by Mr. Osborn's orders, not by his chiefs desire, that he was "eaten up," and in every instance there was discernible an undercurrent of belief that the punishment inflicted would please the Resident, and

the Natal authorities, and that the outrages thus committed, if not by the Resident's distinct commands, was certainly with his implied approval, and in consequence of hints from him to the appointed chiefs that if they had really nothing to do with sending these deputations, so displeasing to the white authorities, they ought to punish such men of theirs as had joined them, as a proof of their own innocence.

Ngcongwana and Posile give the following account of how they fared upon their next attempt to obtain a hearing at Maritzburg, which attempt was made after the Resident had refused to give them the pass for which they asked on the day after the Inhlazatshe Meeting.

They started again for Natal after their last repulse from the Resident as described above, reaching Bishopstowe once more, on October 26th; but Ngobozana, who still desired to go to Cape Town with the other two, was this time detained in Zululand by his brother Siwunguza, who feared the anger of the White Authorities if he should allow him to come down upon this errand.

The Bishop, who was aware that Cetshwayo had prayed Sir Hercules Robinson, Governor at the Cape, that these three men might be sent to him, at once reported their arrival to Sir Evelyn Wood, whose reply, through his private secretary was a request that he would "refer the Zulus * * * * * to the Secretary for Native Affairs."

Accordingly, on Saturday, October 29, Ngconge-

wana and Posile went in (5 miles) from Bishopstowe, starting at 7 A.M. On their return after sun-down they stated as follows:—

“ We arrived at the S. N. A. Office, and presented Sobantu [the Bishop of Natal]’s letter (stating that they had been referred to the S. N. A. Office by the Governor). The Induna Luzindela asked, ‘What have you come for?’ We said, ‘On the same business as before.’ He asked, ‘Have you a letter from Mr. Osborn?’ We said ‘No.’ Said he, ‘That’s the mistake you make. If you would only bring a letter from him, you would have no trouble.’* Then he took in our letter, and presently we saw a letter taken out by another door, and sent up (as we suppose) to Government House. We had to wait a very long time, so that Luzindela went away, and came back again. At last came a messenger with an order for beef for us; and, when the sun was now in the west, we were taken up to Mr. Shepstone’s private house. Here Luzindela gave us a pot of *tshwala* (native beer) to drink, and Mr. John had his horse saddled, and rode up with us to Government House. Here we found Lukuni (Sir E. Wood) and his interpreter (? secretary), and Mxakaza (Mr. F. B. Fynney), and another gentleman (? Colonial Secretary), and Mr. John made the fifth, so that Luzindela said, ‘Why all the white chiefs are gathered here to-day!’

“ Mr. John began by saying, ‘The Governor asks, what have you come about?’ Said we, ‘We have come on the same business as before: when we were sent with Mfunzi and his party to thank for the return of Mkosana, because he was the skin in which the child (Cetshwayo) had been wrapped, and therefore the chiefs who sent us say, “Pour-on, sirs, and fill-up for us of the same, &c. &c.”—by which they meant, again, that they prayed for the ‘Bone.’

“‘That will do—Enough, enough!’ was the reply. ‘The

* These “Indunas,” subordinate native officials of the Natal Government, reflect (naturally) the sentiments and intentions of their superiors, from whom this pretence of blaming the Zulus for coming to them without those credentials from the Resident, which they knew were systematically refused, was as foolish as it was wicked.

Governor asks, 'By whom were you sent?' Said we 'We were sent by Mnyamana and Maduna and Ziwedú; and Mfunzi and Sidindi were sent by *Siwunguzà*; and Gagaqikili by *Ntshingwayo* and Nozaza by *Seketwayo*.'* Said he, 'Were those all?' We replied 'No, for the other five [appointed] chiefs (naming them) all sent to Maduna for the same purpose.' 'And how was it that you told Malimati [Mr. Osborn] that you were sent by Mnyamana and Maduna and Ziwedú only?' 'We told him that we were sent by those, and by the eight (appointed) chiefs also,' naming them 'just as we have done here to-day, and just as we did to yourself, sir, [Mr. John Shepstone] when we were here before.'

" 'The Governor asks who sends you now.'

" 'The same persons send us always,' we replied, naming them again.

" 'But we wish to know whether you are merely sent to Capetown, or do you wish to go of your own accord?' they asked.

" 'As to that,' said we, 'we ourselves wish very much to go; but, at the same time, we are always sent by them.'

" 'And, if we were to tell you to pack up, and start to-morrow?' We raised our fingers, saying 'Ah! that would be good! we should say that truly you are with us, you are a friend to us, son of Sonzica' (patronymic of Mr. John Shepstone).

" 'But how was it that you delayed so much, and did not come to the meeting at Inhlazatshe, although you were at a kraal close by for two days?' they asked.

" 'Said we, we were not at any such kraal, and we did not delay.'

" 'But Malimati's letter here says that you were at a kraal close by for two days before the meeting?'

" 'Said we, it was not so, the letter is speaking untruly. The place where we were kept for two days by the snow-storm was Ndhlongolwana's kraal of Mavumengwana's down far away. We stayed afterwards one day at Ngobozana's. And on that day John Dunn passed by on horseback going to the meeting. On the next day we got to Shingana's, and that was the day of the meeting. That letter of Malimati is not speaking the truth.'

* In this sentence the italics indicate appointed chiefs.

“ ‘For how long do you suppose you would stay at Capetown,’ he asked.

“Said we. ‘We would stay for five years, or for any length of time.’

“ ‘And since Cetshwayo is to be taken away to England, which is very much farther off, what will you do?’

“Said we. ‘We are quite ready; we only want to go to him wherever he may be; but, if we can go to England with him so much the better.’

“ ‘And are you not afraid of the journey?’

“Said we. ‘If we were afraid we should not have come here.’

“ ‘But where is the money to pay the expenses?’

“Said we. ‘For that we leave ourselves in the hands of the authorities.’

“ ‘How many of you wish to go?’

“We said. ‘All of us?’

“ ‘What! all sitting here?’

“We said. ‘There are only two of us here; this is Ngcongwana, and that Posile. The rest whom ye see are attendants.’

“ ‘And Ngobozana—where is he?’

“ ‘Sir, he too wishes greatly to go,’ we replied; ‘he has not come down with us, but he wishes to go all the same.’

“ ‘And Mgwazeni?’ asked Mr. John, reading the names from a paper.

“Upon this Mgwazeni (who was present with the party of Zulus) assented joyfully, wondering who had asked for him, and if he could have been Cetshwayo himself.

“And the paper went further still, naming the young man Guyana, brother of Mgin, so, as the latter was already with Cetshwayo at Capetown we thought the summons must surely come from thence.

“Then Mr. John said, ‘Go now, and come again at the end of ten days. For we shall send a letter to Capetown, and also to Malimati, to enquire what sort of a person is this Ngcongwana, &c.—whether you are fit persons to send—and according to the answers that we receive we will answer you. But we blame you in that you did not come direct to the Government. Was it not a custom in Zululand for a man to go direct to the king’s kraal, and get his words there? And, besides, you can’t expect us to go looking for you, to give you beef wherever you

may choose to be. However, we do not forbid you now. Go, and wait the ten days there where you have chosen to go (i.e. Bishopstowe).’”

It was a pitiful farce this censure of the Zulus for coming down without the permission which they had tried in vain to obtain, and which could not have been so repeatedly refused them without the connivance of the very men who now lectured them, as though they had but to ask to obtain a pass, and had come without one through mere negligence, or want of respect. And, again, the pretended grave reproof because—coming as they did without that unobtainable *pass* concerning which so much had been said, with grave anxieties for what might be the fate of the families they left behind, in consequence of their action, and entering themselves a country which they could not but regard as that of a pitiless foe—they went first, on their way to “government,” to the one spot in all Natal where they knew that they were sure at least of sympathy and kindness, and such comfort as *could* be given by the Bishop and his family, even although it did not lie within his power to help them in the object of their painful embassy.

How their brave and faithful persistence was at last rewarded, with other matters affecting the welfare of the Zulus, must be reserved for another chapter of our sad and humbling tale.

CHAPTER V.

HOWEVER good the intentions of the "Natal authorities" may have been, there can be no doubt at all as to the effect actually produced by Sir E. Wood's visit to Zululand, and the Inhlazatshe meeting. For, in the words of the correspondent of the *Natal Mercury* for October 22, 1881, "up to the arrival of Sir Evelyn Wood, the Chiefs did not fully realise that they were really independent at all. Now they do, and if I mistake not, like a beggar on horseback, will ride to the devil sharp. Hamu has begun by killing a large number of the Abaqulusi people. . . ."* And these words, published by one of the most persistent enemies Cetshwayo and the loyal Zulus ever had, and who vouches for his correspondent being "trustworthy," only confirm the sad accounts given by the loyal Zulus themselves of the tyranny and ill-treatment from which they suffered in immediate consequence of the Inhlazatshe meeting, to which they had looked for relief from the grievances that they had already endured, but which, great as they were, were together cast into the shade by the misery and bloodshed which followed. It is not too much to say

* Part of the letter given at p. 54.

that, had the sole intention of "government" been to stamp out the devotion of the Zulus to their king, or rather to silence all expression of it, by encouraging the ill-treatment and destruction of those who dared to speak, they could not have acted more effectively than as they did throughout the whole period of Cetshwayo's detention. That, nevertheless, the cry of the people reached the ears of the British public, only proves how deep and strong were the feelings it expressed. From the evidence of a number of respectable Zulus, it appears that Zibebu went straight from the meeting at Inhlazatshe and sent an *impi* to eat up and drive out Maduna, and that he then set himself triumphantly to play the despot in a fashion which did small credit either to his original selection as Kinglet by Sir G. Wolseley, or to the counsel just received from Sir E. Wood. There appears to have been a long standing dispute concerning cattle between him and his brother Haiyana, the latter being their father's eldest son, while Zibebu was *the son of the Chief Wife*. The father, Mapita by name (brother to the old King Mpande), had decided in favour of Haiyana, upon which Zibebu appealed to Mpande. The King, however, refused to reverse Mapita's judgment, saying that the latter knew best to whom the cattle belonged, and that it was an unheard of thing for a son to dispute his father's decision in such a case. For the time being—that is for many years—Zibebu was obliged to submit, but now, finding himself placed in special authority by the English, and encouraged by

them to use it to the utmost, the old grievance came up again, and he took the law into his own hands, for his own special benefit. In the evening, after the meeting, he sent a message to three of his brothers, Haiyana, Fokoti,* and Makoba, saying "To-day my sores are healed, all my annoyances are cleared off. You had better behave yourselves, for I have something to say to you." He was as good as his word, and the threat proved no empty one, for, that very evening, he sent out an *impi* which began to "eat up" Haiyana's cattle from the different kraals of the Sutu (Cetshwayo's own tribe), where they had been put for safety, and which took also Sutu cattle from the Prince Maduna's own people. They even tried to drive off the cattle from Maduna's own kraal, and also from the royal kraal Esisusweni. Maduna and his men had not yet returned from the Inhlazatshe meeting; but, at each of these two places, the royal women themselves came out, armed with sticks, and drove the cattle back, upon which the *impi* was ashamed, and left them in peace, yet they did mischief enough.

Of Haiyana's six kraals they destroyed the principal one, and took possession of the others, and of all the property in them.

Of Fokoti's four kraals, they pulled down one, a second they burnt, and took possession of the other two.

Of Makoba's three kraals, they destroyed one, and took possession of the other two.

* Who gave this account, verified by others.

“They have got all the property of all these kraals,” said the Zulu reporters of this outrage, which they attributed undoubtingly to the influence of *Lukuni* (Sir E. Wood), “hoes, and blankets, and stores of fat, and everything. And two of Fokoti’s mothers, aged women, were unable to get away, and to this day we do not know what has become of them; for all the owners of these kraals had gone with Maduna to the meeting with Lukuni, and had not yet returned. Zibebu’s *impi* killed also two old women among the kraals of Nzuza’s people, destroying kraals there also, carrying off cattle, and spilling and defiling the grain.”

“News of this was sent to Maduna, who was still in the neighbourhood of Inhlazatshe, and he reported it all to Mr. Osborn, who sent a man of his own to go home with Maduna, and see what had happened. But the princes never reached home, being prevented by the *impi* [Zibebu’s]. They remained therefore in Hamu’s District, and only youngsters were left to keep watch at Kwa’ Minya (Maduna’s kraal).”

“Maduna now called his own people together, saying ‘Since many of you have not heard the words of Lukuni, come and hear from me the heap of troubles with which I am destroyed to-day.’”

But the night before they came together, when it was known that Maduna had called them, the young men left in charge of Kwa’ Minya heard that the people of some of Zibebu’s kraals near at hand were alarmed at the news, and were taking flight. Where-

upon they—some 15 in number—went out on an expedition of their own, and on finding that the report was true, they attacked the fugitives, and took possession of their cattle, killing a woman and wounding another woman and a man, in retaliation, as they said, for the two old women killed by Zibebu's *impi*.

By this undesirable exploit, this handful of young men did serious injury to their prince's cause, furnishing a handle against him for the enemies who were sure, sooner or later, to find (or make) an excuse for attacking him, but who would never have been able to irritate him into beginning a fray. Throughout these most trying circumstances Maduna restrained himself from all violence for the sake of his brother, Cetshwayo, although he and his men were frequently taunted with such words as these: "You are kept back, by just a single missionary (the Bishop of Natal) who cannot help you, but only writes letters." Yet it was more remarkable that this representative of a dethroned and captive king, a landless prince, stripped of all power and property by the British conquerors, without wealth to purchase or authority to compel the obedience of a single follower, should have been able to control large bodies of fighting men, and to prevent them, repeatedly, from taking vengeance for the injuries and insults put upon him and them; and we need not wonder that, on this (apparently) single occasion, a small party of young undisciplined men,

finding themselves without the control of older and wiser heads, should have broken out into what was, after all, an act of retaliation, and not an unprovoked attack.

When Maduna heard of it, upon the following day, he was very angry, saying, "Who gave leave for this? An evil thing has been done." He gave orders that the young men should be taken prisoners to Mr. Osborn, the Resident, but that, before going, they should return the cattle they had captured to the place from which they had taken them. And he appointed two head-ringed men (that is to say, responsible men of good position), one of them a cousin of his own, by name Gebuza, to go in charge of them, and to see the order carried out.

On the same day Maduna's people came together to him according to his previous order, and he directed them to go hunting in the neighbourhood, and to keep watch for what might happen. During the hunt the firing of guns was suddenly heard, and the hunters exclaimed, "Is not that the *impi*?" (Zibebu's). And, in point of fact, as Gebuza and his companion, Mjwapuma, with the captured cattle, and the culprits in custody, approached the place to which the former were to be restored, four men on horseback galloped up—Zibebu, and his white man "Johan" (Colenbrander), followed by two of Zibebu's retainers. Gebuza and his party ran away, but Colenbrander galloped after them, and shot down Gebuza, and then rode after one of the young men calling him to stop, and dismounted. But the young man turned,

and struck at him with his assegai, which grazed his head ; at which moment Zibebu rode up, and shot the young man down.

From this account, given by Zibebu's brother Fokoti, it appears that, although Maduna's two messengers were in the act of performing a deed of reparation, and had the offenders against Zibebu in custody, to be taken to the Resident, yet not that chief only, but his white adviser, attacked them without asking what they were doing, or giving them time to speak, and, amongst others, wantonly shot down the Prince's cousin, who was innocent of all fault in the matter.

Meanwhile a messenger came from the Resident to summon the Princes before him. They obeyed the order at once, accompanied by a small party only, while Maduna's men dispersed by his orders, and by the advise of Mnyamana, the loyal old Prime Minister of former days, to whom the Princes looked for advice as to a father, and to whom all the old King Umpande's descendants were as sons. And then, when all who could have resisted were gone, Zibebu's *impi* poured in upon the Princes' kraals, pulling down the huts, destroying the stores of grain, killing two more women, two youths, and a head-ringed man.

“But,” said the speaker in conclusion, “we see plainly that all these acts of Zibebu's are committed by order of the English authorities, and that this is *Lukuni's* (Sir E. Wood's) *impi* [rather than Zibebu's]. Before Lukuni came, there was comparative quiet,

and they were getting more friendly with us; but now the whole country is roused."

The two Zulus, Mfutshane and Mlilwana—who were sent on more than one occasion by the Princes Maduna and Ziwedu to report important matters in Zululand to the Bishop of Natal, and to others whom they thought their friends in Maritzburg—also describe how, upon their first return after reporting the Inhlazatshe meeting, they heard as soon as they reached the Tugela, from the white ferryman, that there was trouble in Zululand between Hamu and the Aba Qulusi, and between Zibebu and Maduna. "We went on," they say, "and found the two Princes, Maduna and Ziwedu on the hill-side" (i. e. turned out of their own kraals), women and children and all, and taking refuge where they could, some in one place and some in another.

These two men had brought with them from Bishopstowe a small quantity of a superior kind of *amabele* (millet) with which Cetshwayo had met at Capetown, and of which he had sent a little to the Bishop of Natal, requesting that it might be sown and propagated for him. The Bishop, accordingly, sent some of it by these men, when they returned to Zululand, to Maduna with the same request, in his brother's name. Maduna being now homeless, sent it on to Mnyamana. But the latter said, "It is of no use. If I showed this *amabele* to Ntshingwayo (the 'appointed' chief of the district), he would only go to Malimati (the Resident), and ask if he knew of this, or if I had been sending to Sobantu (the

Bishop) again without reference to him. Tell the Princes to send back the *amabele* to Sobantu, and to ask him to send it back by some messenger of *his own*, not a Zulu, then, perhaps, it will be believed where it came from, and we shall not suffer on account of it."

So the messengers returned to the Princes, but did not find them where they had left them, for they had been driven on by Zibebu's *impi*, which said that it was driving them down to John Dunn's. Yet for the King, their brother's, sake, and lest they should injure his chance of restoration, they submitted quietly to be thus again turned out from the shelter which they had found upon the destruction of their homes by the orders of Zibebu. Maduna moved on to the kraal of a brother of Mnyamana's, and here the messenger already mentioned reached him calling him and Ziweddu to the Resident. The two men whose story is next given were of the small party spoken of by Fokoti as accompanying the Princes to Mr. Osborn, and they are therefore good authorities upon what passed.

"Said Malimati, 'What are you delaying for, since we have ordered you to go under John Dunn? Be off to him at once!'

"The Princes replied, 'But were we not given a choice, then, by Lukuni?' [i. e. Did not Sir E. Wood say, "If you go, Zibebu shall return part of your cattle; but if you do not, he shall not return any?" (p. 51)].

"Said Malimati, 'No! I tell you, go at once! There is no more to be said;' and then he left them."

But this command, to go and place themselves under the man whose fortune their brother Cetshwayo had made, loading him with favours, but who had deserted and betrayed the King as soon as trouble came, and upon whom, indeed, the Zulus generally looked as the original author of all their woes, was "a word" which the Princes could not obey. So they went on to Mnyamana, who had repeatedly invited them since they had been driven out from their homes by Zibebu, the boy Dinuzulu being at Mnyamana's own kraal, which was already full of the royal women and children. That same day a messenger came from Mr. Osborn, the Resident, to summon Mnyamana to him. When he arrived, according to the same Zulu reporters, Mr. Osborn said, "I have sent for you, Mnyamana, to ask what you mean by taking in those people. Turn them out at once, and send them to John Dunn! Watsha! (you are in great danger! you burn!*)). Why do you get yourself into trouble for another person's fault, when you have not been blamed?"

But to this paltry suggestion from the representative in Zululand of England's majesty and might, the fine old man replied, "Why should I cast them off? To whom shall I give them to take care of them? Did I not refuse a chieftainship because I said I must

* This was the word used, at the time of Cetshwayo's restoration, to frighten the Zulus from the landing-place, by those who wished to make it appear that the King was not enthusiastically received by his people—*Natsha* (for plural, *watsha* being sing.) *izinhlamvu*, i.e. "you are in danger from the bullets" of the soldiers forming Sir T. Shepstone's escort.

stand by them? They are to me as children of my own, and if I die a second time, as I have died once in losing Cetshwayo, I shall die with them on my back."

Said Malimati, "It is not my affair; it is yours, and your house will be on fire, if you do not turn them out at once, and send them to John Dunn."

"These words," said the messengers, "were repeated to us by Mnyamana himself when he was sending us down."

"Then the royal women, the wives of Cetshwayo and Maduna, set out themselves, to go to the Resident and to ask why they were treated thus, saying, 'Since you have taken away the King, it is you who ought to take care of us, you who are responsible for us. How should you give us to John Dunn? Is that fitting, when he was merely one of our indunas (officers)? And do you now set on Zibebu and Hamu to destroy us? If you will not take charge of us yourself, give us a letter that we may go down to the authorities at Maritzburg. We will not belong to Zibebu, nor to Hamu, nor to John Dunn.'"

Malimati hereupon bade them wait awhile and he would "see about" a letter.

"Here Sotondose (one of Mr. Osborn's native subordinates)* interfered, but the royal women snubbed him at once. Then Mr. Osborn asked them how he was to know that they were with Maduna (and so

* The same who advised Mnyamana to please the authorities by lying, "according to the English custom."

were turned out of his kraal with him). To which idle question they answered, with some scorn, 'How should you *not* know [a self-evident truth], when you sent for three of us last year? Where did you suppose we came from, and where should we be, since you have killed our husband [the King], if not with his own brother? Maduna belongs to us; you know quite well that we are with him.'

"Said Malimati, 'I thought that you had gone home to your fathers.'

"Said they, 'Why should we be sent back to our fathers? What crime have we committed? Is a married woman sent back to her father's house without a reason? Ever since the King was taken from us we have been with Maduna.'"

The Resident then asked them whether they wanted a "letter" (pass over the border) because they wished to go and live in Natal, and Maduna also. To which they replied:

"Are we not driven out by your *impi*? Give us a letter, and let us go and speak for ourselves. We do not know what Maduna will do; we only know that you are destroying us."

And now Mr. Osborn's white subordinate put in his word in the following fashion: "I will write this letter for you, and I will say in it that you have been committing adultery;" to which they answered, "We are not speaking to you; we do not want a letter written by you, but one from Malimati."

Said Malimati then, "Well! come again tomorrow."

This cruel and gratuitous insult from the Resident's *white* subordinate does not appear even to have been reproved, at least to the knowledge of the Zulus; and that so disgraceful an incident should have occurred at all at the Residency, and in Mr. Osborn's presence, must, so far as it became known to the Zulus, have greatly impaired the moral influence of her Majesty's Representative.*

The reporters set out next day, and do not know all that followed, but they continue thus: "We heard (afterwards) that Malimati sent that same day to tell Zibebu to disperse his *impi*. And he sent also for Ndabankulu, son of Lukwazi, and for Nguqa,† who must have come through the night, for they were with him early the next day. He asked them to take in the royal women just for the present, and to take care of them for him, while he sent a letter (to the Natal Government) to ask what was to be done with them. They rejoiced at the idea, and Ndabankulu said, 'Where could they go better, since our kraal belongs to Ngqumbazi (Cetshwayo's deceased mother), and was given to her by my father, Lukwazi? And

* As these pages are going to press, news is telegraphed from Natal of an attack by the royal women upon the Resident, in which he nearly lost his life. What the precise nature of the occurrence may be we cannot, of course, tell from telegrams concocted by those who have throughout bolstered up the policy which has led to the destruction of the King, and of multitudes of leading men of the nation. But the news at once reminds us of the incident recorded above. However blameless Mr. Osborn himself may be in the matter, we should expect to find some excuse for excited conduct on the part of the women.

† Chiefs loyal to the King.

you, Malimati, know that, as far as our wishes are concerned, we should all have been in arms before now on behalf of the Princes, the sons of Mpande; it is only the English that prevent us, because we are afraid of offending them.' ”

It is a significant fact that the only Zulu chiefs who were *not* afraid of offending the English by taking up arms are precisely those who did so in order to crush out the prayer for the King's return, and the circumstance cannot but be regarded as some confirmation of the repeated assertions made by these chiefs that they did not act of their own accord. At least it cannot be denied that, although, had they thus acted without the Resident's permission, they would have done so in direct defiance of the conditions of their chieftainships, yet they remained in favour with the Natal Government, of which, indeed, Zibebu appears throughout to have been the special *protégé*.

Such grave accusations against British officials may be regarded with suspicion by that very large portion of the reading public who have never followed the paths of officialism far enough to be aware through how much mire they frequently lie. But of such doubters the question may be asked, in the words of the Bishop of Natal, “What would have been known about the ‘Letters Patent’ of Seketwayo, or about the composition and genuineness of each of these two deputations, or about the object for which they came, if they had merely gone to the Resident and the Secretary for Native Affairs (in Natal,

i. e. Mr. J. Shepstone)?”—seeing that Mr. Osborn stated,* with regard to the first deputation, that “he had reason to believe that there was no truth in the allegation that several of the appointed chiefs joined in or supported the prayer for Cetshwayo’s return ;” and with regard to the two portions of the last deputation the Colonial Secretary stated publicly,† in the name of his Excellency, that “neither said one word about the ex-King’s return.” To this may be added the fact that *no report of the first great deputation of May 1880 was received in Downing Street until, on February 10 of the following year, the Earl of Kimberley wrote for a full account of the proceedings, in consequence of a question put by Sir David Wedderburn in the House of Commons two days previously.*

The “Report” by the Secretary for Native Affairs, Mr. J. Shepstone, which was sent on March 19 in reply,‡ will need short comment to show its extreme inaccuracy to any reader who has followed us thus far. It runs as follows:—

“Undabuko, own brother, and Ishingana [Ushingana], half-brother to Cetshwayo, accompanied by a large number of attendants, visited this colony during the month of May 1880, with the purpose, as stated in a pass obtained by them from the British Resident, Mr. Osborn, of paying their respects to the Governor of Natal.

“I believe they reached Bishopstowe on the 24th, and met me at

* C. 2695.

† In the Government Council of Natal, Oct. 11, 1881.

‡ C. 2950, p. 74.

my office on the 26th [they arrived at Bishopstowe *about sundown* on the 24th, and went to report themselves to Mr. J. Shepstone the next morning, but saw no one, as the offices were closed early, it being holiday time, of which facts Mr. Shepstone could not have been unaware], when I took a statement * made on behalf of the brothers by Ufunzi [Umfunzi], one of their attendants, † which was, together with the pass above alluded to, duly laid before his Excellency the Administrator of the Government, Major-General Clifford, who expressed a wish to see them at Government House. This meeting took place, I think, ‡ on the 28th of May, when they made another statement, complaining of Sibebu [Zibebu], in whose district Ndabuko [Maduna] lives, interfering [!] with Ndabuko's adherents. I was present at the interview, and interpreted for the Governor. His Excellency asked them if they had made known to Mr. Osborn their intention of asking for the return of Cetshwayo, § and of complaining of Sibebu [Zibebu]; they replied they had not. They were then directed to return to their homes, and informed that any request or complaint they wished to make must come through the British Resident, who was placed in Zululand for that purpose. The meeting then broke up, and they left in a day or two after for Zululand. ||

“I may state that as these people did not call themselves a deputation, and also in consequence of the wording of the pass, I questioned the brothers very closely regarding their request that Cetshwayo be returned to them, and they admitted that it was their own, and not the expressed wish of the Zulu people; that they, the brothers, were asking for the return of Cetshwayo as a

* This “statement,” made on behalf, not of “the brothers” only, but of the whole deputation, including representatives of four appointed chiefs, was not published, and does not seem to have been forwarded to England.

† Mfunzi was not an attendant on the Princes, but, with another, represented the appointed chief Siwunguza.

‡ From this expression it would seem that no record was made of this meeting, which took place on May 27th, not May 28th.

§ Therefore the Government was aware of the “prayer for Cetshwayo.”

|| They took leave of the writer of this report *eight days* after this meeting, not “a day or two.”

member of their family, and not as the Zulu King;* and added that 'Umuyamana' [Umnyamana], 'Sibebu' [Zibebu], 'Sitshaluza,' and 'Ishingwayo' [Tshingwayo] were with them in their desire for the restoration of Cetshwayo to them.

"I may add that from the first I was satisfied that this was no deputation from the Zulu people; its constitution was not that of a native deputation,† and not one of the several attendants reported themselves as representing any single chief in the Zulu country. I have not the slightest hesitation in stating that it was no deputation.

"Later on in year, Sibebu ‡ himself paid a visit to the Governor, and distinctly stated that he knew nothing of this so-called deputation, and that the first he heard of it was on its return to Zululand.

(Signed)

"J. SHEPSTONE,

"*Acting-Secretary for Native Affairs.*

"Secretary for Native Affairs' Office,

"March 19, 1881."

It is only necessary to select two points in this surprising work of diplomacy in order to measure the value of the whole:—

1. It is absolutely impossible that the Princes can have named *Zibebu* as one of the chiefs who were with them in their desire for the restoration of Cetshwayo. It was well known to white and black, from the very first, that J. Dunn was the only savage in Zululand more inimical to the King than this very Zibebu. As early as February 1880 the great

* They would have preferred anything to his continued exile, but their request for a *little* justice and mercy did not, of course, imply that they *desired* no more.

† No reason is given for this opinion, which is directly contradicted by the Bishop of Natal and others well versed in Zulu customs.

‡ Zibebu, who was universally known from the first to be opposed to the King's return, and to his own consequent loss of power, and who had been selected as kinglet by J. Dunn's advice *on that very account.*

chiefs sent a message to the Natal Government, complaining of the injuries and insults heaped upon Cetshwayo's family by Zibebu, who had lost no opportunity of enriching himself at their expense, or of endeavouring to degrade them in the eyes of the nation,* and that three months later they should have mentioned his name as above is incredible. His name can only have been introduced by the writer of this very imaginative despatch because Zibebu had "paid a visit to the Governor" later in the year (when, of course, he expressed himself strongly against the object of the deputation), and it was thus convenient to mention him as a chief spoken of by the Princes, and who repudiated their claim.

Zibebu, however, is reported to have said—either scoffingly or in sincerity—that if Cetshwayo were brought back, he should be the first to meet him at the Tugela, and make it all up with him. That this is what he might really have done, but for "white" influence, would appear from the explanation of his subsequent misconduct given by two of his followers to Cetshwayo, on the day (July 21st, 1883) of the surprise of Ulundi by the European-led party of marauders known as "Zibebu's impi." They asked the King why he had not sent, in a friendly way, for Zibebu, upon his restoration, and said that it was this neglect which had embittered him, and turned him into a determined foe.

[N.B.—The meeting between Cetshwayo and Zibebu

* See p. 18, Chap. II., where Zibebu orders the Princes to build a kraal for him with their own hands, &c.

was prevented by the Natal authorities who reinstated the King, on the excuse that there would surely be a collision if they met.]

2. It is almost as incredible that "not one of the attendants reported themselves as representing any single chief in the Zulu country." No *actual* "attendant," i. e. servant or carrier, could do so, of course, but the word is plainly intended to include all who accompanied the Princes. Amongst the "attendants" in this sense, was Nozaza, bearing the chief Seketwayo's "Letters Patent;"* old Mfunzi, who never hesitated to express his desire in this matter, with others representing eight of the thirteen kinglets. These all spoke freely and distinctly, when kindly questioned at Bishopstowe by those who had no interest in the question except that of truth, humanity, and justice, and from whom they had nothing to fear, not even a black look, whatever desire about the rule of their country they might express.

What the Bishop of Natal studied throughout to learn, and to make known, was the *actual feeling and wish of the Zulu people at large*, and he would never have attempted to bring about Cetshwayo's restoration

* Nozaza carried his credentials in his hand to the S.N.A. office on this occasion, fastened into a cleft stick in native fashion. Mr. Shepstone's positive assertion can only be explained by the supposition that, while the chiefs present paid the Princes the compliment of leaving them to be their spokesmen, neither he nor the Resident took the trouble to ask the party any questions, but took for granted the convenient supposition that Ndabuko and Shingana *only* prayed for the King.

without conclusive proof that the heart of the nation, so to speak, was with its King.

The deputations made it very plain, accordingly, at Bishopstowe, that the heart of every member, with those of by far the greater part of the nation, was bound up in this hope of the King's return. And if it is really true that they were silent on that point, when, after so many futile efforts made, and so many perils dared, they found themselves at last at the Government Native Offices in Maritzburg, it only shows how little encouragement they received there, and how thoroughly they were made to feel that their prayer would be unwelcome.

Apologists for "the powers that be" have endeavoured to explain away such extraordinary discrepancies as the above by asserting that on such occasions the native *indunas* (policemen) of the court made the mischief by frightening or cajoling those who were shortly to appear before the dreaded "authorities" within, and that, consequently, the Zulus told one story to the Bishop of Natal and quite another to the Acting Secretary for Native Affairs.

This may be the case (as to the influence exercised or attempted by the *indunas*), but let us see where the admission would lead us. The policemen in question are Natal natives who have long lost any personal interest in the condition of Zululand, and the only possible object with which they could endeavour to exercise such repressing influence would be that of *pleasing their* masters. Now, the Natal natives are neither so extraordinarily dense nor so

exaggeratedly subtle as to imagine, year after year, that they were acting in accordance with their masters' wishes in suppressing the real desire of the Zulu people, while those masters themselves were innocently and honestly endeavouring to learn the truth.

The simple explanation of the whole matter—of the delusive promises and disheartening evasions, or harsh rebuke and punishment, with which the Zulu petitioners met; of the repeated refusals of their requests to the Resident for “passes” to go down to Maritzburg, and the unfailing repulse of the authorities there when, in desperation, they came without passes; of all their weary journeyings to and fro, and of the disfavour uniformly shown towards all those who persevered—is not far to seek when we read in a semi-official statement in the *Natal Witness* (May 1881) of “the declaration made by Sir George Colley, nearly two years ago, that *the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed.*”

There may be differences of opinion as to what would have been the wisest course to take for the administration of the Zulu country after the great crime we had committed in invading it; but there can be no two opinions as to whether that course should have been carried out openly or not. Let us, at least, have done with the contemptible mockeries and subterfuges which have hidden the truth from British eyes so long—with sanctimonious assertions that the welfare of the Zulus is dear in our eyes—with virtuous indignation at suggestions that their prayer for Cetshwayo's return has been suppressed, and equally

virtuous attempts to throw discredit on the Bishop of Natal's faithful reports of the facts of the case. Were it possible to tear away the web of misrepresentations woven around Zulu affairs by a series of official spiders, it might conceivably bring about a new and better order of things. It is better—or, rather, it is less evil—for a nation to act with palpable and high-handed tyranny, laying herself open to the criticisms of her neighbours, and, probably, to the reforming influence of some of her own best sons, than to carry on injustice and oppression under the cover of pretended virtues, of strict honour, and motives above suspicion, the evidences of which—on paper—blind the British public to what is really going on, so that to this day many well-meaning persons still believe Cetshwayo a sanguinary tyrant, the Zulu war a sad necessity, and the leading official spider of them all an eminent philanthropist, and the saviour of Natal.

The Bishop, indeed, had done his utmost to bring the truth concerning these Zulu deputations to the acknowledged notice of the Natal Government, the heads of which certainly cannot plead *ignorance* as an excuse for their conduct. On January 4th, 1881, he addressed a letter* to Sir G. P. Colley, then High Commissioner for S.E. Africa, in which he said that he believed Mr. Osborn to be mistaken in making the statement quoted above; and after giving his reasons for that belief,† he requested

* [C. 2950, p. 54]; and see the full text, *ante*, p. 68.

† Which form the main grounds of this account.

His Excellency to direct that inquiry should be made through Mr. Osborn as to the truth of the facts related in four short numbered paragraphs, of which the first ran as follows: "That Seketwayo was represented in the deputation which waited on Mr. Osborn, by Nozaza, bearing his 'Letters Patent';" while the other three paragraphs contained the like inquiries concerning the representatives of the other seven appointed chiefs who had an interest in the two deputations.

On January 5, 1881, Sir George Pomeroy-Colley informed the bishop that he had forwarded his letter to Mr. Osborn for report. But on February 11 he was further informed by the Colonial Secretary for the High Commissioner, then at the front, that "the present is not considered a propitious time for making the inquiries requested by you, as the minds of the Zulus are very much unsettled by Boer emissaries making certain statements relative to the return to Zululand of the late King."

There the matter rested until October 14, 1881,* when the Bishop, after seeing Colonel Mitchell's reply in the Legislative Council, denying the object of the deputations, addressed another letter on the subject to Sir E. Wood, giving him full information upon the actual facts which the "Government" had

* This was after the visit of the second deputation that reached Natal, but which was really the *fourth* that had started from their homes on a like attempt, the *second* having been stopped by the Resident, who refused them a pass, and the *third* having been turned back, after crossing into Natal, by the Border Agent, Mr. F. B. Fynney.

either strangely misunderstood or else purposely ignored, and quoting the above-mentioned passage from the previous letter to Sir George Colley.

There was no direct result of this second appeal, although various second-hand denials of the Zulu deputations having "prayed for the Bone" were put forwards, notably one newspaper account of an interview with Sir E. Wood, in which he was supposed to have told the three Zulus, Posile and his companions, to "speak without fear or reservation," and, if they were sent to ask for Cetshwayo's return, to say so, but that they declined to do so. But the three chiefs did not recognise at all the report of this conversation when it was translated to them, and they heard with grief and indignation that they had been made to appear to have denied their King. When asked to repeat once more, as they remembered it, what had passed on that occasion, they gave the same account of it as they had given six weeks previously, on the evening of the day on which the interview took place, and positively maintained that their report was the true one, and that the (apparently) semi-official one published in the *Daily News* was incorrect where it differed from their own. They declared that they now heard for the first time that Sir E. Wood told them to "speak without fear or reservation, and, if they were sent to ask for Cetshwayo's return, to say so."

"Why," said they, "what else have we been doing all along?"

The aforesaid writer to the *Daily News* suggests

that the men may have been afraid, and so may have spoken less freely to Sir E. Wood than they did to the Bishop ; but this is an absurd suggestion in view of all that these three chiefs had risked and suffered on Cetshwayo's behalf, after speaking boldly and persistently on occasions when they met with threats and insults only (see p. 49, the Inhlazatshe Meeting). It is incredible that when, at last, they received kind encouragement and *permission* to say all that they had already said in spite of prohibition, they did not speak a word of what was in their hearts.

But the explanation, which is so palpably an impossible one in this case, is very reasonable when applied to any denials on the part of the appointed chiefs, which may really have been made, of complicity with the deputations. For these chiefs had taken but one step, by denying which, when they found that the white authorities were displeased, they could at once reinstate themselves in that favour which they did not desire to lose, under the uncertain conditions of their own chieftainships.

We must not, however, lose sight of the stedfast three, waiting the appointed *ten days* at Bishopstowe, where they had "chosen to go." As soon as the time fixed was over (November 9, 1881), they presented themselves again at the S.N.A. office, but were told by a sub-induna that there was no "word" for them, as the authorities, i. e. Sir E. Wood and Mr. John Shepstone, were absent. So

they returned to Bishopstowe, and on the following day sent in a messenger, who brought back word that the authorities had returned to the city, Sir E. Wood, indeed, having reached it on the Tuesday. On Friday, therefore, they sent another messenger to ask for directions, and he brought back word that they were to wait till they were called. Very patient were these brave fellows through these manifold delays, yet it needed but a few kind words addressed to them to bring out the expression of their keen desire for a favourable reply, and their anxiety, meanwhile, concerning the fate of the families they had left behind, upon whom vengeance might fall for their temerity, should it prove in vain, while the official sanction of their proceedings involved in their being permitted to join the King would probably prevent molestation of their kraals during their absence.

On Tuesday, November 15, they were summoned at last, and, on their return to Bishopstowe, they gave the following account :—

“When we got to the S.N.A. office, we were hardly kept waiting at all, but were taken up to Government House. There were present only Lukuni (Sir E. Wood) and Mr. John (Shepstone), who said, ‘The letter has now come from Malimati (Mr. Osborn); he agrees that you were sent by Mnyamana, Maduna, and Ziwedu, and he has nothing to say against your going; and a letter also has come from the Cape, and we have nothing to say against your going; on the contrary, it seems good to us that you should go. But do you wish to go and spend these four months with him (the King) at the Cape, for he cannot go to England till they are over?’ Said we, ‘We wish to go at once, and, if they

were years instead of months, it would be all the same to us.' Said he, 'We thought that you might prefer to wait here those four months. But, if you agree to go at once, the Governor will send a telegram to the Cape to say so, and you can wait for the answer, which will come back to-day. And do you agree to go on to England with him, you, Ngcongwana, Posile, and Mgwazeni?' We said, 'We do.' 'But how will you pay your expenses—for the steamer will require money?' he asked us. Said we, 'How should we pay? We are looking to you, sirs, for that.'"

Mr. Shepstone then informed them that directions had already been sent to the Resident in Zululand to send down the fourth member of the party, Ngobozana, who, it will be remembered, had been detained by his chief and brother, Siwunguza, in fear of the well-known British displeasure against the deputations from Zululand on Cetshwayo's behalf, but who would now come down at once.

"So we waited," they concluded, "till nearly sundown, and then we were told to go home (to Bishopstowe) and sleep, and we should hear what the answer was when it came."

They were summoned again two days later, November 17, and came back broken-hearted and in utter despair, which was hardly to be assuaged even by the sympathy and teaching of one who was himself, through perfect faith in the Giver of all good, never cast down for long, whatever his disappointments in the apparent failure of good work. The poor fellows had been told that, after all, they were to go back to Zululand and behave properly to the Resident, who would send for them if they were wanted.

Their story of what had passed was as follows :—

“ We were taken to Government House and saw Lukuni (Sir E. Wood) and Mr. John (Shepstone), who said, ‘ We sent the telegram as we told you we would, and the answer came the same day. It said that the Governor of the Cape directed that you should not despise the proper way of entrance on this affair of yours (viz. the Resident)—that he (the Governor of the Cape) was going to send on your words (request) to England, and that you must go back to Zululand to Malimati (Mr. Osborn, the Resident), and remain at your homes quietly, until he sends and calls you when the time comes for you to go.’ We said, ‘ We do not see at all how we can go back to Zululand to Malimati, since it is there that we are being killed, and it is he who brought this trouble upon us.’ They gave us a letter to take to Malimati, and said, ‘ And you too, Ngongwana, if you were put in authority as Malimati is, how would you like Posile, being under you, to go down to Natal without your leave? If we find that Malimati is not able to manage you, we shall send other white men—plenty of them—and insist upon your obeying.’ [The only way in which these chiefs had failed to “obey” was by their persistent efforts to entreat Government on Cetshwayo’s behalf, and, far from despising the “proper way of entrance,” they had done their utmost to obtain the Resident’s sanction to their mission, and had only come without it because their appeals to him were all in vain. Thus, again, was the farce repeated of censuring them for not having obtained the “pass” which, apparently, Mr. Osborn had been ordered to refuse.] But we said, ‘ Who is to protect us when we get there, since you are merely sending us to be killed, we and our families? Said they, ‘ Oh! are you afraid? Come in to-morrow, then, and we will give you a letter to the magistrate at Greytown, and he will give you a policeman, who will look after you a little.’ [This was another farce, for what use would a policeman, between Greytown and Inhlatzatshe, have been against the *impis* of Hamu and Zibebu?] We said we did not know how we could go, and Mr. John replied, ‘ Well, go away now, and we will speak again to-morrow.’”

They then produced the “letter” which they were to take to Malimati, which was in an open blank envelope and was merely as follows :—

“ *Copy.* ”

“ *Telegram.* ”

“ Governor,
Capetown. ”

“ H. E. Sir E. Wood,
P. M. Burg. ”

“ 16th. Yours to-day received. Ministers concur with me in thinking that it would be better for the visit of the chiefs to be postponed until Her Majesty’s Government come to some definite decision about Cetshwayo. Meanwhile the chiefs may rest assured that Cetshwayo is alive, and in good health.”

It was clear that this was not the reply to a telegram of the 15th, sent off in their presence, as related above. But, in ignorance of the real reason for this very sudden change of plan, it was impossible to administer any comfort to their present distress, except by assuring them that, however disappointing at the moment, the letter of Sir Hercules Robinson was certainly meant for good, and not for evil, and contained no order for them to go back to Zululand. And the Bishop addressed the following letter on their behalf to Sir E. Wood :—

“ BISHOPSTOWE [17th Nov. 1881]. ”

“ SIR,—Ngcongwana and his party have brought to me a copy of the telegram received yesterday from Sir Hercules Robinson, which being open, I presume was meant to be read ; and I find by it that Sir Hercules Robinson thinks that it would be better for the visit of the chiefs to be postponed until Her Majesty’s Government come to some definite decision about Cetshwayo.

“ I beg to request, on their behalf, that they may be allowed for the present to remain here, and not to return at once to Zululand, as in the present disturbed state of the country they are afraid to do so, dreading that some of them will be killed, as they live in the

districts of Hamu, Zibebu, and Mfanawendhlela, and some of them have been already eaten up, and the brother of one of them, Mgwazeni, killed by Zibebu's white man.

"I have, &c.,

"J. W. NATAL.

"H. E. Sir E. Wood, V.C., K.C.B."

Next day they went in again, and stated in person that they could not possibly go back to Zululand at this time, and begged to be allowed to stay on for a while at Bishopstowe.

They were told that their request should be communicated to Sir Evelyn Wood, and on the following morning a letter was addressed to the Bishop, as given below:—

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE, NATAL, 19th Nov., 1881.

"MY LORD,—I am directed by His Excellency Sir Evelyn Wood to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter of the 17th inst., and to inform your Lordship that any application Ngcongwana or other Zulus may make to the Secretary for Native Affairs will be duly considered.

"I have, &c.,

"EDWARD L. SANDEMAN,

"*Private Secretary.*

"The LORD BISHOP OF NATAL,
"Bishopstowe."

This reply was fully in accordance with the constant practice of the Natal authorities of ignoring the Bishop in Native matters, or, rather, of jealously excluding him from such participation in them even as might have been allowed to any intelligent colonist who possessed a tithe of the Bishop's acquaintance with, and influence over, the Zulu races. In this case even his offer of hospitality to the three unfortunate Zulus, and his request that they might be permitted

to accept it, were unnoticed except by the information that the chiefs must make their applications to the Secretary for Native Affairs. It is but another case of what Colonel Durnford, R.E., remarked upon in 1875, when his usefulness in connection with the Putini tribe in Natal was stopped in consequence of petty official jealousies against him, "I was told that all must be done by those charged with such business (i. e. *those who do nothing*), and so on."*

On Monday, Nov. 21, the chiefs sent in two of their party from Bishopstowe, to ascertain if any reply had come from Sir E. Wood to their request of Nov. 18. They were told by the induna Luzindela that Mr. John [Shepstone] was ill, and asked "Why were they always bringing letters from over there (Bishopstowe) to worry him?" So they returned, and waited till Mr. John should have recovered, sending in a messenger daily, who daily brought them out the [Government regulation] *shin-bone* as their rations.

Three days later a Government native messenger came to fetch them, who asked them what they meant by staying on at Bishopstowe when the authorities had ordered them off. If they wished to stay, they should ask permission from the Governor [which they had done already, through the Bishop on the 17th, and in person to the Acting S.N.A. on the 18th]. So they sent in at once Mgwazeni, Cetshwayo's cousin, and a brother of Posile's, to

* From (private) letter, quoted in 'A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa: A memoir of the late Colonel A. W. Durnford.' By Lieut.-Colonel E. Durnford: Sampson Low and Co., publishers.

repeat their prayer, the other two chiefs being at the time too unwell to take the ten miles walk themselves. They waited all day outside the S.N.A. office, without obtaining an audience, and were finally told to come again next day. Their attendant received the *shin-bone* as usual.

When they appeared on the following day, November 26th, they were rudely accosted by the induna Luzindela, who asked, "Where is Ngcongwana? What does he mean by not coming in person? He will get no meat unless he comes to ask for it himself. And, as for being allowed to stay on here (in Natal), it would have been a different matter if you had come straight to this office, and been appointed by the Government the place that you should stay at. But all of you who choose friends of your own to go to—you will get nothing at all from us" [i. e. from Government].

Mgwazeni's reply to this was that they had understood at their first interview with Sir E. Wood that they were given leave to remain at *Sobantu's*, but that Ngcongwana had no intention to be disrespectful, and he and Posile would certainly wait on Mr. John on Monday.

The account, given at p. 87 of the last chapter, of the arrival of these chiefs at Bishopstowe on their way to Maritzburg, &c., will show how absurd was this accusation of not coming "straight to this office," especially as they must have halted at many other places on their way to "Government" during their long journey. They had, indeed, as much right to

choose Bishopstowe for their last night's rest on the way, as any other place where they could be sure of a kind reception; and of such places there were, no doubt, many amongst the *natives*, as was amply proved by the hospitality of the Natal natives to the 2000 Zulus who formed the great deputation of April 1882, of which some account will presently be given. But a mere induna like Luzindela, a man of no rank other than the fictitious one given by his petty official position, would never have ventured to use so insolent a tone and such discourteous language to these three great chiefs of high Zulu rank, the value of which is perfectly understood by the Natal native indunas, unless he had been encouraged by the disrespect shown by his masters towards these men. The smallest white official—or even colonist without the lion-skin of office—is deeply imbued with the notion that all Zulus (all "Niggers," to quote the almost invariably employed epithet), even those of the highest rank, are his inferiors, and therefore claims from every member of the nation each sign of respect for himself which would be paid by the Zulus generally only to their King. This feeling was amusingly illustrated in a colonial paper, *Natal Mercantile Advertiser*, of August 14, 1883, by a writer who protests strongly against the notion that black and white can be put upon an equality under any circumstances whatever. "Take the lowest English yokel," says the writer, "some creature that knows not his alphabet—who has worked in the fields frightening birds away all his boyhood—the son of

parents equally ignorant with himself. Well, is he inferior to the native gentlemen Colonel Butler and his clique are so fond of applauding? Brute and brutal as he may be, is he not something differing from and superior to his black brother, notwithstanding all Exeter Hall may say?” From the rest of the letter it is apparent that the writer includes the Zulu King amongst the “native gentlemen” to whom his “lowest yokel” and “brutal brute” is still superior, and, although it will probably be difficult for the English reader to believe that such fatuous conceit and ignorance exists in an enlightened British colony, it is none the less true that the writer has no notion at all that he has made himself ridiculous, and that his sentiments are not shared by educated men. The native sub-officials naturally pick up the manners and ideas of their white superiors.

On Monday, Nov. 28, Ngcongwana was still too unwell to walk into town, so his companions went without him, and were taken into the office. “Mr. John” was not there, but his two white assistants and Luzindela were present, and they asked the Zulus what they wanted.

These replied that “they had come to ask the authorities to appoint them some place at which they might stay, awaiting the permission to go forward to Cetshwayo.”

One of the white men asked them what was wrong with the place they were at already, to which they answered :

“It appears that the authorities object to our

staying there, as on Saturday we were blamed again for doing so. But we truly supposed that the matter had been settled, after the Governor telling us that his objections to our going to Sobantu were for the future, and saying, 'Go back now, and stay at that place, since you have chosen it for yourselves.' And we shall be quite content if the authorities allow us to stay on at Sobantu's."

Said the white man, "We will report your request to Mr. John, who will take it to the Governor."

On Tuesday they sent in an attendant, who received the shin-bone, and was ordered to tell them to come in themselves at once, since they were making a request to the authorities. So on Wednesday they all went, and were taken into the office to "Mr. John," who greeted them kindly, and asked Ngcongwana what was the matter with him, and promised him a bottle of medicine. He talked pleasantly, and laughed with them for a little time, and then said, "Well, then, what you say is that Zululand is in such a disturbed state that you don't wish to go back there now, and you wish the Governor to allow you to stay on where you are until you are allowed to go to Cetshwayo." They agreed to this, and he continued, "Come, Posile and Mgwazeni, and touch the pen, since it was you who made the request on Monday. You too, I know, are in this matter, Ngcongwana, but you do not sign, because you did not come in on Monday, being ill." So they made their marks on a paper, and Mr. John said it would show (prove) their truth, that they had really made this request. And he took

leave of them pleasantly, giving them the bottle of medicine.

The poor fellows, in fact, had become so used to brow-beating and repulse that they were as grateful for the least ray of good nature on the part of one of the "authorities," as though it had been actual benefit, as in one sense it was, raising a little the hopes which had been so rudely dashed to the ground twelve days before.

It was nearly a month later, December 26, before they heard anything more of their probable fate. Mr. H. Shepstone had returned, a day or two before, from Capetown, and, as soon as this was known, Ngcongwana sent Mgwazeni and another to wait upon him, but they found that he had not yet come up from Durban. It was known that he had seen the King, and would probably accompany him to England, and the chiefs Ngcongwana and his party were therefore most anxious to see him. They sent in each day to ask if he had arrived, and at last, on the Thursday following, the whole party went in to town, and found him there. They came back saying :—

"We have seen Mr. H. Shepstone, and he was very friendly with us. He read out our names from a paper, asking 'Which of you is Ngcongwana? which is Posile?' &c. He named us all, Mgwazeni, and Ngobozana, and the others. We told him that the two last mentioned, Ngobozana and another, were still in Zululand, and he asked, 'Will they come?' Said we, 'Certainly, if you let them know, sir.' He said, 'The King also wants certain medicines,' and named them from the paper, and said that the girl Mpansi is still ill in her chest. Then he said, 'And now, my men, we must collect our testimony, for on ahead there [in England], whither we are going, there will be great questioning by the authorities as to

things that have taken place, and we must be able to answer thoroughly, and bear witness for the King.* What can you say now about people having been killed because they refused to buy guns?' We said that no one had ever been killed for that reason. And he asked about the girls being killed, &c., and we answered him with the words which we spoke before to you.† 'Ah, well,' said he, 'you speak to the purpose. But it is not time yet to start. The cold of England is terrible now, but I am expecting a letter to say when we are to start, and I will then tell you.' "

The chiefs were so inspirited by this cheerful reception that they next ventured to send a couple of messengers to the Resident, Mr. Osborn, who chanced then to be in Maritzburg, to ask him whether—as it had been said [officially, equal to "ordered"] that cattle "eaten up" by Hamu and Zibebu were to be returned—he would be good enough to recover Ngcongwana's cattle for him from Zibebu? On their return they reported that Malimati was quite gracious, and asked the number of the cattle.‡ The men said they did not know the exact number.

* This was to be the first visit to England of Mr. H. Shepstone, as well as of the Zulu chiefs, and probably more amazing to him than even to them, since the education which he had received at Capetown was such as to have excited his imagination somewhat beyond their expectations.

† They refer to the answers given to the like questions put to them at Bishopstowe when they came down with the first deputation, and when they gave a complete justification of the King on these particulars, showing that John Dunn had introduced the guns against Cetshwayo's wishes, and that in the very few cases (nine) of the killing of girls under the marriage law which really took place, Cetshwayo was not to blame, as it had been done by the chiefs of their districts in accordance with an old-established law which he had wished to abolish, and without his consent.

‡ These poor people had done nothing on earth on account of which the Resident had reason to be otherwise than "quite

“ Well,” said he, “ Ngcongwana had better come in himself to-morrow and tell me, and name a man too who shall go with my policeman and fetch them for him, since he himself is going to Cetshwayo.”

So on Saturday they all went in to Mr. Osborn, and Ngcongwana reported on their return that “ Malimati was quite friendly ; he sat down with us, and talked, as we are doing now. I said to myself, ‘ *Hau !* but this is curious, seeing the way in which he and I last parted ’ ” (when Mr. Osborn refused him a pass to Maritzburg, saying, “ Go and tell your lies in your own way ” [i. e. without my help]). Ngcongwana enumerated the cattle of which he had been robbed by Zibebu’s *impi*, and mentioned a man who might fetch them for him, and he spoke also of some cattle of Posile’s which had been taken by Mfanawendhlela, and of which, he said, the same messenger could take charge (that is to say, if the Resident would give orders to these two greedy kinglets to disgorge this portion of their prey). To all this Malimati readily agreed, saying that he was returning to Zululand on Monday [and could therefore attend to the matter himself].

He then asked them, “ And do you Zulus all say that it is I who brought this destruction on you, as Hamu and Zibebu do, who insist that they acted by my orders, and keep on accusing me of this ? ”

gracious” to them. Their sole offence lay in their persistent loyalty and affection for their captive King, of the existence of which sentiment it was not *convenient* to let the British public know.

“ We replied, ‘ Well, yes, sir ; we too say so, for we continually reported all our troubles to you [with no result], and then Hamu and Zibebu went to you [to the Inhlazatshe meeting], and, coming away, they straightway attacked us.’

“ Said he, ‘ For my part I deny it altogether : I had nothing to do with them. The business I had to do with was Sitimela’s. There I did direct John Dunn, Zibebu, Siwunguza, and Mgitshwa to attack.’

“ Said we, ‘ Well, sir, if you now find Hamu, and Zibebu unmanageable, Mnyamana, and Maduna, and Ziweddu have always been dutiful, and they will support you now.’ We repeated to him that we all—all Zululand—pray for the King’s return. Said he, ‘ Oh ! you Zulus !’ and so we parted in quite a friendly manner, to our great amazement and satisfaction.”

The Resident told them that he had “ nothing to do ” with the injuries which they had received. But, however that may be, such words as he addressed to the well-meaning but weak-kneed kinglet Siwunguza in a like case, that is to say, concerning the two men whom Siwunguza had sent on the first deputation—viz. that if he had nothing to do with it (i. e. if he were innocent in a matter which had offended the Natal authorities), he “ must eat up their cattle as a proof thereof ”—*may* have been intended as a mere philosophical axiom, without special application, but sounds remarkably like a strong hint. On his own showing, too, he made himself a party to the violent actions of the four disloyal (to Cetshwayo) kinglets,

since, if "he had nothing to do with them," as he says himself, he should have punished them in some way "as a proof thereof." Indeed, it is difficult to see why such a point was made of maintaining Zibebu in his chieftainship on Cetshwayo's restoration in 1883, since, unless he *did* attack the Princes and others by order of the Resident, he had broken at least three* of the conditions of his appointment. He had therefore no claim whatever to be upheld by British authority and promises forced from Cetshwayo, and would appear to have been thus upheld for the sole purpose of annoying the King and creating disturbances in Zululand.

For the present the ban of British displeasure, which had stirred up Hamu and Zibebu to attack these chiefs, and compelled Siwunguza, against his will, to repudiate and punish them, being thus apparently removed from those who prayed for Cetshwayo, Posile decided to go up himself to see after his cattle, as, according to Mr. H. Shepstone, he would have time enough to do so before going to Capetown; and he

* *Viz.*: The third condition concerning firearms, freely used by Zibebu's *impi* in the attacks on Maduna's people.

The fourth condition—"I will not allow the life of my people to be taken for any cause, except after sentence passed in a council of the chief men of my territory, and after fair and impartial trial," &c.—the old women killed by Zibebu's *impi* immediately after the Inhlazatshe meeting, and others, being resident in his district and therefore his "people" in the sense intended by this condition.

The sixth condition—"I will not make war upon any chief or chiefs, or people, without the sanction of the British Government through the Resident," &c.

started on January 3, thus effectually disproving the insinuation which had been made in support of the assertion that these Zulus had come down unauthorised by any of the kinglets, viz. that they refused to go back to Zululand because they dared not face the chiefs whose names they had used.

They waited altogether four months at Bishopstowe, for the promised summons to Capetown; but at last, on Monday, February 6, 1882, Ngcongwana, Mgwazeni, and two hair-dressers (required by the King), having been summoned by telegram, were sent down to Durban, whence they embarked the next day for Capetown. Posile and Ngobozana were still in Zululand, but were to come down afterwards, as the telegram stated. The special purpose with which this portion of the second deputation (the second actually reaching Pietermaritzburg) had so gallantly persisted in their efforts to get a hearing was now fulfilled, and they were sent to cheer the captive King in his loneliness by telling him how devoted to him still were the hearts of his people. But the wider and more important aim of all these embassies, the release of the King, seemed to them no nearer than before; for means were found by which they were so suppressed and discredited that for many months the truth, so unpalatable to South African politicians, concerning Cetshwayo's well-deserved popularity with his people, was prevented from reaching England's ears. The means to this end may be recognized in the reply given in the Legislative

Council by direction of Sir E. Wood, in which it was stated that "each of the eight appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation."

It was plain that there was some serious error in this reply, but what it was did not appear until the publication of the official Blue Book (3182) on the subject.

From this it appears that the eight appointed chiefs, or kinglets, were never asked whether they had sent any members of the deputation which arrived in July (that is to say, the first portion of the fourth that *started* and the second that *arrived*), and which, though less high in actual Zulu rank, was of far more consideration in the eyes of the Government, since it contained representatives of some of the appointed chiefs. The eight chiefs had only been asked whether they had sent the second portion, which had been delayed and met the others on their way home, and which, though forming part of the whole body which was deputed by the eight appointed chiefs, had been sent expressly by Mnyamana and the two Princes, with a special request that the three chiefs composing it should be sent to Capetown as companions for the King. This appears clearly from [3182, pp. 109, 111, 136] where each of the eight kinglets "denies categorically having sent" Ngcongwana, Posile, and Ngobozana. The Resident, it seems, purposely abstained from asking the other most important question, for he says (p. 176), "I made no allusion to Mfunzi, Sidindi, and other

Zulus having been to the Government on a similar or the same errand."

This circumstance, acknowledged by the Resident himself, cannot be too severely commented upon, for it is an excellent sample of the manner in which the before-mentioned official spiders of South Africa weave their webs, and, under the guise of obtaining the *exact truth*, manage to extract that which they require to justify themselves.

The first party of this deputation included men who had stated that they were individually sent by such-and-such appointed chiefs, one of them bearing Seketwayo's "Letters Patent" as a proof; yet, in questioning the eight appointed chiefs, Mr. Osborn "made no allusion to Mfunzi, Sidindi, and other Zulus" who composed it, *and whom, therefore, the eight kinglets did not repudiate.*

The *second* portion of the deputation could only be said to have been sent by the "eight appointed chiefs" in a general sense, because their party originally belonged to the other, and had been intended to accompany it. But they had formally stated that they were especially sent by *Mnyamana, Maduna, and Ziwedu*, requesting leave to go and stay with Cetshwayo at Capetown, and only spoke of the appointed chiefs—who, in the sense above mentioned, might be said to have sent them—when the authorities refused to accept their first reply.

The eight chiefs had been thoroughly frightened about the consequences of sending the former party, and it is hardly to be wondered at, therefore, that

when the question was put to them about the *second party* only, with the members of which, individually, they had nothing to do, they merely replied as they did, and as they could do with verbal accuracy, without committing themselves to a confession (which was not required of them at all) concerning the previous party.

CHAPTER VI.

WE must return once again to the now "famous" Inhlazatshe meeting between Sir Evelyn Wood and the Zulu chiefs in order to give some account of a very striking circumstance which is said to have occurred upon that day, and which throws much light upon the apparent hesitation of many of the chiefs from that time forwards to express any fervent desire for their King's return. The subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed by Sir G. Colley in 1880, and the subsequent action of Sir E. Wood, the Resident, and others certainly was plainly in the same spirit of repression throughout the whole period of Cetshwayo's detention. But a noteworthy instance of the terrorism employed in forcing the Zulus to assume a convenient attitude occurs in a speech reported to have been made in Sir E. Wood's name by his interpreter, Mr. Rudolph,* the correctness of which report is vouched for by a large number of respectable Zulus of the highest

* Sir E. Wood, knowing no Zulu, was, of course, at the mercy of the interpreters, who, although it is to be presumed that they expressed the *spirit* of what he said to them in English, may probably have added some harsh *words* of their own.

rank. The words were these, quoted before, but without special attention drawn to the point, "We turn you out, Maduna, Dinuzulu, and Ziwedu [two of the King's brothers and his young son], because you are always saying that you want the 'bone' of that scoundrel (*ishinga*), whom we have done away with."

From quite a different source, and certainly one from which Cetshwayo and the Zulus never received a beneficial word except by accident, comes additional evidence that the lowest depth of ignominy had been reached by wanton insult in England's name to a fallen foe. The following passage occurs in an editorial of the *Natal Mercury* of October 1st, 1881, portion of which I italicise:—

"Take for instance the following letter from J. H. W. in the Newcastle District:—

"Sir,—It is a surprise to many others and self in the district to see it published that the journey through Zululand taken by Sir E. Wood was perfectly satisfactory. In this part of Natal we had heard the reverse.

"In the first place not half the chiefs were present, and many of those that went *were very cross and threatening after the language used towards Cetshwayo, he being called ishingá, the meaning of which is little less than scamp or rascal.*"*

The epithet in question was mentioned—always with grief and indignation—at one time and another, by every Zulu who, having been present, described what passed at the Inhlazatshe meeting, and it certainly seems impossible that what was asserted, at different times, by so many respectable men of good

* In point of fact it is no 'less' at all, but it is literally *scoundrel*.

position, should be a mere invention, for which there could have been no imaginable motive at the time their statements were made.

Immediately after the meeting the distressed Princes sent down two messengers, Mfutshane and Mlilwana, to report all that had passed to the Bishop of Natal and one or two others in the colony whom they believed to be their friends. One of the two, Mfutshane, was present at the meeting himself (as, of course, were the two Princes who sent them both), and "heard with his own ears the interpreter Tshele (Mr. Rudolph), who spoke quite audibly, use the words, 'Do you think we will give back to you the bone of that *ishinga* whom we have done away with?'"

It will be remembered that a reply* was given in Sir E. Wood's name, on October 11th, 1881, by the Colonial Secretary, to a question put in the Legislative Council as to "whether the Government was in possession of any information regarding the alleged desire on the part of some of the appointed chiefs in Zululand to have the late King reinstated," and that the reply pooh-poohed the deputation, and was calculated to cast doubt upon the genuineness of their mission. The preceding chapters have sufficiently proved the incorrectness of that reply, which need be alluded to only because it was the immediate cause of a letter addressed, on October 14th, to the Governor by the Bishop of Natal, and in which the latter gave a full report of the composition of the two deputations,

* See p. 48.

and the rank and authority of the principal members, with the main points of what he had learned from themselves of their mission and of their hopes and wishes in undertaking it. This account was naturally far more complete than any which had previously reached the Governor's ears; for while (to quote the Colonial Secretary's words) "neither of the parties were, as they should have been,* accredited to this Government by the Resident in Zululand," and consequently received small attention and no encouragement from the Government officials, to the Bishop they could fearlessly speak out the whole truth, expecting, at all events, no *evil* consequences to follow. They had, at least, full comprehension that the truth *only* was acceptable to him, and entire confidence in his wish that they should obtain justice, and in his readiness to do all in his power to that end. Yet they learnt by bitter experience that (owing to intense official jealousy) his good word was less likely to help their cause with the authorities than to produce scant courtesy and consideration towards himself. Of all those who came under the heading of "Authorities" during the troubled times between 1879 and 1883, the late Sir H. Clifford was the only one who seemed to recognise the value given to the Bishop's opinion upon Zulu and other native questions by the exceptional character of his opportunities and disposition, which greatly enhanced what in any case could only

* And would have been, had it depended on themselves instead of upon the Resident, who so frequently refused or evaded their requests for a "pass."

be entirely disinterested action in one who, owing to his position alone, could not, directly or indirectly, have had the smallest personal concern in the matter.

The Bishop's report of the deputations contained mention of the sentence spoken to the Zulus at the Inhlazatshe meeting in the name of Sir E. Wood, and in which Cetshwayo is spoken of with contempt as a scoundrel (*ishinga*), and this is the only point alluded to in the short letter of acknowledgement received a few days later, and in which several questions were asked as to the names of the Zulus who had reported the use of the word *ishinga*, and whether they themselves heard it spoken, and so on. The Bishop's reply, including the sentence already quoted from Mfutshane's report (*supra*, p. 138) and that from the correspondent of the *Natal Mercury* (*supra*, p. 137), gave the required information, at the same time expressing the hope "that they will not be allowed to suffer for having discharged their duty to those who sent them, as," he said, "I fear has been the case with others." This was written in consequence of information just received as to doings in Zululand of the manner in which some of the chiefs were reported to have been coerced into repudiating and even punishing their own messengers by the Resident and his men, the whole of which information the Bishop now laid before the Governor.

On November 7th he wrote again, as follows:—

"SIR,—I think that I ought to report to your Excellency that other evidence has reached me from Zulus of rank besides that of Mfutshane and the writer in the *Natal Mercury*, which supports

Mfutshane's statement, that Mr. Rudolph did actually apply the word *ishinga* to Cetshwayo in interpreting your Excellency's words at the Inhlazatshe meeting, though perhaps he may have forgotten the circumstance, or in the excitement of the moment may hardly have been himself aware of doing so.

"Your Excellency is doubtless aware that a party of Zulus came down subsequently to Mnyamana to complain of Zibebu's violent action, and the dreadful massacre of the Aba Qulusi by Hamu's *impi*, both of which have occurred since the meeting. They saw the Secretary for Native Affairs on Friday last, and were told (as they have informed me), that they must go back to Zululand, and get through Mnyamana a pass from the Resident, without which they could not be heard. On their way back to Zululand they called yesterday (Sunday) at Bishopstowe, to see Ngeongwana and pay their respects to myself, and I took the opportunity of inquiring if any of them had been present at the meeting, and could tell me what Mr. Rudolph had said in your Excellency's name. The principal person among them, Fokoti, brother of Zibebu, said that 'he was present at the meeting, and heard with his own ears the interpreter (Mr. Rudolph) say, "Your offence, Maduna, is that you went down saying that you were going to ask for 'the Bone.' Bone of what, forsooth? Is there any one whose bone is asked for when we have thoroughly killed him? Did we not kill that scoundrel (*ishinga*) who was disturbing the land? We order you to be off, all three of you, Ziwedu, Maduna, and that fellow's child, and go down to John Dunn!" This was the word which stopped the very breath of Mnyamana and the Princes, and choked them with amazement and despair.'

"Another of the party, Nyokana, induna of Mnyamana, said that he also was present, and confirmed all the words of Fokoti.

"They said also that as soon as they began to say that the proceedings of Zibebu and Hamu appeared to the Zulus to be the results of the words spoken at the meeting, the Secretary for Native Affairs stopped them, when they would probably have given the words of Mr. Rudolph, as above, and said 'he did not want to hear about that; but where was their pass?'—and so dismissed them.

"I have, &c.,

"J. W. NATAL.

"Sir H. EVELYN WOOD, V.C., K.C.B., &c., &c."

From this it is plain that both the Governor at this time, and those who followed him (unless such important documents as the above-quoted letter were suppressed by the recipient) had what most intelligent persons would have considered strong reason for doubting the completeness (to say the least of it) of the reports received from their own subordinates, yet no attempt seems to have been made to obtain any more light upon the subject than the said subordinates themselves would give. The only full explanation of the strange fact that they continued in office and were apparently believed on no further grounds than their own word would seem to be the not very far-fetched supposition that the reports they gave were such as their superiors desired to receive, and were determined to believe.

A previous chapter dealt with the aggressive conduct (p. 92) of the kinglet Zibebu towards those living in his territory who ventured to pray for Cetshwayo's return, and it must now be shown how J. Dunn and Hamu, the other two chiefs who have shown themselves violently opposed to the King, proved themselves unworthy of Sir G. Wolseley's choice. In point of fact, there seems little doubt that, but for J. Dunn and other white men's interference, none of the eleven Zulu kinglets would have taken any active measures against Cetshwayo's cause, for Hamu had in the first instance spoken warmly on his behalf to Sir E. Wood, and with good reason, for Hamu, who was always a quarrelsome and ill-behaved person, had been forgiven and protected by his large-hearted

brother times out of number, during the latter's and their father Umpande's reign. Even Zibebu surprised and disappointed the other members of the reigning family by his enmity; for, as one of the Princes remarked, in speaking of Sir G. Wolseley's settlement, "when Zibebu was appointed chief over us we were glad, and looked upon him as [representing] our father."* Both these chiefs had the greed and violence in their natures stirred up and directed by the influence of the Europeans who may well be called the evil geniuses of Zululand. Communications from at least one of these have often appeared in the Natal journals, and have no doubt formed the basis, from time to time, of telegrams to the London *Times*. J. Dunn's attack on the chief Sitimela, and massacre of the Mtetwas, to which we have before referred, was the matter in which his bloodguiltiness was the greatest. No full account of these atrocities appeared in any of the Natal journals; and, though it can hardly be doubted that the editor of the *Natal Mercury* received information on the subject from its correspondents in "Dunn-land," it would seem that either their accounts must have suppressed a great deal of the truth, or else that the editor modified them to suit his own policy (as usual) for publication in his local journal, and communication to the London *Times*.

It is, at all events, incredible that Sir E. Wood should have received a correct report of this horrible

* Resident's Report. Mpande, Cetshwayo's father, was first cousin to Mapita, Zibebu's father.

butchery of hundreds of unresisting fugitives, men, women, and children, when he publicly gave thanks in Her Majesty's name, before the assembled Zulus at Inhlazatshe, to chief J. Dunn for his detestable action, exceeding infinitely in savage cruelty and brutality anything that ever happened under Cetshwayo's rule; and when, again, in his address to the Legislative Council of Natal, he commended "the vigour and decision shown by chief J. Dunn, in carrying out the advice of the Resident."

From the voluminous evidence which exists upon this subject, the following "statement made by an Englishman of good standing" is selected because while it is thoroughly supported in all important particulars by the independent reports of the Zulus themselves, it is more concise, and, entering into fewer details, will prove less trying to the reader. After describing the circumstances under which Sitimela (the son of a chief who, in the days of Tyaka, had refused to submit to Zulu supremacy, and had fled the country) visited the sections in Natal and Zululand of the great tribe once ruled over by his father, and was forcibly expelled as a pretender from the latter country by the chief Mlandela, influenced, it is said, by J. Dunn, the writer proceeds:—

"Sitimela again visited Zululand in July 1881, to recover his cattle and other property which he had been obliged to leave behind. On his arrival many of the Mtetwas again visited him, as the hereditary chief of their tribe. J. Dunn raised an impi at the request of Mlandela and went and attacked Sitimela, who sent messages to say that 'he was there with the knowledge of the

Natal Government, and, his mission being a peaceful one, he would not fight.'

"Dunn then gave this order to his people, 'Go and stir him up (hambani niyekumoka—irritate, rouse him).' The result has now become a matter of history. Some of Mtetwas did fight in self-defence; but that Sitimela either joined in the fight, or countenanced it, is not true in fact. Such a statement could only be made as an attempt to justify a shameful wrong and brutal slaughter, which it is to be hoped—for the honour of England—will yet be fully inquired into, when, no doubt, many startling facts will be brought to light. There will be abundant evidence forthcoming, whenever an investigation does take place.

"The men said to have been killed on John Dunn's side were of the party sent by that chief to *oka* or provoke the Mtetwas, and who wedged themselves right into the camp. To say that the people under Sitimela began the fighting is false, for Sitimela would not and did not fight."

The "result," which "has now become a matter of history," may be given shortly in John Dunn's own words (with a few necessary corrections), taken from his official report to Sir Evelyn Wood [3182, p. 83]:—

"*Yesterday* about daylight I sent some of Mlandela's men on to a hill to watch Sitimela [i. e. to *oka*, provoke Sitimela's people, and draw on a fight, which they did by seizing the cattle of a small kraal, which chief Dunn does not mention]. When Sitimela saw the men [seizing the cattle], he [some of the people with him] charged them, and killed seven. Then I called upon my men and attacked Sitimela's men and routed them, and burnt their kraals and took their cattle. *The men are still in pursuit, and the rebels may expect no mercy.*"

Even without the corrections made above, on the authority of many of the Zulus, J. Dunn's own words condemn him, and show that, in that he, a white man, with all the advantages of his race, and opportunities for education, could act, without the

smallest excuse, as savagely as the lowest barbarian could possibly do, he was even more unfit, because more dangerous, for his post, than Hamu or Zibebu themselves. According to his own account, the battle began at daylight, and was soon over, yet on the *next day* he writes that his men are "still in pursuit, and the rebels may expect no mercy"! The action was the more savage in that the people with Sitimela were not a trained band of soldiers expecting warfare, but a large party of men with their families, engaged in peaceably visiting their old chief's son, and whose only thought of fighting was the feeling that, judging from past events, Sitimela himself might need their protection. J. Dunn did not himself follow the pursuit, which was carried on far into Somkele's country, led by Colenbrander [Zibebu's white man] with a force of the Mandhlakazi [Zibebu's own tribe]; and Dunn asserts (*Mercury*, March 3rd) that "no women or children were killed the day of the fight," which may be the case, as they were, naturally, not to the front in the first instance. But on the *next day* after the fight, the day of the flight and massacre—when, under his own orders apparently, the fugitives were to "expect no mercy"—men, women, and children were butchered indiscriminately, except such young girls as were taken captive as booty. Nor can J. Dunn shield himself from blame for the consequences of his own unprovoked and unwarrantable attack by saying that he was not present with the pursuing force, since he raised and started it under his white coadjutor, Colenbrander, and took no ex-

ception to, nor tried to vindicate himself from, the savage slaughter of the second day. He merely says that "no women or children were killed the day of the fight," in which he is supported by Colenbrander, who writes: "I was present during the whole engagement . . . during the whole of the routing and subsequent pursuit, and I am quite prepared to endorse chief Dunn's statement that no women or children were injured."

Yet in every Zulu account "Johan" (Colenbrander) is mentioned as leading (on horseback) the force of which it was universally said, "*That impi swept clean!*" Nor can these two white men, who make no secret of having encouraged and led the Zulus under their command to the slaughter of their countrymen, exonerate themselves from further bloodguiltiness and ferocity, unless they can produce, or otherwise account for, the thirty-eight wives and children of men of note, of whose names a list was made at the time, and unnumbered others of the common people, whose parents and husbands report them as killed by John Dunn's force upon that day.

A little later in the same year (1881), a letter appeared in the *Natal Mercury*, dated Oham's (Hamu's) Camp, October 15, from a Mr. H. J. Nunn, who has filled under Hamu, for many years past, the same sort of post which J. Dunn held under Cetshwayo, living also in the same style as J. Dunn, i. e. Ngcongwana states, with a small harem of only five or six black wives, whereas J. Dunn has a very large one. Mr. Nunn's statements are evidently meant to

protect Hamu from the consequences of his proceedings by saying—as J. Dunn has done in his own case—that they were authorized by the Resident; in other words, by the English authorities. But what he says respecting Mnyamana, Maduna, and the Aba Qulusi requires a great deal of correction, which has been supplied by Ngcongwana and his party, among whom Ngcongwana himself lives under Hamu, while Mfutshane is one of the Aba Qulusi.

“To account for the present unsettled state of northern Zululand,” says Mr. Nunn, “it will be necessary to refer back twelve months for the primary causes, as it was well known here at that time that there existed a combination between Mnyamana, Maduna, the Aba Qulusi tribe and others, against Hamu, Ntchingwayo, and other constituted (appointed) chiefs.”

The only “combination” was between Mnyamana, Maduna, the Aba Qulusi, and others (which “others” included eight appointed chiefs), to pray that the English authorities would restore Cetshwayo to them. Nor was a ninth (Hamu) always averse to the object in question, since he had himself expressed personally to Sir E. Wood, and very distinctly, his desire for the return of Cetshwayo, eighteen months ago, on the occasion of the visit of the Empress to Zululand,* and had sent since to Maduna, proposing to join the “combination,” of which Ntshingwayo was himself a member,

* As related to the Bishop of Natal by Sir E. Wood himself, as well as by Zulu witnesses.

instead of, as Mr. Nunn represents him, an object of its enmity.*

“Meetings were held at Mnyamana’s kraal, at the Isikwebezi,” continues Mr. Nunn, “between Mnyamana, Ndabuko (Maduna), the heads of the Aba Qulusi tribe, Mkosana, who had just returned from the ex-King Cetshwayo, and the Kafir Sitimela.”

This meeting, held first at Maduna’s kraal, and then at that of Mnyamana, was for the express purpose of welcoming Mkosana for Cetshwayo’s sake. It included eight kinglets or their representatives, and a number of other chiefs, but not Hamu, Mfanawendhlela, and Zibebu—nor, of course, J. Dunn and the Basuto Hlubi.

There was never any communication between Sitimela and Maduna or Mnyamana, though Mlandela, the kinglet of the district, and Sitimela’s uncle, sent to report the latter’s arrival to the Princes, as to the real heads of the Zulu people.

“Mnyamana and the Aba Qulusi tribe,” says Mr. Nunn, “persistently refused to deliver up the King’s cattle and guns.† Towards the end of last year (1880), while I was stopping at Hamu’s kraal, a Kafir, representing himself to be a policeman of the Resident’s, came to Hamu with a message that it was Hamu’s business to collect the King’s cattle and guns in his territory, and to deliver them up to the

* Ntshingwayo sent down 6*l.* as a thank-offering to the white authorities for Mkosana’s return, regarded as an earnest for that of Cetshwayo.

† The Aba Qulusi gave up many of their guns and 100 King’s cattle to the English force after the war.

Resident, and also that, wherever these cattle and guns were found, Hamu could imitate the example of chiefs Dunn and Zibebu, and eat up the whole kraal, retaining the private cattle for himself. I heard this message given, and, not satisfied in my own mind that this was a true message from the Resident, I afterwards called the policeman on one side and asked him, 'Is this a true message you have delivered to the chief?' He answered, 'Yes; wherever he finds King's cattle or guns, he is to eat up the whole kraal.' Hamu had in two instances acted thus before, and had returned the cattle afterwards to the owners; hence those secreting King's cattle or guns saw they ran no risk in retaining them.

"From this time commenced the eating-up of cattle belonging to Mnyamana's people, who in several instances turned out armed with guns and assegais to resist Hamu's messengers. I may add that Hamu was always anxious that this duty of collecting guns and King's cattle should be performed by the Government police. From this case of Mnyamana's people arose the first complication."

The "first complication arose" when Hamu returned to Zululand after the war, and killed immediately seven males and eight females of the Aba Qulusi, for having tried to stop him when he was going over to the English. This may have been at or about the time (September 16, 1879) when Colonel Villiers writes of Hamu's men [2482, p. 402], "I cannot say that they behaved very well on their way down, and they looted the kraals whenever they

had an opportunity ;” and Mr. John Shepstone says (*ibid.*, p. 482), “With regard to Hamu’s killing his people the British Resident has been instructed how to act,” while Sir G. Wolseley says of Hamu [2482, p. 471], “Hamu is not a chief whom of my own choice I should have selected for rule in Zululand. But I had no option in regard to his appointment, for the British Government were under pledges made to him at the time of his defection from Cetshwayo by Colonel Wood and Lord Chelmsford.”

But, according to Mr. Nunn’s account, it was the Resident, who was only to be the “eyes and ears” of the English Government, that advised Hamu to follow the example of J. Dunn and Zibebu, in eating-up each kraal which had kept back (or was *accused* of keeping back) King’s cattle, and “retaining the private cattle for himself,” about the time when he objected to make the inquiries requested by the Bishop, as to the genuineness of the first deputation, as he “was convinced that any such action would tend greatly to unsettle the minds of the people” [2950, p. 55].

Mr. Nunn proceeds to accuse Mnyamana, Maduna, and the Aba Qulusi of intriguing with the Boers, but he does not make out his case; and from Zulu accounts it appears that Hamu himself was the only chief in the habit of receiving Boers, who indeed might have been either emissaries or private visitors. He then gives a long account of the hostilities which followed with just sufficient warping of the truth in each successive incident to create a general impression

of aggressive conduct on the part of the Princes, Mnyamana, and the Aba Qulusi, and action in self-defence only on that of Hamu.* This account is so far garbled as to present actually the contrary of what really occurred, for, after careful inquiry from various respectable Zulus, it is plain that the aggression was entirely on Hamu's side, that he systematically harried and robbed this tribe of loyal Zulus,† partly for the sake of acquiring their cattle, and that in so doing he was acting, as he understood, both from what passed at Colonel Wood's meeting, and from other communications with the Residency, in the fashion that would be most pleasing to the white authorities as well as most lucrative to himself.

It would occupy too much space to give a complete story of all the attacks and reprisals which kept this part of the country in a state of anarchy and bloodshed at this period of its history, nor would it be worth while to follow in detail the elaborate attempt to justify Hamu's savage conduct; for no more is needed for our purposes than the simple fact that in the so-called "battle" by which the Aba Qulusi were almost swept from the face of the earth, a white man who was present with Hamu's *impi* reports that "out of an army of 1500 [of the Aba

* In one instance he goes so far as to charge the Aba Qulusi with the slaughter of "four women, the wives of a captain named Sigadi," whereas, in point of fact, two of Sigadi's three (not four) wives were wounded, and one killed, by Hamu's *impi*. Sigadi himself belonged to the Aba Qulusi, though at this time under Hamu's rule.

† By "loyal Zulus" those who were faithful to their own King are always indicated in this volume.

Qulusi] but few escaped,” and that “our casualties” [that is, on Hamu’s side] are eight killed and thirteen wounded.” Plainly this was no battle but a mere massacre of fugitives. An attempt has been made to show that, nevertheless, Hamu told his *impi* not to kill women and children, and that his orders were strictly carried out, but unhappily there is ample evidence that this was by no means the case, and that, as Ngcongwana and party say, “Hamu’s *impi*, we hear, swept clean, killing men and women indiscriminately.”*

“Truly,” said another, “we Zulus did not kill [by comparison with current events] in the old days of Mpande and Cetshwayo; we just jostled one another, and few were hurt. It is you Englishmen who have taught people to kill—to sweep clean, pointing behind and saying, ‘That’s right!’ even when you appear to be peace-making. And if the red-coats are now going home, as it is said, it is because this work of theirs is completed; and we who prayed for the ‘Bone’ are driven out, homeless, and hunted upon the hills, or killed outright so that the

* It does not readily appear why the butchery of unarmed and fugitive men should be thought so much less atrocious than that of women and children, since it is the helplessness of the victim in either case which makes it a coward’s act to kill them. But the sentiment will perhaps not find favour with a nation that could glory in the “battle” of Ulundi in 1879, and exalt into a hero the man who earned on that day the nickname of “pig-sticking Beresford,” by his prowess in the slaughter of fugitives, and his exclamation of “First spear!” on riding them down. Compare, too, the account given by one who took part in the pursuit after the battle of Kambula:—“The Zulus turned, begging and praying for mercy, but we gave them none.”

rest may take warning, and may not dare to speak the word that is in all their hearts.”*

Nyokana also, an induna of Mnyamana's, who had been present at the Inhlazatshe meeting, and gave the same account as did Fokoti, already quoted, was sent by his chief to the Resident about other business, and found him at Hamu's kraal. He states as follows:—

“There came men from Hamu's *impi* reporting, ‘To-day we have cleared off the Aba Qulusi. We have left not a soul, not even a woman!’ Malimati (Osborn) asked Hamu, ‘What is this?’ Hamu replied, ‘They refuse to turn out of my district. They go asking for the “Bone” without my leave. They don't obey me, and when I go to turn them out they fight.’ Malimati (Osborn) asked, ‘Where was the fight?’ And when he heard that it was near the Bivana, he said, ‘No, Hamu; your *impi* was not fighting there, it was pursuing fugitives. How has it killed?’ Said Hamu, ‘It has swept clean.’ Then said Malimati, ‘This is your affair; I have nothing to do with it, mind, as I shall tell the authorities. Why did you not tell Mnyamana what you were doing? Don't you know what we said when he refused the chieftainship—that he was to be with (advise) you?’ Said Hamu, ‘Why should I, an appointed chief, report my doings to Mnyamana?’ Malimati blamed him, and asked, ‘How did Mtonga (Mpande's son) come to be there with the *impi*?’ Said Hamu, ‘He went of his own accord.’ ‘And the *impi*—who gave him power to take that?’ Said Hamu, ‘I did, but I did not tell him to fight.’ And Hamu asked for a pass, that he might send to the Transvaal, and recover such of the

* In point of fact, each of the appointed chiefs, John Dunn and Hamu, had killed already men, women and children, within a few weeks in Zululand, and in John Dunn's case, with the express sanction of the white authorities, to an extent unheard of during the five years of Cetshwayo's rule. And Zibebu also did his share in such massacres for the purpose of maintaining Sir G. Wolseley's settlement, as he has repeated them lately for the purpose of gratifying Sir H. Bulwer's opinion that bloodshed would follow Cetshwayo's restoration.

Aba Qulusi cattle as had escaped. But Malimati refused, saying, 'Go on by yourself, as you could begin the business. Did you ask for a pass to kill the Aba Qulusi? I have nothing to do with it.' Said Hamu, 'I am going on at once, sir, to eat up Mahanana (his brother, son of Mpande), because he refused to help me to eat up the Aba Qulusi. I am going as soon as your back is turned, sir.' So Malimati went away, and warned Mahanana, who took flight."

No wonder Mr. Osborn stood for a moment aghast. He told Hamu, it appears, not that by his ferocious action he had forfeited his claim to his chieftainship, and would assuredly be deposed by those who had set him up, *upon conditions which he had violated to the utmost*, but that *he could go on by himself, as he had begun the business*, and that he himself, the Resident, should tell the Natal authorities that he was not to blame. Hamu answers him with a defiance, and the Resident goes away and warns the next intended victim, a step which any little herd-boy might have taken. Hamu was but following the example of his superiors when he gave that answer, so like their own, "I did [give him power to take the *impi*], but I did not tell him to fight."

But, indeed, even if some of the slaughter which took place during those unhappy years of the history of Zululand, was actually not only without the permission of the white authorities, but also strongly against their wish, they would still be responsible for it all. From first to last, and by every Government official from the ruler of Natal down to the clerk in the Resident's office who insulted the royal women (see p. 103, Chap. V.), every opportunity was seized of showing contempt towards Cetshwayo and

his family, harshness and disfavour towards all who prayed for his return, and favour and support to all those who suppressed that prayer and punished the petitioners. Then, as now,* the love and loyalty of the Zulus towards their King was left to stand alone upon his side, while on the other side, against him, were ranged all the might and influence of England's name, all the machinations of small Europeans, and determined blindness to what they did not choose to see of big ones, and all the meaner qualities and passions that existed, or could be roused, in some of the Zulus themselves—fear, cupidity, and selfish ambition. That nevertheless so large a number should have throughout remained constant to the King is far more wonderful than that it should have been possible to gather together a party (of mixed white and black) large enough to dispute his restoration.

With regard to the standing army of Zibebu, and the bloody proceedings of the three chiefs J. Dunn, Zibebu, and Hamu—if they were not expressly sanctioned by the Resident—in other words, by Sir E. Wood—they would clearly be a breach of some of the rules the observance of which Sir George Colley speaks of as “their sole title to the chieftainship” [C. 2695, p. 84], e. g. :—

“2. I will not permit the existence of the Zulu military system, or the existence of any military system or organisation whatever, within my territory.

“3. I will not make war upon any chief or chiefs or people without the sanction of the British Government.”

* Written in September 1883.

Nor is it clear how chiefs Dunn and Zibebu, and their white and black auxiliaries, were able to use firearms in their attacks (since all firearms were to be surrendered at the time of their appointment), unless "the express sanction of the Resident" had been given for their importation (Rule 3).

Much more, indeed, might be said. There are many pages of evidence carefully sifted, annotated, and recorded by the Bishop of Natal in the interests of that "truth" which has ever been his main object in all his battles. But the whole would be too voluminous to place before the British public with any hope whatever of its being generally read; while those few who may care enough about our subject to verify for themselves this summary of the exhaustive record, printed, but not published, by the Bishop, upon British treatment of Zululand during the last few years, may have access to the latter if they care to peruse it. It is the existence of this wonderful work of faithfulness which has made it possible to construct the present narrative. The correspondence with Sir Bartle Frere extended to forty-five closely-printed octavo pages. These were followed by "Extracts from the Blue Books," being a searching investigation into the circumstances which led to the invasion of Zululand, and into the charges set up against Cetshwayo. These gave place to a record laying every source of information under contribution, and extending to 855 pages. The last of these were occupied with Cetshwayo's own statement, made at Capetown, of the origin and progress of the war.

Then followed a new series, continued down to the Bishop's death on the 20th of June, 1883, and his last notes were on the 685th page, to which he attended on the 18th of June. Thus there were printed at the Bishopstowe press in all 1540 pages. They have been well characterised by a recent writer in the following language:—"The heroic Bishop bent himself to his task once more. Sheet after sheet of closely-printed matter issued (for private circulation) from his printing press at Bishopstowe. He reprinted, analysed, and annotated every leading article, every official proclamation, every correspondent's letter, that appeared in Natal on the Zulu question. He collected information with a diligence and determination that never flagged. He printed everything. Those who wish to know the history of Cetshwayo's restoration may know it; but to do so they must go into an atmosphere thick with brutality of feeling and a recklessness of statement of which, happily, we have no conception here.* Meanwhile it is a task that makes the heart bleed to follow the history of these recent events and to think of Colenso's ebbing strength, as in his noble, patient heroism he tracks up to its source and exposes every slander and misrepresentation that strikes his Zulu friends, unravels the 'web of force and fraud' by which Colonial officialism seeks to hide the facts, but pays no heed to the shower of coarse abuse that rains relentlessly upon his own head."

* Except, perhaps, in connection with utterances in Parliament concerning Cetshwayo, e. g. Lord Elcho's and Lord Salisbury's language.

CHAPTER VII.

WE have now seen how the first four deputations from Zululand on Cetshwayo's behalf were either stifled in their birth, or else made of no avail.

THE FIRST,* in May 1880, included representatives of four appointed chiefs, one of whom, Seketwayo,† sent down his Letters Patent by his messenger in token that he had been deputed to represent him. Nevertheless, the Resident, Mr. Osborn, reported the matter as merely "an application made by Ndabuko (Maduna), Mpande's son, for the release of his brother, the ex-King Cetshwayo," and added that he had "*reason to believe that there is no truth*" in a statement made in some of the Colonial newspapers that several of the appointed chiefs joined in or supported the prayer; which assertion of Mr. Osborn's was repeated by Mr. J. W. Shepstone ten months later when Lord Kimberley asked for a full account, no report at all having been forwarded to the Colonial Office.

THE SECOND DEPUTATION, which was to have included Siwunguza, one of the actual appointed

* The Great Chiefs' message in Feb. 1880 being omitted.

† Since killed by Zibebu's army at the second sack of Ulundi, 1883.

chiefs, the son of a second, and the brother of a third, was stopped by the Resident, who refused to give them a pass to go to Maritzburg.

THE THIRD DEPUTATION, including representatives (as before) of certain appointed chiefs (Dig., p. 780), with many additional headmen, crossed into Natal, but was stopped and turned back by the Border Agent, Mr. F. B. Fynney.*

THE FOURTH DEPUTATION, including representatives of three appointed chiefs, but speaking in the name of eight, came down in July and August 1881, and of their reception by the Government of Natal a full account has been given in these pages.

Up to this point the persistent check applied by the Government officials to every effort on the part of the Zulus to obtain their King's release was sufficiently, though far from creditably, explained when, in May 1882, was published, for the first time, a semi-official report of "the declaration made by Sir George Colley, nearly two years ago, that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed."

But this state of things, partially covering the acts of minor officials, was at an end, for the Prime Minister of England had expressed entirely different sentiments on the part of the British Government.

The *Times*, April 18, 1882, reported a speech made by Mr. Gladstone to the following effect:—

* See the Bishop's Digest, p. 780, &c., for a very interesting account of this transaction.

“If it should finally appear that the mass of the people in Zululand are for Cetshwayo, so that something like unanimity should prevail, so far from regarding him as an enemy of England, and wishing him ill, and so far from being disposed to any but the most favourable course that the welfare of the country would permit, I should regard the proof of that fact with great pleasure, and that would be the sentiment of my colleagues. . . . We have done the best that in us lies to obtain the very best information in our power; we have sent to a neighbouring colony a gentleman* in whose judgment, ability, and impartiality we have entire confidence; and we have called upon him to lose no time in applying his mind to the consideration of the affairs of Zululand.”

After this it might have been expected that some change in official demeanour would follow, and that every facility would be given to the Zulus for making their wishes known to the Governor in place of the rigid insistence on the fulfilment of regulations purposely made impossible, and the observance of small points of etiquette with no bearing on the real question, which had been hitherto used to hamper the Zulus at every turn.

An excellent opportunity for fulfilling the wishes of the Home Government occurred at the very moment, for simultaneously with the arrival in Natal of a telegram giving the condensed substance of Mr. Gladstone's speech, appeared † the last and largest Zulu deputation, consisting of 646 chiefs and headmen, making up, with their followers, a party numbering over 2000. It was no longer possible to altogether conceal the object and importance of this embassy, which was acknowledged in the semi-

* Sir Henry Bulwer.

† April 1882.

official newspaper article already mentioned in the following terms :—

“ Among the crowd of visitors, there were, without doubt, duly accredited representatives from three of the thirteen kinglets, viz. *Seketwayo*, *Faku*, and *Somkele*.

“ That the professed object of the deputation, when it was all collected on Natal soil, was to ask for Cetslwayo’s return, there can, we believe, be little doubt.”

This admission practically acknowledged the genuine character—so often officially denied—of the previous deputations, *Seketwayo* having sent a representative with each one of the three that succeeded in reaching Maritzburg, and *Faku* with two of them. It establishes, beyond denial, the fact that all the *eight* kinglets mentioned by the various deputations had expressed their desire for the King’s return with more or less boldness and frequency according to their several characters and the amount of official pressure brought to bear upon them to keep them silent. And it proves that out of Sir Garnet Wolseley’s thirteen kinglets, *three only* (not counting the two aliens *J. Dunn* and *Hlubi*,* were averse to Cetslwayo’s restoration, while one of those three, *Hamu*,† was acknowledged on all sides to be a worthless fellow.

The first news of the approach of this great deputation reached Bishopstowe on April 11, 1882,

* It is an injustice to the Basuto chief, *Hlubi*, to class him with the traitor *J. Dunn*, but both are alien to the Zulu people, and, therefore, unsuited to the position given them by Sir G. Wolseley.

† See Sir G. Wolseley’s confirmation of this opinion [2482, p. 471], already quoted in these pages (p. 151).

brought by two Zulus, who said that they were sent on ahead to tell Sobantu (the Bishop) that the Princes were on their way to the Governor with a large party, including representatives of the three appointed chiefs already mentioned.*

* Sir H. Bulwer, speaking of their arrival, writes, "I have little doubt—I may say I have no doubt—in my own mind that the party of demonstration under Undabuko came into Natal, not with the primary object of seeing the Resident or the Natal Government, but with the primary object of seeing the Bishop of Natal" [C. 3293, p. 4]. Upon this absurd statement it may be remarked that the party was *not* one of "demonstration" in the turbulent sense implied by Sir Henry; that, in its relations to the Natal Government, it was *not* under Undabuko, but accompanied by him and the other Princes (although loyalty to Cetshwayo *would* break out in special respect to his nearest relatives, on the part of all loyal Zulus); and that the notion of the Zulus having covered a desire to communicate with the Bishop, in which they had never yet found the smallest difficulty, under a pretended embassy to the Government, whose ear they had earnestly, but in vain, been endeavouring to reach for several years past, is so preposterous that it could only have originated in a set determination to put both the Bishop and the Zulus in the wrong.

There is not the smallest ground for supposing that the Zulus expected anything whatever from the Bishop, except the kindness and sympathy with their troubles which they had already received from him, which are the common requirements of every human heart, and of which these poor fellows, on their perilous and doubtful expedition, were sorely in need. They relied on him solely to help them by his advice in avoiding anything by which they might ignorantly offend that most unaccountable and touchy creature, the *Government* (Mr. Osborn himself reports [C. 3247, p. 71], amongst other striking speeches, the touching words of one of them, "We thought that this time we were doing right, as you are here"), and to make a faithful record for them of all that they reported. Nevertheless, Sir H. Bulwer bitterly resented what surely was a simple act of humanity on the Bishop's part, and chose to speak of it as "the rival quasi-authority against the Government that is so often set up . . . by the Bishop of Natal in respect of political matters where the natives are concerned" [C. 3293, p. 5]. An

They said that Mnyamana and Ziweddu (Mpande's son) had gone to the Resident to ask for a pass for the Princes to go down to Maritzburg, but he told them that "they must wait ten days, when he expected to return, as he was going down himself to Maritzburg, and he would speak of their affairs and troubles to the new chief (Sir H. Bulwer) who had come to take the place of Lukuni (Sir E. Wood), or, rather, to take his own place, which Lukuni had been holding for him."* But, when they brought back this answer, Ndabuko (Maduna) said :

"I do not see it at all! For did we not go to him continually last year, ever since we were turned back by Mr. Fynney, when we had already crossed into Natal, asking for a pass to go down to the authorities,†

old despatch of Sir H. Bulwer's own, in reply to Sir. T. Shepstone's sympathy with the Boers in objecting to arbitration on the "Disputed Territory" question, might well be paraphrased against him here. "Of course," he writes on Feb. 23, 1878 [2100, p. 67], "if the object of the memorialists is war—if what they desire is a war with the Zulu nation—it is not to be wondered at that they should find fault with any steps that have been taken to prevent the necessity for war." So it might have been written: "Of course, if the object of Sir H. Bulwer is annexation—if what he desires is that, and to prevent the restoration of Cetshwayo—it is not to be wondered at that he should find fault with any steps that have been taken to show that annexation is unnecessary, and that the Zulu people desire their King's return." *In neither case* could anything but *fear of the truth* account for the anger of the complainants.

* The accuracy of their report may be gathered from this mention of the *Administrator*, the difference between whom and the actual Governor they could not have arrived at for themselves.

† "Since then [May 1880] several requests have been made to me by Ndabuko for a pass to proceed again to Maritzburg to

and he always said 'Wait,' and, when at last he went down himself, he came back with Lukuni [to the Inhlazatshe meeting], which was our destruction? And, now that he says that he is going again, to the chief who has taken Lukuni's place, shall we not be destroyed again? And, if he is going on our account to report our affairs for us, why should he object to carry us down on his shoulders, and let us be present ourselves also?"

So they sent again to the Resident to say that, if he would not give them a pass, he must not wonder if they followed him without it (according to the word which Mr. John Shepstone spoke to Fokoti and Mvoko, saying that "Mnyamana should have asked for a pass for you, and if Malimati (Mr. Osborn) refused to give one, then he might have said to him, 'Since you refuse to give me a pass, I am now going down to report for myself.' If you had come to us with such a word as that, it would have been quite another thing."*)

The messenger sent repeated this to the induna Maziwane, as the latter refused to introduce him to the Resident, and the Princes Maduna, Ziweddu, and Shingana, having waited the ten days mentioned by

renew his application for the return of Cetshwayo, which requests I have always refused to grant." (Why?)—Mr. Osborn, May 31, 1882 [3182, p. 27].

* See also Sir E. Wood's own words to Ngeongwana, &c. [3182, p. 175]: "If you were refused a pass, I think you were justified in coming to me for one, but you should come to Mr. John Shepstone first, not to other people [i. e. the Bishop of Natal]."

Mr. Osborn, started for Maritzburg, being brought by the representatives of the three appointed chiefs.

This Fifth or Great Deputation was composed as follows:—

1. The three appointed chiefs, viz. Seketwayo, represented by his brother, and by his son and heir, and Faku and Somkele, each represented by a brother.

2. Five Princes, brothers of Cetshwayo, viz. Maduna (Ndabuko), Ziwedu, Shingana, Siteku, and Dabulamanzi.

3. Six hundred and forty-six chiefs and headmen of all the principal and most of the minor tribes from all the thirteen districts of Zululand, the least represented being that under the Basuto chief Hlubi. In each case where the appointed chief himself did not pray, his own tribe (if he had one) and the members of his family did, except in the case of Hamu. Thus Zibebu's tribe, the Mandhlakazi, was represented by his two brothers and two first cousins, while from his district came the Usutu, Cetshwayo's own tribe, with Maduna. From Mfanawendhlela's and Dunn's districts came many chiefs and headmen—in spite of Dunn's threat that "no one who left his district to pray for Cetshwayo need think of returning to it; he might consider himself as then and there turned out, and eaten up."

In fact, the deputation very rightly described itself as "All Zululand, praying for Cetshwayo's return."

Hamu's own tribe was the only considerable one not represented, and they said, "He has to hold it by the

throat to stop it." But his *district* was largely represented by Mnyamana's tribe and the Aba Qulusi.

4. The Deputation stated also that the five other appointed chiefs who prayed for Cetshwayo in July 1881 were still with them in desiring his return, but were held back by fear, in consequence of the results of Sir E. Wood's visit. And two of them, Siwunguza and Mgitshwa, were indirectly represented, since they freely permitted the chiefs and people under them to join the Deputation, *saying that they too pray for Cetshwayo*. And their tribes were thoroughly represented.

On Saturday, April 15, the Zulus, numbering with their attendants, 2000, reached the Umgeni River, about twelve miles from Maritzburg, having of their own accord left their weapons, assegais and knobkerries, behind them in Zululand.* From thence they sent on messengers to announce their coming to the authorities, and the Prince Maduna gathered the company together and addressed them as follows :—

"Say, O Zulus! to what end have you all come here? For we (Cetshwayo's brothers), as you see us, have devoted ourselves for him; we are prepared for the consequences, whatever they may be. But how is it with you? You have joined yourselves with us to-day; but will you not draw back to-morrow, when O-John Dunn [literally "John Dunn and Co."] come

* This was a sure sign of their desire to propitiate the Natal Government. For it is a most unusual thing for a Zulu to travel unarmed, as Colonel Durnford, R.E., said (2144, p. 237) in 1878: "The fact that the men at work (in building a kraal) are armed is of no significance, because *every Zulu is an armed man, and never moves without his weapon.*"

down upon you with their *impis*? And we, as you know, are unable to protect you. But, if you say that you too are prepared for the consequences, we shall thank you—we shall say ‘It is well!’”

And the people answered, saying, “We do devote ourselves! We pray for the King!”

Then the Prince went on, “And, in coming here, we ourselves do not know what we are coming to. What of good may arise, we know not, or what of evil. We have come because we are driven by our hearts, and can do no otherwise.”

And the people assented loudly with one accord.*

The messengers sent forward were five in number, one from each of the appointed chiefs, and two from the Princes, and their mission was to announce to the Resident, then in Maritzburg, the arrival of the

* It is difficult to understand how it was possible for Sir H. Bulwer to speak of this deputation in the harsh terms which he employs throughout his despatches, insisting that they showed disrespect to the Government which they were so anxious to propitiate, on such miserable grounds as their having let the Bishop know, as a private friend, of their approach before they formally announced it to Government. But Sir Henry Bulwer saw everything in this connection with a jaundiced eye, and was determined *not* to believe in *any* deputation on Cetshwayo's behalf. However conclusive the evidence forced on him, he would still deny that the majority of the Zulus were loyal to their King. The Governor's displeasure was as wanting in magnanimity as that of Sir Garnet Wolseley when he objected so very strongly to being likened to “a hen, which does not mind any kind of chicken, whether of a duck or turkey, or of any other bird; she does keep them all under her wings,” that he severely snubbed the unlucky petitioners (Natal natives) who employed the simile, and so put an end to their well-meant, though awkward, attempt to bring about a good understanding with Government on the subject of their needs and grievances.

Deputation, and to beg him to introduce them and their prayer to the Governor. A heavy thunderstorm delayed their arrival, so that they did not reach the Resident until Sunday, when he, after expressing great displeasure at the news they brought, told them that he could hear nothing more from them that day, because it was Sunday, and they must therefore come again to-morrow. They said that they would do as he desired, but reminded him that the morrow was their own (Zulu) sacred day, on which the chiefs might not enter upon a new undertaking, although they, the messengers, would come, according to his word.*

In the arrival of this deputation Sir H. Bulwer had, indeed, an opportunity to obtain the information desired by the Home Government, without loss of time. Zululand had come to him, to save him a troublesome and anxious visit to that disturbed country. But the "information" which that "wise and impartial gentleman" meant to obtain was that to which he had made up his mind beforehand, namely, such as would seem to prove the inherent stability of Sir G. Wolseley's "settlement," and the almost universal execration of Cetshwayo by the Zulu

* The Zulu sacred day is the day of the new moon, the *black day*, on which they never commence anything of their own will. On account of this superstition the camp at Isandhlwana would have been safe from attack on Jan. 22, 1879, in spite of its scattered and defenceless position, had Lord Chelmsford and his A.D.C. continued over that day the sketching and sauntering which occupied them, instead of reconnoissance and fortification, on the 21st. It was the attack made by the General on a party of Zulus who, under Matshana, were on their way to the great rendezvous, close to the ill-fated camp, which broke whatever charm held them back.

people. For his purpose, then, and that of those whose wishes chimed in with his, nothing could be more unfortunate than the arrival, in the very nick of time, of such a deputation as this. One searches the Blue Books in vain for one trace of any kindly or even *human* feeling towards these people—for anything like indulgence to ignorance, sympathy with loyal devotion, or pity for the fellow-creatures on whom already so much suffering had been inflicted in England's name. If the boon they begged *was* an impossible one, there was surely the more reason to refuse it gently, and without the needless addition of harsh and unfriendly treatment. But no; from first to last one thing only is plain—that Government would *not* be induced to show favour to any Zulus who committed the one unpardonable crime of praying for Cetshwayo, by any amount of good behaviour on the part of the petitioners. From first to last they were browbeaten, snubbed, and discouraged in every possible manner. Their word was doubted, their motives were misconstrued, the most far-fetched suggestions as to conceivable *evil* explanations of their conduct being seized with avidity on every occasion; and Sir Henry Bulwer caps the climax of his wildly unjust suspicions when he speaks of certain Zulus, who chanced at this very time to return from the Cape (where they had been in attendance on the King), as staying at Bishopstowe, "though," he says, "*they none of them had any possible good reason for going there*"! In point of fact, not only was it most natural that the two Zulus in question should go to Bishopstowe, on their way

through Natal, to see the friends who had shown them and their King so much kindness, and to report to them of Cetshwayo's health, &c., but also they had in their charge a Zulu girl of the King's household,* thought to be in a decline, and therefore sent back from the Cape; and on her account only they would have been glad to break their journey at Bishopstowe, where they knew she would be cared for as kindly as though she had been white.

The deputation, then, was to be discredited as much as possible, and the first idea, as usual, was an attempt to make out that it *had been sent for by the Bishop of Natal*, and could not, therefore, be looked upon as a voluntary expression of Zulu feeling. The Natal newspapers at the time (notably the *Natal Witness* of April 22, 1882) insinuate the accusation, and Sir H. Bulwer, in his despatches of July 22, August 25, and other dates, makes it in the fullest and most undisguised terms. To the former attack (from local journals) the Bishop was able to give immediate and complete reply, which he did in a letter to the *Natal Witness*, dated "Bishopstowe, April 25, 1882," and referring to a letter addressed previously by himself to the *Times of Natal*, October 22, 1881. This latter was in reply to similar accusations concerning the previous Zulu deputations, in answer to which he had written:—

"I beg to say that the above statement (of having 'suggested' the earlier deputations) is absolutely false. I have sent no agent

* Not a "wife of the ex-King," as Sir Henry calls her. Cetshwayo had no wife with him at all during his captivity, the girls captured with him in 1879 being simply attendants, and unmarried.

to Zululand, either lately or at any former time, calling for any deputation. The two deputations came entirely of their own accord, and were as wholly unexpected by me as they were by the Government."

The *Natal Witness* of April 22, 1882, having then repeated the old *contradicted* accusations as *facts* giving grounds for suspicion with regard to the great deputation, lately arrived, the Bishop wrote to the editor as follows:—

"As you must, I presume, have some reasons which have seemed to you sufficient to justify you in writing as above in the face of my distinct and positive denial, I think that I have a right to request you to make public any such reasons you may have for repeating a statement which, from whatever source you may have received your information, I again declare to be absolutely false, and without a shadow of foundation in fact.

"I write, not on my own account, but in the interests of the Zulus themselves, whose persistent and self-sacrificing efforts to bring to the ears of the authorities their prayer that Cetshwayo may be restored, as the only means of restoring peace to the country, and putting a stop to the dreadful bloodshedding and oppression which have already taken place under the present system, and are only too likely to be repeated, would be naturally depreciated if your statement, remaining uncorrected, were believed by any one to be true.

"It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to add that neither I myself, nor any of Cetshwayo's friends in England or Natal, so far as I am aware, had any knowledge of the despatch in question* until it was published in the recent Blue Book, which reached me very shortly after the deputation had reported themselves to Mr. Osborn in Maritzburg.

"J. W. NATAL."

Mkosana (the Zulu chief before spoken of who returned from Capetown, and whose report to the

* Lord Kimberley's despatch on Zulu affairs.

Zulus of the King's being still alive was the chief cause of their renewed efforts on his behalf, and of the formation of the Great Deputation), when he heard of the "suspicion" entertained by certain colonists, that the Bishop had contrived to bring down this deputation just at the very time when Lord Kimberley's despatch on Zulu affairs was published in the colony, observed, "Truly, it is they who have the wire (telegraph-cable), but we Zulus have the *amadhlozi* (the ancestral spirits). It is they who have done this for us. For they down below there know all things. They knew, of course, that such words were coming, and it was they who stirred up the Zulus, and brought them down at the right time. We say that it is all the doing of those below."

Surely, after the publication of this letter, Sir Henry Bulwer should have been satisfied that he had misjudged the Bishop, even though he had been blind enough to doubt him in the outset. But no! the Governor had made up his mind that the Zulu "prayer for Cetshwayo" was (and *should be*) only "the agitation of a party which has been promoted by artificial means, and not the movement of a people" [C. 3466, pp. 145-6]. He maintains that "we may be sure of this—that never one of them (the thirteen appointed chiefs) would have accepted his appointment as chief had he supposed the restoration of that rule (Cetshwayo's) possible," and therefore he ignores all proof that eight out of the thirteen have asked for that restoration, and he declares that "of one thing we may be sure—that the idea of a deputation of the

Zulu people asking for the restoration of the ex-King never had its source in the Zulu people.”*

The long despatch in which the above sentences occur teems with the most amazingly incorrect assertions, imaginary premises, and unwarrantable conclusions. A complete analysis of it would be too lengthy for our present purpose, but it should be consulted by those who care to see how the very man who in 1878 so admirably exposed the fallacies

* Yet the first move in that direction was as early as Feb. 9, 1880, when Zulu messengers came down, sent by several appointed and other chiefs, and bearing *Cetshwayo's book*, i.e. a handsomely bound copy of Sir T. Shepstone's 'Report of the Proceedings at Cetshwayo's Installation' [*supra*, page 17], to ask Sobantu (the Bishop) to inquire of Government, and find out for them, what law contained in the book the King had in any way broken, as they themselves knew of no fault which he had committed against it. Although, on this first occasion of an appeal for mercy from the foe whom they had lately proved relentless, they did not get so far as a distinct prayer for Cetshwayo's return, what they came down to say was plainly a first step in that direction. Sir H. Bulwer, as usual, insinuates that the idea of the "prayer" originated with the Bishop, but in this he has always been utterly and foolishly mistaken. The movement was as wholly unexpected by the Bishop as by any other Englishman in the colony. No doubt, he soon became convinced that the restoration of Cetshwayo in a proper manner [see in Appendix the Bishop's "conditions"] was the wisest and most just course that could be taken with regard to Zululand, but that conviction was the *consequence* of the evident desire of the majority of the Zulus for their King's return, and not, as Sir Henry Bulwer obstinately asserts, its *cause*. The Bishop's sense of justice would have been entirely opposed to anything like forcing back an unpopular ruler at the wish of a small party of the nation, and his knowledge of the language, with the confidence which the people placed in him, gave him far better opportunities for learning the real truth than Sir H. Bulwer could have, dependent as he was throughout upon the report of officials whose prejudice from the very first is self-evident in every line of their despatches, and who were regarded by the greater portion of the Zulu people with far more fear and suspicion than affection.

and subterfuges by which Sir B. Frere and Sir T. Shepstone brought about the invasion of Zululand, could himself produce a despatch which rivals those of his then colleagues in determined contempt of such trifles as "fact" and "proof."

In a previous despatch of May 30 [C. 3293, p. 4], Sir Henry Bulwer descended so far as to accuse the Bishop of being the cause of "agitation" in the Zulu country on the authority of two low-class natives whom the Governor describes, one as "residing on Bishopstowe lands," the other as "staying in ——'s kraal on Bishopstowe lands," which description led to their identification. The former (a petty official under Government) had long been known to the Colensos as a spy, who made a practice of retailing, at the office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, whatever he discovered, or imagined that he had discovered, of doings in Zulu matters at Bishopstowe, though the Bishop would take no measures to get rid of him from off his land, saying that there were no transactions at Bishopstowe which he desired to conceal, and that if the man chose to *invent*, he would do so wherever he resided. Added to which the Bishop disdained to inflict punishment upon a mere tool, whose object in lying could only be that of pleasing his superiors and employers. So that Mtungwana lived, and still lives, "on Bishopstowe lands" unmolested. The other man was an *induna* of Mr. John Shepstone's, one "Tom," who *was* staying at Mtungwana's kraal at the time of which they gave their false reports. It must be supposed that it was on Mr. J. Shepstone's authority that the Governor

positively speaks of these two scamps as "*both of them trustworthy men,*" and unhesitatingly accepts their assertions without further inquiry. Without first laying the accusations brought against him (and his daughter) before the Bishop, Sir Henry Bulwer sent them home, with the seal of his own credulity upon them, to the Secretary of State, and they were only made known to the Bishop when they were published, some six months later, in the Blue Book [C. 3466].* So curiously blinded was the Governor by prejudice that it (appears to have) escaped his notice that part of the report of what was said to have taken place at a supposed meeting of the Zulus at Bishopstowe is made on the authority of a native who complains in the same breath of *having been excluded from it*, saying, "Only Zulus were allowed to be present." In another despatch, May 12 [C. 3247, p. 85], Sir Henry Bulwer repeats part of the "information" thus reputedly received, accompanied by a broad insinuation that the rejection of advice which he had given to certain Zulus had been recommended to the latter at a meeting held at Bishopstowe; on seeing which, in the Blue Book in question, the Bishop wrote to the Governor telling him that he had been misinformed when he stated that such a meeting had been held or such advice given at Bishopstowe, and that there was "not a shadow of foundation for such a suspicion."† Nevertheless, some three months later (Nov. 7, 1882), Sir Henry Bulwer *actually*

* See in Appendix a letter to Lord Derby from Mr. F. Colenso.

† For the whole letter, see Appendix.

repeats the accusation received from his "two trustworthy natives," and enclosing new and more elaborate statements from the same persons [C. 3466, p. 223]. He says indeed that he has "accepted the assurance of Bishop Colenso that no such meeting" as the one reported had been held, or, rather, that "if there was any meeting . . . it was without his knowledge,"* but proceeds to say that in that case the words reported to him must have been spoken by Miss Colenso, the Bishop's eldest daughter.† That *she* had given Maduna "authority" to gather an *impi* and attack his enemies, on their return to Zululand, and that she had urged Dabulamanzi to reject the Governor's advice ‡ he does not hesitate to accept as a fact, while the unavoidable conclusion from his various despatches is that he looks upon the Bishop's own denial as a prevarication; and indeed he was perfectly aware that it was *impossible* for Miss Colenso to do that of which he accused her without her father's knowledge, even though he (Sir H. Bulwer) were so poor a judge of character as to believe it possible that she *could do it at all*. It never seems to have occurred to him that it was more likely that these two natives (who from their own account had acted as thorough-paced spies, and had tried to get statements prejudicial to the Bishop from his own servants) should have deceived him, than that the Bishop or his daughter should have acted in such a manner. Relying on

* An absolute impossibility.

† Sister of the present writer.

‡ The full account of this will appear in its proper place.

these and other insecure authorities, Sir Henry Bulwer writes perpetually of "agitation," "disturbances," &c., &c., applying the terms to every appeal, however quietly and humbly made, on the King's behalf, and as perpetually charges the Bishop with having stirred up or caused such "agitation." Whatever disturbances really took place in Zululand resulted solely from attacks made upon the petitioners for Cetshwayo by the few chiefs who were really against his return, to punish them for having petitioned. But in these official despatches such disturbances are frequently mentioned in such a way as to give the impression that they *originated in violence on the part of the King's adherents*, while, as an actual fact, in every single instance, if the latter fought at all, it was either in self-defence, or, much more rarely, in retaliation. And in many more instances the originally far more numerous party submitted quietly to outrage from their enemies rather than do anything to prejudice their King's cause. In consequence of this truly admirable self-restraint, slaughter was carried on by Hamu, Zibebu, and chief Dunn with impunity, *thereby continually lessening the numbers of the King's more loyal subjects*. Notably Hamu's massacre of the Aba Qulusi deprived Cetshwayo at one blow of (taking the *lowest* computation) at least 1000 fighting men, always accounted the bravest of the nation, besides such women as fell in the way of the attacking force (the majority escaped beforehand); while the statement of a white witness, fighting in Hamu's ranks, that "out of an army of 1500 but

few escaped," while "our casualties are eight killed and thirteen wounded," proves at once that this was no battle, but literally a massacre of people unprepared to fight. These facts should be remembered when the King's *fighting* adherents are counted up later as less numerous than the reports of his friends showed them to be. The Bishop, of course, never advised them to "agitate," but quite the reverse. In point of fact, he never "interfered" at all in Zulu matters, first and last. Twice only, if we except what is related on page 26, did he give political advice to the Zulus, and then only in answer to their earnest desire.

First, in 1877, when the difficulty about the territory in dispute between the Boers and Zulus had grown to a point which showed plainly that it must be settled, Cetshwayo sent to ask advice of the Bishop of Natal. And the latter's reply* was to the effect that "he must on no account think of fighting the Transvaal Government, and that he had better send down some great indunas to propose arbitration to Sir Henry Bulwer, in whose hands he might leave himself with perfect confidence † that the right and just thing would be done by him." About twenty days later Sir Henry Bulwer himself made the very same proposition of arbitration to Cetshwayo, and it was gladly accepted, perhaps partly in consequence of the previous advice, though indeed Cetshwayo has always shown himself dutiful to England through

* 'Hist. Zulu War.' Colenso and Durnford, p. 142, 2nd edit.

† Judging from Sir H. Bulwer's public actions at that time, in which judgment he was justified *then*, as the "right and just thing" *was* done, though spoilt at once by Sir Bartle Frere.

the British Government in Natal. The Secretary of State at the time wrote to Sir H. Bulwer as follows: "I have read with satisfaction the explanations given by the Bishop . . . with respect to the course taken by him, which would appear to have been judicious;" and again, "I concur with the opinion you (Sir H. Bulwer) expressed to the Bishop that the advice given by his Lordship to Cetshwayo in reply to his message was sound and good, and I trust that, if circumstances render it necessary, it may be followed." [Feb. 18, 1878, 2079, p. 21.]

Yet Sir Henry Bulwer's comment, six months later (C. 3466, p. 71), is as follows:—

"The Bishop, and some of the members of his family, had been in communication with Cetshwayo before the Zulu war, and their proceedings, which tended to *prejudice the relations between this Government and Cetewayo* [!], had given me a great deal of trouble at the time"

How it was *possible* for any prejudicial influence to attend the advice given by the Bishop, that Cetshwayo should *ask* of the Governor of Natal the very thing the latter was just about (unknown to the Bishop) to *offer*, it is difficult to understand; and, in point of fact, if the request had come before the offer, the dignity of the Natal Government would only have been enhanced thereby. The allusion to "members of his family" can only refer to the attempt made by messengers from Cetshwayo to appoint Dr. J. W. Smith and Mr. F. E. Colenso* as his political

* A barrister, brother of the present writer. The similarity of name has given rise to some curious mistakes, such as the publication of a passage commencing, "*Miss Colenso*, writing from the Oxford and Cambridge Club, says so-and-so."

agents, which arrangement, though acquiesced in by the Secretary of State, fell through, owing to Sir Henry Bulwer's strong objection to any intervention on the part of those whom he considered "irresponsible persons." But Colonel Durnford, R.E., a good authority on Zulu matters, at that time wrote home: "Don't alarm yourself at any stories you may hear about the Zulus. They have just appointed two barristers here to be their agents for diplomatic purposes. Cetshwayo sees plainly that, if he fights [with the Boers], all is lost; so, like a wise man, he adopts the European style of having an ambassador or *chargé d'affaires* to look after his interests, and represent his views." And again, "He (Cetshwayo) is really doing all he can to keep peace [with the Boers] . . . he has appointed two English barristers to be his agents here, and to offer arbitration in the European mode of settling differences," and, "Frank Colenso (one of the two diplomatic agents) has just returned from Zululand, where he has been to see his sable Majesty, and you will be pleased to hear, in the interests of peace, that Cetshwayo has no idea at all of fighting the English: he asks for arbitration (between himself and the Boers); and when a savage comes to that, it's surely a good sign,"*—plainly showing that he considered the appointment to be "*in the interests of peace.*"

So much for the first occasion on which Sir H. Bulwer says that the Bishop had given him "a great

* 'A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa' (pp. 167-8), edited by Lieut.-Col. Edward Durnford.

deal of trouble" in Zululand. The second time that the latter gave the Zulus, in answer to their earnest inquiries, a piece of political advice was in 1881, when the fourth deputation on Cetshwayo's behalf came to him and asked what could they—all the Zulus—do to obtain their King's release, and to escape from the cruel tyranny of a certain few of the appointed chiefs. To which he replied that they should refrain from any sort of violence, even in retaliation for their wrongs, and if it was really true, as they asserted, that "all Zululand" wished for his restoration, they should go to the Resident, and ask leave to come down to Maritzburg, and make their wishes known in a proper manner to the Government.

Sir Henry Bulwer was furious with the Bishop for giving this advice, though it is difficult to know what reply would have pleased him, unless it had been one assuring the Zulus that it was utterly useless for them to make any efforts on behalf of Cetshwayo, whom they had much better forget and leave to his fate. He speaks of his "conviction" that "to the Bishop's intervention in the political affairs of the Zulu country has been mainly due the agitation that has of late disturbed that country," and his despatch (C. 3466, p. 70) on the subject is crowded with errors, resulting from his dependence upon the information of others, and with groundless assertions such as that quoted on p. 180 *supra* and elsewhere in these pages.

It is difficult to understand how it was possible for an educated gentleman of Sir Henry Bulwer's experience to have known the Bishop of Natal for so long,

and yet to believe what he says of him, in the face, too, of his positive denial. But the Governor condemned the Bishop on the authority of such men as Mr. John Shepstone—a man convicted by the late Sir G. Colley* of making statements which were (Sir G. Colley said) “entirely without foundation,” and whose actions had been characterised by Lord Carnarvon as “underhand manœuvres, opposed to the morality of a civilised administration”—and Mr. Osborn, whose own despatches may be referred to as specimens of self-contradiction and weak judgment, which should long since have convinced Sir Henry that, in trusting to him, he was leaning upon a broken reed. On the authority of such men as these, with their paid and humble native followers, was the Bishop of Natal accused by Sir Henry Bulwer of falsehood, prevarication, treachery to his country, and detestable counsel to the Zulus, and, when the latter is forced somewhat to withdraw from his position, he does so only to shift the blame upon the shoulders of Miss Colenso, deliberately accusing her of inciting savages to bloodshed and murder, and thereby causing all the current misery in Zululand. Only an attack of temporary insanity, taking the form of obstinately gripping one preconceived theory and entertaining the wildest improbabilities, rather than accept *any* evidence *against that theory*, can account for Sir Henry Bulwer’s conduct at this time. Had he chosen to avail himself, privately, of the Bishop’s knowledge and influence in native matters, he might

* In the “Matshana Inquiry” of 1875.

have earned the honour and glory of—to a great extent—undoing the wrong wrought in England's name in 1879, and his own name might have gone down to the future as one of those who redeem their country's honour and prestige and make it still possible for men to speak of "English justice." Instead of doing this, he chose to put himself into the hands of men who are either ignorant or untrustworthy, or both, some of whom have been associated with all the high-handed and disastrous acts of misgovernment that have disgraced our rule in South-east Africa, and who placed before him a view of facts which, while it was agreeable to his preconceived notions, misled and deceived him, to the subsequent ruin of the people especially confided to his care.

Yet he was not without warning. Much of the foregoing was earnestly brought to his notice in various ways before it was too late, and he might, at least, have taken warning by the fate of one of his predecessors, Sir B. Pine, who was recalled for the Langalibalele affair, after Sir T. Shepstone had gone home to set things right—for both, if possible; in any case for *one*.*

When the Bishop saw the accusations against himself and his daughter in the Blue Book [C. 3466], he addressed a letter, in reply to them, to the Earl of Derby, and forwarded it through Sir Henry Bulwer.

* Or, as Colonel Durnford puts it, "to make things pleasant, and to explain away certain acts, which he probably would have done, had not the Bishop of Natal gone home, too, to *tell the truth*." ('A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa,' p. 99, edited by Lieut.-Col. Edward Durnford.)

It is too long for quotation here, but may be found in the Appendix,* and is well worth the perusal of those who really care to understand the whole subject.

The Princes and chiefs of the fifth deputation did not take up their abode at Bishopstowe, as would have been most pleasant to themselves, for they were, above all things, anxious to avoid anything which might offend "Government," and previous parties had been, as already related, severely reprov'd for going to the Bishop for shelter. They seem'd capable of understanding that, while he was their best friend and adviser, he was not, as he † repeatedly told them, an "authority," and could not directly influence their fate as much as the smallest official under Government in the department concern'd with native affairs. Nevertheless, their confidence in and affection for him was great, and especially marked was their anxiety that he should know every step taken, and every word spoken, by and to them in this matter. During the three weeks that the party wait'd near Maritzburg for leave to see the Governor, and urge their prayer in person, they repeatedly sent over messengers to report carefully to the Bishop every word that had been said to or by them during the day on the subject of their mission, for they reli'd most implicitly on him as their one sure channel for truth, and knew that, in what he recorded, nothing would be misrepresented, misunderstood, or omitted. The conversations between them and the Government

* And see there a letter address'd to Lord Derby by one of the Bishop's sons.

† And *others*.

officials who visited them on the hill were therefore immediately and minutely repeated to and taken down by him; and as the men sent to Bishopstowe for the purpose were most anxious to fulfil the duty confided to them by giving a precise account of all that passed, the result may be assumed to be as correct as attentive listeners, with the memory for details naturally arising from the absence of all clerical aids to recollection, could, under such circumstances, make it. The conversations in question, recorded word for word as related, will be found in the Appendix, and form a powerful indictment against the Natal Government.

After Mr. Osborn's first reception of the messengers sent on to announce the approach of the Great Deputation, he had two further interviews with them, the Governor being absent for a few days in Durban. During these he considerably modified his tone, even commending the action of the chiefs and headmen in joining together to "speak the word that they meant, and leave talking of other matters" [i. e., presumably, complaints of the working of Sir G. Wolseley's unlucky "settlement" in minor details], and saying, "The chiefs have done well to send you to me." This looked well for their hopes, and on Thursday, April 20th, the whole deputation, which had been approaching with respectful slowness, moved on to within five or six miles of Maritzburg.

It must be borne in mind that this large body of Zulus was advancing into a lately hostile and still unfriendly country, which had, not long before, laid the scourge of war upon them and trodden them

under foot. They had left their weapons behind them, and, having no means of transport beyond the bearing powers of their attendants, cannot possibly have brought with them anything like sufficient provisions for so large a party. They waited on the hills, about five miles from Maritzburg, from the 20th of April to the 8th of May, and they received no hospitality or assistance whatever from the Government they came to visit, not even the Princes being supplied with the miserable allowance of *shin-bone* of beef dealt out to Zulu messengers and visitors to the Government of Natal. Under the circumstances, it seems wonderful that not even any of the attendants committed thefts or disorderly acts of any sort. For it is a matter of fact that, although the colonial newspapers began at once, open-mouthed yet vaguely, about what might be expected from a mob of invaders, &c., &c., they were unable to support their prophetic abuse by quoting a single complaint against the Zulus during their whole stay in the colony, or since. Without doubt, the native population and some few whites did assist them with provisions, but of *official* assistance there was no sign whatever. In point of fact, the 646 chiefs and headmen were simply the cream of the nation, and little likely to disgrace themselves by depredations; and as they were most anxious that their party should be blameless in the eyes of the Natal Government, no doubt they made a careful selection of attendants before leaving Zululand. But the mere presence of so large a body of Zulus, however peaceable and orderly in their

demeanour, would be enough to scare some of the more timid colonists, and, whether for this or for other reasons, Government certainly showed a desire to keep them at a distance.

On Friday, April 21, six days after the first formal report, by messengers, of their approach, the whole party set out to present themselves to the authorities, once more sending on heralds to announce them. But they were soon met by an induna of Mr. Osborn's, who hurried back again to his master, whereupon the latter himself came out to meet and stop them at some distance from the city.

Either Mr. Osborn had forgotten all that had already passed between him and the messengers, and his admission (see p. 164) that the chiefs and Princes were justified in following him to Maritzburg on the expiration of the "ten days"* which they believed he had told them to wait, or else he had, on the Governor's return, found that the latter was alto-

* Mr. Osborn denies that he told them to wait ten days [3466, p. 185], and probably he said nothing to them which he *intended* them to take as a permission to come down at the end of that time. But there can be no doubt, on the testimony of so many Zulus of rank and (some of them, at all events) of tried sincerity, that some mention of "ten days" *was* made during their interview with the Resident. Probably it had no further object than that of putting them off, and keeping them quiet for the moment, and being only one of so many temporising answers given to *keep the Zulus quiet*, and to *prevent their petitioning for their King*, while the latter's fate still hung in the balance, it may hardly have dwelt in the Resident's memory. But he scarcely has a right to complain if, put off and eluded as they had been so often, the Zulus seized upon any words of his which gave them the opportunity they so earnestly desired, and had so frequently failed to obtain, of laying their case before the Governor of Natal.

gether averse to even that much encouragement being afforded the petitioners.

At all events, the Resident's tone had entirely changed, and, having taken the Princes, chiefs, and headmen apart, he began once more with the old reproach to the former for having come down without his leave. They reminded him that they had asked for a pass, and had given him notice that, if they could not obtain one, they must go down without,* and, furthermore, they added that they were now brought down by (the representatives of) the appointed chiefs.†

Mr. Osborn was obliged to admit the truth of their statements, and went on to the next point, "What

* Sir Evelyn Wood said to Ngcongwana and his companions who came down with the previous deputations [3182, p. 175], "If you were refused a pass [by the Resident], I think you were justified in coming to me [N.B. at Maritzburg] for one; but you should come to Mr. John Shepstone first, not to other people" [i. e. not to the Bishop of Natal, even for a night's lodging!]. So, also, Mr. J. Shepstone said to two Zulus who came down in November 1881 to complain of the ill-treatment of the Princes by Zibebu and Hamu, but brought no pass from the Resident, "Mnyamana should have asked for a pass for you, and if Malimati [the Resident] refused to give one, then he might have said to him, 'Since you refuse to give me a pass, I am now going down to report for myself.' If you had come to us with such a word as that, it would have been quite another thing." And now that they had done this very thing they found that it was quite the same thing—a mere excuse for not receiving them at all.

† Mr. Osborn's "Instructions" as Resident in Zululand contain the following passage: "You will not prevent any chief from corresponding with or visiting the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor of Natal should they wish to do so." [3482, p. 261.] (N. B.—The appointed chiefs only are here indicated, therefore the representatives of the three who accompanied this deputation had a right to see the Governor *without* Mr. Osborn's leave.

had the deputation come for?" Again they repeated what they had previously said of their desire to pray for the King's return, and again he raised the old objection to the mention of the *eight* appointed chiefs, on the grounds that they had repudiated the previous deputations.* Again the reply was given that the actual representatives of *three* chiefs were present, and that the other five were with them at heart, but had drawn back when they found from Sir E. Wood's reception, and the warnings of Mr. Osborn's indunas, that "Government" was offended by their petition. Again Mr. Osborn promised, though in less assured terms than before, to report them to the Governor, adding, however, that his Excellency would assuredly inquire why they had broken his law in coming down without leave from the Resident; and *again* that point was explained as before.

On the following Monday (April 24, 1882), he interviewed them once more, sending word the day before that he would come out to them, but that he did not wish to meet the whole party. When he appeared, however, the bulk of the people objected to being left out, saying "We came of our own free

* The reader will bear in mind how this "repudiation" was *managed*, by first allowing the chiefs to see that the deputations were displeasing to the Natal Government, and then giving them a loophole of escape by formally asking them whether they had sent the three men who accompanied and formed part of the fourth deputation, on a special and separate errand, viz. to ask leave to go to Capetown to wait upon Cetshwayo, and carefully abstaining from questioning them as to the rest of the deputation, or whether they had sent other messengers than these on "a similar or the same errand." [3182, p. 176.]

will only. We are all concerned ; we cannot be left out ;” and they sent a messenger to make their protest to Mr. Osborn, who finally agreed to the presence of all.

Once more the direct representatives of the three kinglets were called upon to express the object of the deputation, and Mbenge, Seketwayo’s brother, replied, “ We have come, sir—I from Seketwayo—bringing these Princes. Seketwayo says, ‘Sirs, you have corrected us enough ; give us back Cetshwayo,’ ” and the other two followed him with words to the same effect from their respective chiefs. This done, the first speaker added, ‘ We name these three chiefs, but they all [all the eight] say the same.’ ” Once more the Resident objected that the chiefs themselves denied it ; once more Mbenge replied, “ Sir, those chiefs saw that you punished people for that [i. e. praying for Cetshwayo’s return]. How, then, could they approach you with the same word for which they saw that others had been punished ?”

Upon this it may be remarked that, although Mr. Osborn has [3466, p. 186] indignantly denied having in any way “ stifled or suppressed Zulu feeling on the subject of the King’s return,” his own despatches prove the contrary. On May 21, 1882, he [3182, p. 176] writes : “ Since then [May 1880] several requests have been made to me by Ndabuko for a pass to proceed again to Maritzburg to renew his application for the return of Cetshwayo, *which requests I have always refused to grant.*” And again [*ibid.*, p. 177], he himself reports that he had advised

Siwunguza to "deal leniently with Umfunzi in this matter." Not, that is, to *eat him up* entirely, but to "*punish him by fine for any wrong that he may have done.*" As Umfunzi's only crime was that of having eagerly taken part in the deputations on Cetshwayo's behalf, it is plain, on the Resident's own showing, that he *did* treat that prayer as a fault, and therefore *did* help to "suppress and stifle" it. He reports that he gave the same advice concerning Ngobozana, who had also "prayed for the King."

To return from this digression. Mr. Osborn next informed them that he had repeated all their words to the Governor, who had expressed his displeasure with the Princes for having come down without leave, and had said, "Let the three representatives go back, and let the chiefs themselves come to me, or, if they cannot come themselves, let them send their chief men to speak with me." *

To this the representatives modestly replied that this latter had already been done, since each one of the three was his chief's own brother, in sending whom the chief had, so to speak, come himself, and that thus they had already done all that the Governor required of them, since they had come to the Resident himself, he being the right person to introduce them

* Two, at least of these three kinglets were aged men, quite unfit to take so long a journey, which would have had to be made on foot, since few, if any, of the elder Zulus ride, and carriages are hardly known amongst them. Horses were not common, even amongst the younger Zulus, until Zibebu, by the advice of his white allies, mounted some of his men for the attack upon Cetshwayo in 1883.

to the Governor. This they one and all entreated him to do, while the whole assembly earnestly re-asserted that they had not come in wilful disregard of his authority, but in hopes that he would obtain them the hearing they desired.

To all this Mr. Osborn once more assented, accepting their explanations, as he had done before, and engaging to do what he could for them with the Governor.

He then continued, "We have now finished speaking of your prayer, so let us speak of your troubles up to to-day."

The Zulus at first demurred to this, remarking that they had told it all before, and, doubtless, feeling the difficulty in which they were placed in being called upon to repeat accusations against himself to the very man who must be their mediator with Sir H. Bulwer, if they were to find one at all. But the Resident insisted, and, when they had once begun to speak, they did so with terrible distinctness. There was an end of all hesitation then. Man after man came forward, each one preserving the utmost respect in language and manner, and yet each one plainly charging the Resident himself with being the chief cause of their personal troubles, with having repeatedly suppressed the cry of the people, and again and again encouraged their enemies and tyrants to punish them for their loyalty to the King.

Humiliating indeed must have been the position of the British official overwhelmed by these direct and

detailed accusations, to many of which he could offer no reply, although, when the charges rested on the word of men not present (appointed chiefs who had "eaten up" members of the previous deputations, saying that they did so by order of, or suggestion from, the Resident), he remarked, "Who can bear witness for himself?" Yet charge after charge followed on, with much circumstantiality yet unvarying courtesy of language, and to these Mr. Osborn appeared to have no reply to give, until an interview of which one reads the full account* with shame at what the British name for truth has sunk to in South Africa, closed with the Resident's remark, "I have heard what you say, men. Let two of you follow me into town."

Sir Henry Bulwer reports [C. 3247, p. 65] this interview to the Earl of Kimberley in terms of the highest displeasure, stigmatising Ndabuko and Usiwetu as adopting towards the Resident an "exceedingly disrespectful and overbearing" tone, and commenting with especial severity upon Ndabuko's behaviour and disposition.

"Their behaviour towards the Resident on Monday last," he says [*ibid.*, p. 66], "was without excuse, and the distrust which they affected to feel of his good faith in reporting truly to the Government was an audacious attempt to gain their ends, † &c. . . . on hearing

See Appendix (B).

† And so at the famous (or infamous) trial of Langalibalele in 1874, the "Court" decided that that unhappy chief had added to his heinous offence (of running away) by venturing to state that he had had doubts of the good faith of the Government which had

of which," he continues, "I was, of course, only the more confirmed in my determination not to see them."

Accordingly, having thus decided the case on the sole evidence of the accused person, Sir Henry Bulwer [*ibid.*], as he "did not wish to expose the Resident to a repetition of such treatment," deputed Mr. John Shepstone to manage the affair. The two men brought into town by Mr. Osborn on the Monday returned at night with a message to the effect that the Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, Mr. J. Shepstone, would send out next morning to summon members of the deputation to wait upon him in town.

The hopes of the party began to rise, for this message looked as though they were at last to get a hearing. That another day was suffered to elapse before the promised summons came was but in keeping with the well-known dilatory movements of the Native Affairs Office, and on the following morning four chiefs, including one of the representatives of the three kinglets, were sent for, and had the promised interview with Mr. Shepstone.

But they returned to their party greatly depressed, and grievously disappointed, for all they had got was a severe reproof for bringing down so large a party. "Was it not all right?—did we not treat you well when you came down before with a smaller

summoned him to appear before it. Yet one, at least, of his judges (Mr., now Sir, T. Shepstone) well knew that those doubts had some foundation; while the Crown Prosecutor for the occasion, Mr. John Shepstone, was the very man who, by his treacherous conduct towards another native chief, some years previously, had given rise to Langalibalele's fears.

party?"* asked Mr. Shepstone.† "You have done very wrong. And as for your words, we have heard what you say, but we shall give you no answer here. Go back to Mr. Osborn in Zululand, and make your statement to him, and then come back here just a few of you, a proper party."

Thus were these unhappy Zulus made shuttle-cocks of between the Resident, who, by his own admission, refused them passes, and to whose influence they believed much of their misery to be due, and the Natal Government, which mocked them by sending them back for the passes which they had already tried in vain, *and were not intended*, to obtain, with injunctions to lay their grievances before the man whom they considered guilty of causing them. But, in point of fact, what was desired was, not that they should make their petitions in this form or the other, but that they should not make them at all, the intention being that Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement," of which Sir Henry Bulwer *alone* ever expressed approval, ‡ should appear to be successful, and that Cetshwayo should not return.

* The good treatment they received amounted to their being sent back without an answer because they bore no pass from the Resident.

† Mr. John Shepstone is universally known among the natives as "Misjan."

‡ "As to the settlement itself," writes Sir Henry Bulwer to Sir G. Wolseley, on Feb. 4, 1880 [C. 2584, p. 142], "your Excellency is aware that the principles of it are those which have my entire concurrence. From one or two of the details I may have been disposed to differ; but the general character of the settlement, its general features, and the principles upon which it

Mr. Shepstone's own report [C. 3247, p. 73] of his interview with the four men consists almost entirely of his reproof to them on Mr. Osborn's account, and he concludes it by saying [3247, p. 74], "These men were most respectful in their behaviour, and paid particular attention to what was said to them, and accepted the instruction to return home without demur, and I anticipate no further trouble."

Sir Henry Bulwer's comment is that the interview "appeared to promise a satisfactory termination to the affair" [C. 3247, p. 66].

In point of fact, although the Zulus made no useless attempts to dispute the cruel order to them to return as they came, they were beyond measure cast down by it. They had left Zululand knowing that the inimical chiefs Zibebu and Hamu would probably punish those who came from their territories if they returned without that sanction to their proceedings which a kind reception from the Natal Government would have given them. But, besides this, they knew that John Dunn had threatened to fall, with his murderous *impi*, on every man of the party who might attempt to return to his district after taking part in the deputation. Having left their weapons behind them, the whole 2000 could easily be slaughtered, if met by even a small body of well-armed men. They

is based are, I believe, such that it would be difficult to find any which would be at once more satisfactory to the justice of the case and better calculated, under the circumstances, to secure the peace and good order of the Zulu country and the safety of the adjoining British communities."

had known their danger when they started, intentionally unarmed, upon their expedition, but they were too much in earnest to be stopped by threats against themselves, and they were well aware that if they gained their desire—that is to say, a hearing from the Governor, and a favourable reception at Maritzburg—the mere fact would be a safeguard against their tormentors, who would never have dared to act as they had done throughout, if they had not received considerable official encouragement.

The chiefs sent two messengers back to the Native Affairs Office to say that, while consenting to go again to the Resident, at Inhlazatshe, they must accompany him back when he went himself, as they could not go back unarmed to meet John Dunn's *impi*, except under his protection.

In reply to Mr. Shepstone's reproaches for their accusations brought against Mr. Osborn on the hill-side, they explained that they had said nothing new, nothing that they had not told the Resident many times before. They pointedly repeated that on this occasion they had come for the one thing only—to pray for Cetshwayo. They were, indeed, quite alive to the danger of their main object being artfully pushed out of sight, did they allow themselves to be led away into discussions on the many minor grievances, which had, in reality, but grown out of the one great evil—the expatriation of their King.

Mr. Osborn, they said, had insisted on their repeating all their personal grievances, but in doing so there had been no intention or desire to behave dis-

respectfully to him [3247, p. 74]. They did not think that they were doing wrong in following him into Natal, and it was because he had asked them what they had come about, speaking as though all on which they had so often appealed to him before were new to him, that they had begun to suspect that the grievances that had been reported to him in Zululand, had never been forwarded by him to the Governor. They had, therefore, asked him what had become of the report which he had written for them before, and of which they had heard no more. Mr. Shepstone expressed his surprise on hearing this, and said that he would report it to the Governor.

In this second interview, the explanations given by the Zulus were directed by the Princes and principal chiefs, who also sent especially to explain to the Resident that, in point of fact, it was not they who accused him, but their persecutors, who always declared that they were set on by order of the Resident; and they wished him to know that such was the case. The messengers were also charged to beg Mr. Osborn to obtain permission for the chiefs, at least, to visit the Governor—to set eyes on him and pay their respects, even if they were forbidden to speak to him of their errand, that they might not be entirely snubbed and left out on the hill-side.

Mr. Osborn's reply to this appeal, as reported by the messenger who received it, ran as follows: "Yes, I, too, held that your words cleared me, and I wish that you should be admitted. I assure you, it is not I who am keeping you back. But go and hear for

yourself from Mr. John Shepstone. I authorise you to go to him. Say that I sent you."

So the messenger, Mfunzi, went, but the answer was the same as before: the Governor would not see them; they must go to the Resident at Inhlazatshe; no member of the deputation might come into town, not even to see the houses and the shops; and this prohibition extended to the Princes themselves.

This final rebuff was received on Friday, the 28th of April, and, on the following day, the chiefs and Princes, feeling that further delay would avail them nothing, made their preparations for departure. These preparations included the despatch of messengers to Bishopstowe, to say that they would come to take leave of the Bishop next day (Sunday, 30th), the Prince Dabulamanzi never having visited Bishopstowe previously at all. Accordingly they arrived, but meanwhile a new phase of their adventures had arisen, in which Dabulamanzi was chiefly concerned, and the immediate return of the whole party to Zululand was of necessity postponed. When Mfunzi went back to the party on the hill-side, with the report of his last futile effort to obtain grace, he also brought with him the news that chief Dunn had arrived, or was expected immediately in town, and early on Sunday morning an order came out from the Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, to the effect that the men from J. Dunn's district were to come in to him next Monday morning, with one Sicoto, a chief from one of the northern territories. While at Bishopstowe that day, Dabulamanzi asked the Bishop to tell him

what he knew of a statement of chief Dunn's which had reached his ears, that the people in his district did not wish for Cetshwayo's return. "What," he asked, "did the white people know about this statement?" The Bishop, in reply, read to him an extract from the *Natal Mercury* of December 20th, 1881, viz.: "He (J. Dunn) affirmed emphatically that, so far as *he and his people* were concerned, Cetshwayo should not come into Zululand across the Tugela," and, at his request, copied the words for him on a sheet of paper.

Next day, Monday, May 1st, the people under J. Dunn went in, all of them—a great crowd. But the Secretary for Native Affairs said that he had only sent for the principal men amongst them, and sent the others back. But he gave them some rations of beef, and named twenty-one chiefs and headmen amongst them, who, with Sicoto, were to come in again. Neither the object for which Sicoto was summoned, nor the reason for his selection, is made apparent in the Blue Books. But, at all events, the fact that a representative of the remainder of the deputation, who could not be personally concerned in the question between J. Dunn and the men from his territory, was summoned to an interview with the Government, was an ample reason why the Princes and their party should wait for the result, which accordingly they did.

On the same day (Monday) there came out a message from chief Dunn, ordering Dabulamanzi and Manxele (the representative of a powerful tribe in

Dunn's territory), to come at once to him in Maritzburg, but as they had already been "called" by the authorities there, they did not attend to his summons. In the afternoon, Manxele, with some others, went to receive the rations of beef, and were separated from the rest of the party. Before they had left the town, a carriage passed them; they could not see who was in it for the dust; but presently they saw some one standing up and beckoning to them. On approaching, they found that it was chief Dunn, who called to Manxele, "Here, boy! What do you mean by not coming when I call you?"

"Sir," replied Manxele, "I could not see you for the dust." Chief Dunn went on in a rage, "And what do you mean by joining yourself to those fellows belonging to other chiefs? Don't you know that you belong to me? Break off from them directly, I tell you; or only wait till we get home, and you will need a rope to reach from earth to heaven for you to climb to safety by, you and Mavumengwana* too. Leave these fellows, I tell you." And so they parted.

The above is a sample of the insolent and overbearing tone assumed by J. Dunn towards the chiefs and people in his district who were loyal to Cetshwayo; and, seeing how much power was left in his hands and those of the other kinglets, it is not wonderful that the weaker ones fell away sometimes, and foreswore their previous words.

A little later (June 29, 1882) this threat about a

* Head of the tribe of which Manxele was the representative.

rope to reach from earth to heaven [3466, pp. 82, 83] was transferred to Ndabuko by the Resident, to whom it was repeated by one of his (Mr. Osborn's) men, as having been used against Zulus disloyal to the King. But there is no doubt that it was spoken nearly two months before by J. Dunn, and reported *immediately*, and the case is only another instance of how every possible incident has been twisted to tell against the King and his principal supporters, especially his loyal and devoted brother Ndabuko, against whom, accordingly, Sir Henry Bulwer is never tired of repeating accusations gathered through Mr. Osborn from Ndabuko's enemies; and perhaps there is nothing to be found, even in the South African Blue Books, more entirely opposed to fact and truth than the various assertions and accusations which appear against this unfortunate Prince.

On Tuesday, May 2, these twenty-one chiefs and headmen, placed, without their own consent, under chief Dunn, the renegade from his own nation, and double-dyed traitor to Cetshwayo, by Sir Garnet Wolseley, were taken up to Government House, where they found the "authorities" assembled, eight in number, viz. the Governor and a secretary, Mr. John Shepstone, Mr. Osborn, and "four other gentlemen" (? the four other members of the Executive Council). Chief Dunn was there also.

The Zulus were told to speak, and Manxele began: "Sirs, I am sent by Mavumengwana to say, 'The child has been sufficiently corrected; will you not return him to us now?'—I mean Cetshwayo.

Mavumengwana also says, 'Why is it said by chief Dunn that I pay taxes to keep Cetshwayo away, because I do not wish him to return? I thought I paid them to the English Government. I am amazed to hear that, whereas I have been paying to the Government, I am said to have paid to keep Cetshwayo away. To whom but Cetshwayo have I belonged ever since I was born? I do not belong to you any longer, chief Dunn. You have slandered me by this word.'

The Governor (by interpreter) inquired, "Was money paid?"

A.: "Yes, sir."

Q.: "To whom?"

A.: "To J. Dunn."

Q.: "Into his hands?"

A.: "Into his hands."

Q.: "For whom was it said to be paid?"

A.: "It was said that it was paid for you, sir."

Q.: "For *whom*?"

A.: "For the Governor?"

Q.: "For what Governor?"

A.: "For this Governor."

Q.: "For which one?"

A.: "For this one."

Q.: "Into his (J. Dunn's) hands?"

A.: "Into his hands."

Q.: "Did you yourselves pay?"

A.: "We ourselves paid."

J. Dunn: "Who told you that it was for the Government?"

Manxele : “ Mkateni.”

J. Dunn : “ I don’t know him.”

Manxele : “ Yes, you do—the son of Tshoba, of Nondumbu, of the Zuza family.”

J. Dunn : “ I don’t know him, nor where he lives.”

Manxele : “ You do know him; he lives at your own kraal of Cwayinduku, under the Ungoye (hills), close to you.”

The Governor : “ From whom did you hear that you paid the taxes to keep Cetshwayo away ? ”

Manxele : “ From Mkombo, son of Kaitshana. When we paid last he said, ‘ This which you are paying, when it gets to Maritzburg, it will show that you do not want Cetshwayo back.’ ”

The Governor : “ From whom else did you hear it ? ”

Manxele : “ From Mtshayeni, son of Mboro.”

Chief Dunn : “ I don’t know him.”

Manxele : “ Sirs! He is chief Dunn’s policeman! What! Deny your own policeman! Is everything to be denied to-day ? ”

Dabulamanzi was then told to speak, and he said : “ Very well, sir, then I will speak, and that thoroughly (to some purpose, with my whole heart). I have come to pray for Cetshwayo; he has been quite sufficiently corrected. I have come to pray you to give him to me here ” (holding out his hands). “ And there is another ‘ word ’ which has utterly surprised me, to the effect that I do not wish him to come back, that I prefer *J. Dunn*. Wo! *J. Dunn*! That word has made me wish to meet you face to face, and have it out with you. For Mkateni came to

me to call for the money, 5s. a hut last year, 10s. this; and now I hear that I paid this money to keep my brother away!"

The Governor: "Did you pay it yourself, Dabulamanzi?"

A.: "Yes, sir."

Q.: "Into his hands?"

A.: "Into his hands."

Q.: "Where was it said to be coming?"

A.: "To you, sir."

Q.: "Who said so?"

A.: "He, here, J. Dunn, said that it was coming to you."

Q.: "Did you pay it to himself—into his hands?"

A.: "Yes, sir."

J. Dunn denied it.

Dabulamanzi: "Au! How can you deny it? I heard it myself with my own ears from you, J. Dunn."

J. Dunn replied, "I saw the money come; I did not call for it."

Upon this Dabulamanzi made a long speech, setting forth their wrongs, and challenging J. Dunn to deny that even then there was an *impi* out sent by him to enforce the payment of these taxes by seizing cattle, &c., and concluding, "Have you not threatened us, saying that you would kill any of us who came to the Governor? And we see, sir"—turning to the Governor—"that he will kill us, as he did in Mlandela's tribe,* where he killed men,

* In Sitimela's affair, pp. 41 and 143, *supra*.

women, and children. As it is, he has stopped many from coming. We consider, sirs, that we have convicted him. He has slandered us by that word of his, saying that we do not want Cetshwayo back. We will have nothing more to do with him. The whole countryside has left you, John Dunn, from the sea upwards!"

J. Dunn here asked, "Are Nongena's people here?" and was answered, "Yes, they are (their representatives being named), and all Zululand is here to pray for the King." Then he was silent, and the Zulus repeated, "We no longer wish for him, sirs (to rule over us)."

The Governor said: "You have done a grave thing in coming down without leave, and without reporting yourselves to the Border Agents, and to the Magistrate at Greytown.* The troubles which you complain of are nothing more than the ways of the chief whom we have appointed (things for which he is responsible, but we are not). You must say nothing more about the cattle which were taken from you at first; at that time he was eating up the King's cattle from among you, and they were the property of the Government. And we know nothing about those eaten up this year and last. But what you have said—that you now leave J. Dunn, and will have nothing more to do with him—is a very serious matter. You had better go and reconsider your decision. For where will you go to since the

* He should have added, "in order that you might be stopped and turned back."

land [N.B. *their* land] has been given to him for ever? You will be destitute, with the women and children crying. We advise you to go back to him, and be quiet [i. e. not pray for Cetshwayo any more], and if you do so we will *tobisa* (soften, mollify) him, so that he shall not punish you, and so that the whole affair shall end here now. As for your prayer, we have heard it all; but you should make all your prayers to the Resident at Inhlazatshe."

J. Dunn: "But what if one of them refuses to submit to me?"

The Governor: "Then he can leave your district, taking with him all his property."

But at this we exclaimed, saying, "No! Sirs! Listen to that! Do you not perceive that this is how he means to eat us up one by one? But we will not have it, and we wish you to know that the first one of us whom he attacks we shall defend, and turn out John Dunn, and drive him out of the country, back into Natal!"

At this the Governor said nothing.

Then one after another spoke, and they all said the same thing. And chief Dunn was quite beaten; he had nothing to say, but just denied all that was said, until Dabulamanzi exclaimed again, "What! do you deny everything to-day? Here, then, is a witness to the real cause of dispute between us," and held out the unclosed envelope, containing the extract which the Bishop had given him. Mr. Osborn took it from him, and began to open it, asking, "What is this?" Said Dabulamanzi: "It is certain proof that

chief Dunn did say the thing we charge him with (i. e. that the people in his district were averse to Cetshwayo's return); for I went and asked the Bishop to give me the proof, and he did so. It is out of the newspapers."

Upon receiving this explanation, the envelope was returned to him without further examination; and he was recommended to keep it for some future occasion. The interview lasted until daylight began to fail, and then the Zulus were dismissed, receiving rations of bread, as it was too late to obtain meat.

[N.B.—These men, with the four called on April 26th, were the only members of the deputation (notwithstanding that it included the representatives of three appointed chiefs) who got any supplies at all from Government during the whole visit of the party.]

After this, a wet day intervened, and when, upon the following morning (Thursday, May 4, 1882), they went in again, according to orders received, they found that chief Dunn had already departed, being, as it seemed to them, quite overpowered, and unable to answer the charges which they had brought against him.

The Acting Secretary for Native Affairs received them, saying, "Well, my men, Dunn has gone. But now tell me, have you reconsidered your words, as the Governor advised you to do?"

They replied, "Sir, there is nothing for us to consider or to think about at all. We are quite determined that we will not have Dunn to rule over us.

He has slandered us by saying that we do not want Cetshwayo back. Why does he pretend to be one of us, a Zulu [if he is not loyal to the King]? He ought to have come down with us to pray for Cetshwayo, having been one of his headmen. We will not have Dunn."

To which determined statement the Secretary for Native Affairs replied that "truly a chief is a chief according to the people, and not according to the grass that he possesses;" and he told them that if they persisted in repudiating J. Dunn, they would not be obliged to belong to him.

Now, but one day, a very wet one, had intervened between these two interviews. At the first of these Sir Henry Bulwer had advised the Zulus to submit to J. Dunn, i. e. to practically renounce Cetshwayo, and at the second they stedfastly repeated what they had said when the advice was given—that they could not, and would not, do so. It is so manifest that, having braved and borne so much, with the sole object of helping to procure their King's restoration, they would not throw up the whole matter, and accept J. Dunn in his place simply because Sir Henry Bulwer told them that they had better do so, especially after Dunn had been so signally discomfited by them in the Governor's presence, that to ordinary intelligences no further reason would seem necessary to account for the final answer given by Dabulamanzi and his party. But no amount of proof would induce Sir Henry Bulwer to believe that the Zulus could, by any possibility, feel towards Cetsh-

wayo as he (the Governor) had made up his mind that they ought not to feel, did not, *should* not, feel. Therefore he at once concluded that some sinister influence must have been used to induce the Zulus actually to reject his august advice! Of their own accord they certainly would never have ventured to do so, or to decline his gracious offer to mediate on their behalf with the hated J. Dunn (on the condition that they would at once and for ever resign the dearest wish of their hearts). Who could be the culprit? An answer was not far to seek. No doubt Dabulamanzi had made use of that wet day (pretending to be kept away by the rain) to go over to Bishopstowe, and consult his friend the Bishop of Natal; and to the latter's advice, of course, was due the rejection of that of the Governor.

The Native Affairs Office had no great difficulty in procuring a couple of witnesses to these imaginary facts, of whom Sir H. Bulwer speaks as "two trustworthy natives," but who were, in point of fact, a couple of worthless spies, in Government pay, who, having no true story to relate, invented what they thought would please their masters. A full account of this proceeding has already been given (p. 175 *et seq.*), and it is only necessary to allude to it here, where it properly belongs in point of time. Sir Henry Bulwer promptly accepted the supposed explanation of the action of Dabulamanzi and party, and transmitted it to England, without first applying to the Bishop [3247, pp. 85-6]. The despatch containing the accusations coming to the Bishop's know-

ledge upon reading the Blue Book, he wrote to the Governor, telling him that he had been completely misinformed, that there was no meeting of Zulus at Bishopstowe on the single intervening wet day, and that no word of such advice as his Excellency assumed to have been received by Dabulamanzi had proceeded from him (the Bishop) [3466, p. 127]. Sir Henry Bulwer wrote that he "accepted, of course, his Lordship's assurance," &c., and yet, when, some nine months later, the next Blue Book [3466] reached Natal, the Bishop found that, while accepting his assurance, the Governor did not scruple to say that nevertheless he was convinced that the meeting *did* take place at Bishopstowe, that Dabulamanzi *was* there advised to reject his advice, and that, in fact, though the Bishop may not have been aware of it, the meeting was held in the presence of, and the advice given by, Miss Colenso, the Bishop's eldest daughter. The absurdity of this suspicion and the worthless grounds on which it arose have been spoken of already; but those readers who are not willing to accept this account without proof of its correctness will find in the Appendix (C), as has been already said (p. 184, *sup. ad fin.*), the Bishop's own letter to the Earl of Derby, which places the whole matter in the clearest and fullest light, and will well repay perusal.

CHAPTER VIII.

SIR HENRY BULWER, in his despatch [3270, p. 1] upon the interview described in the last chapter, treats it, and the Zulus composing it, with great contempt. He persists in regarding all they say with suspicion, and accuses them of falsehood and prevarication on the most frivolous grounds. His report shows that he distinctly upheld J. Dunn, brow-beating the complainants, cross-examining them as to whether they had not come without Dunn's permission, and reproving them for having done so, as though it were likely that Dunn would *permit* them to go to pray for Cetshwayo and complain against himself. A careful comparison of the version which the Governor sends of the conversation, translated by his private secretary from notes taken down by him at the time, with that recorded, immediately afterwards, from the mouths of the Zulus by the Bishop of Natal, and Sir Henry Bulwer's remarks upon the former, will not fail to make manifest the prejudice with which he regarded the whole matter. Allowing for some little natural forgetfulness as to the exact order of the speeches made, it is easy enough to see that their own story

is a substantially correct account of what took place, of what they said, and of what they meant by their words. The report in the Blue Book [*ibid.*, p. 6] is plainly a painstaking one, though incomplete in places. Such defects are not unnatural, since to take notes of rapid Zulu speeches, and express clearly in English the gist of them, was a matter that would have required a practised Zulu scholar, and the task—one extending over a considerable length of time—was given to the private secretary, a very young man, who had had little experience of such work.

But the most striking point to be observed is that Sir Henry Bulwer, in spite of the specially expressed wish of the Prime Minister * to know the real feeling of the Zulus about Cetshwayo's restoration, and the tenor of his own "Instructions" [3174], persists in ignoring the main object of Dabulamanzi and his party, viz. to ask for the restoration of Cetshwayo. He "takes this request . . . for granted," as "part of the course of procedure laid down for every one who should speak" [3270, p. 15, last three paras.], as though that would have made it meaningless, choosing for "the point to which [he] directed [his] attention," the "grievances or causes of complaint which these people belonging to chief J. Dunn's territory had against him as their chief" [*ibid.*, p. 27]. Now it is perfectly true that these people had minor "grievances and causes of complaint" against

* See Mr. Gladstone's speech reported in the *Times* of April 18, quoted *supra*, p. 161. Also Lord Kimberley's "Instructions" to Sir H. Bulwer [3174, No. 8; paras. 17, 18, 19].

J. Dunn, under whose chieftainship they had been forced against their will, but they would not have cared to put these complaints forward, while still hoping for Cetshwayo's return, but that they helped to show the mistake made in the Zulu "settlement" of 1879, and the necessity of the King's restoration. In fact the closing sentence of Sir H. Bulwer's despatch, "Their object is to make out that the present settlement is unworkable, and, by doing so, to make out, as they think, a case of necessity for the ex-King's restoration" [*ibid.*, p. 6], is perfectly true, nor does it appear why they should not have endeavoured to "make out" or prove their case, nor why Sir Henry Bulwer should have persisted in believing that none of those who did so expressed their "real wish," except the two or three destitute Princes* and others whom he chose to regard as in some way forcing the situation.

But the Governor would take no notice of prayers for Cetshwayo. It was his will that the Zulus should not desire the King's return, therefore it was quite impossible that their petition should be genuine. This point assumed, everything else was explained so as to suit it. Putting aside therefore as *taken for granted* that each man would make this prayer, but did not "really wish" for its fulfilment, he insisted on making their personal grievances against J. Dunn the main object of his inquiries. It would have been

* Destitute indeed, having been stripped of all their worldly possessions, and having no power except moral influence with which to coerce a single Zulu.

no great crime in these poor people if they really had exaggerated trifling matters into important ones in order to obtain that hearing for their great petition which had so often been refused them. In point of fact they did not do so. The minor grievances existed, but the main cause of their hatred against J. Dunn was his ingratitude and animosity towards the King, and the only complaint which they cared to put forward strongly at this time was that he used the taxes collected from them to prove their disloyalty to Cetshwayo, and to keep him away from them. That was their real trouble. The taxes, being innovations, would in themselves have caused murmurs in happier times,* but they did not now complain of them until they heard for what purpose the fact had been used, and when they say what is translated in this report, "I have no complaint

* It is a question whether the word "taxes" can properly be used of the money exacted by Dunn, since the term is generally applied to sums contributed by a nation to the maintenance of the State, of public works, and the collective good of those who pay. Beyond making a few roads Dunn does not appear to have spent any of the money taken from the people under him upon them. His especial friend, the Ed. of the *Natal Mercury*, writes on December 20, 1881: "Quite a little commotion was caused outside the Standard Bank in Durban yesterday morning by the arrival of a consignment of cash from chief John Dunn's territory. . . . The safe contained between £5000 and £10,000, and this was tax-money." The same report contains the words, attributed to Dunn, "He affirmed emphatically that, *so far as he and his people were concerned* [author's italics], Cetshwayo should not come into Zululand across the Tugela," of which Dabulamanzi and party had heard. It is also notorious that Dunn has invested large sums of Zulu money in landed property in the neighbourhood of Durban and elsewhere,

against J. Dunn," and so on, such phrases should be rendered, "I *make* no complaint, &c.," i. e. "I do not care about mere personal grievances. I want the King." This is explained in one sentence of the report itself, as follows: "We want a letter for the restoration of Cetshwayo. The only trouble we have is the want of money to pay taxes," and "We are content to pay taxes, but do not want it thought that that is all we want." Here, palpably, is something missing, and the reporter himself rightly adds this line, "[meaning that he wanted the ex-King's restoration]." By adding words to that effect in other places it is easy to make sense of somewhat unintelligible passages. All through the report it is evident that the men were treated by Sir Henry Bulwer like witnesses in the witness-box, instead of being kindly encouraged to tell their tale in their own way, and the explanation of this is simply that the real burden of that tale was "Give us back Cetshwayo." In their own report of the interview they have confined their attention to those portions of the conversation which directly concerned the point they cared about—Cetshwayo's return, and the taxes taken from them and, as they had learned, spoken of as a proof of their satisfaction with his absence—and they left unrecorded, as without serious importance, the numerous questions put to them, with their answers, upon their minor personal grievances, which occupy the greater portion of the official report.

But Sir Henry Bulwer [*ibid.*, p. 5], having put aside the main object of the interview in this arbitrary

fashion, is very severe upon what he considers the frivolity and groundlessness of the various charges brought against J. Dunn [*ibid.*, p. 5], and he picks out two for illustration, the first being a complaint against a judicial decision in a criminal case, and the second of a decision in a case of dispute, in consequence of which, according to the report, Dunn had obliged a chief to remove his kraal "to an opposite ridge," retaining the same grazing and garden grounds. In the first of these cases, as it is here told, there is nothing to show that Dunn's decision was a wrong one, but in mention of the second the fact is omitted that an old-established and important family, loyal to Cetshwayo, had been obliged to give up the homes of their ancestors to an upstart *protégé* of Dunn's. But it is a noticeable fact that, in choosing these two instances for illustration, Sir Henry Bulwer passes over in silence, as from the report he seems to have done at the time, the most serious grievance mentioned [*ibid.*, pp. 9, 10], as follows:—

"Umsele comes forward. 'Last year ten head of cattle were taken from Qetuka.* I am sent by Qetuka,' &c.

"J. Dunn here states, 'They were paid to me by Qetuka as a fine.

"Umsele: 'The ten head were levied as a fine because Qetuka came here to ask for Cetshwayo.' †

His Excellency: 'What other cattle were taken from Qetuka?' †

It does not appear from the report that he questioned J. Dunn, or that the latter denied the fact.

* Qetuka, one of the great chiefs. He came down on the fourth deputation.

† Author's italics.

But, however impossible it may have been to reprove Dunn for punishing that which for some time had been forbidden by the Natal Government,* surely now that the Home Government had expressed a strong wish to know the real feeling of the Zulu people, it was a matter of the first importance that it should be made plain that for the future that feeling was not to be stifled thus by the two or three appointed chiefs who had so often been accused of such actions. Sir Henry Bulwer always expressed his disbelief in reports of any such stifling, yet, when an opportunity presented itself of examining into a case of this description, he did not even put a single question to Dunn about it.

The Governor's comment on what passed concerning the taxes is [3270, p. 4]:—

“ On the whole, then, I must say, upon the information I have obtained, that I do not think there is any ground for supposing that chief J. Dunn in any way, directly, or indirectly, gave his people to understand that the tax was for the Government (i. e. the English or Natal Government), nor do I think his people have generally so understood it.”

This ignores once more the main point of their whole argument, viz. their objection to paying taxes to any one *if their doing so would help to keep Cetshwayo away*—and Sir Henry Bulwer's words merely mean that he chose to believe whatever J. Dunn said, and to disbelieve the Zulus. In addition to this he tried to cross-examine Dabulamanzi into contradicting him-

* “ The declaration made by Sir George Colley . . . that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed,” spoken of already.

self, and maintains, on the slightest grounds, that he had done so ; whereas a little comparison of the two accounts shows that it is perfectly easy to reconcile the statements which Sir Henry Bulwer asserts to be at variance ;* and as to the general feeling of the Zulus about Dunn, it is to be noted that he had always been supposed to have some connection with the Natal Government, having been its emigration agent for Zululand, a spy and scout for the British during the war, and having been appointed to collect the royal cattle by Sir Garnet Wolseley at the close of the campaign.

On Friday (May 5, 1882) the chiefs sent in to ask if they might not be allowed to go in to take leave of the authorities, but were refused, and were ordered to start without fail on Monday morning. Dabulamanzi alone, having already been admitted, was bold enough to go in on Saturday to take leave of the S.N.A. on behalf of the deputation. They started, as ordered, on Monday, May 8th, intending to go straight to the Residency at the Inhlazatshe, and there repeat their prayer for Cetshwayo, so soon as the Resident arrived, according to the Governor's instructions. They feared, however, that they might

* " It would not be easy, perhaps, to reconcile Dabulamanzi's statement that chief J. Dunn told it into his own ears that the tax was for the Government with his statement made a few moments afterwards, that he came into Natal to find out from the Bishop and the ' newspapers ' if Mr. Dunn had not said the tax was for the Government." It is perfectly easy to reconcile the statements. Dabulamanzi knew that J. Dunn had said so in Zululand, but wanted to learn if it was known in Natal, and to convict J. Dunn before the Governor.

meet with opposition from John Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu, and might perhaps be obliged to defend themselves, and get rid of these three chiefs, although they had no wish or intention to fight if it should prove possible to avoid it.

Each day, with its date, has been mentioned with care, because Sir Henry Bulwer, in his despatch of May 12, 1882 [C. 3247, p. 85], informs the Earl of Kimberley that the Princes and their party had delayed going for eight or ten days after they had promised to depart at once; that "this delay on their part was certainly an abuse of the forbearance of this Government;" and that "as for the plea given for the brothers themselves remaining behind, this, it need scarcely be said, was a mere excuse.* They had their own reasons for coming into Natal at all at that time, and their own reasons for wishing to remain for some days longer;" and again, he continues [*ibid.*], "But their visit here was really altogether independent of any business with the Government; and, therefore, when they were advised by

* The "plea" here alluded to was that, without some countenance or protection from Government or the Resident, they could not go back, *unarmed as they were*, to meet the assegaïs of John Dunn's *impi*. Considering the frightful slaughter of Sitimela's people by him which had already taken place, it is not easy to see why this was a "mere excuse," but the Governor was mistaken in supposing that the Princes ever proposed to remain behind *alone*, allowing their people to run into the jaws of danger. When they spoke of "us" and "we" they meant all those who had to return to the territory of inimical kinglets; but certain parties amongst them, coming from districts whose chiefs were represented in, or were friendly to, the deputation, could of course return in safety.

the Government to return they were not disposed to do so till they had carried out the purposes for which they had come."

What those mysterious "purposes" could possibly be is best known to Sir Henry Bulwer himself, for they are purely creations of his own imagination. According to their own statement, and to all the dictates of common sense and probability, the Zulus came into Natal for one sole purpose, viz. that of seeing the Governor, and satisfying him that, in truth, "all Zululand" prayed for the restoration of Cetshwayo. Yet it is a curious fact that while insisting upon it that the deputation did *not* come to see the Government, and appeal for Cetshwayo's restoration, in other despatches Sir H. Bulwer condemns it as "a demonstration in favour of the restoration of the ex-King" [C. 3466, p. 59], and makes it a reason first for delaying his proposed visit to the Zulu country [*ibid.*, p. 65], and later on for "postponing the contemplated visit of the ex-King Cetshwayo to England" [*ibid.*, p. 86].

It has, however, been clearly shown that the delay of eight or ten days in the departure of the deputation of which the Governor complains "did not arise from any spirit of disobedience, but was very naturally caused by the action of the Government," [Bishop of Natal to Sir H. Bulwer (3466, p. 105)] in calling back a considerable number of them after the first order to depart. It was simply a matter of course that the rest should await the result of the interviews that followed. As to their having departed,

as Sir H. Bulwer says, "when they had accomplished what they had come in for," that is a complete misstatement. They departed because they were ordered to do so, and when they saw that they were *not to be permitted* to accomplish "what they had come in for," viz. to obtain a hearing from the Governor.

The official neglect of this deputation is repeatedly justified by Sir Henry Bulwer in his despatches [3247, pp. 59, 62, &c.], on the grounds (a) *that it was no deputation at all*, which is a mere baseless assertion; (b) *that it was a demonstration in favour of Cetshwayo's return*, and that he would not commit himself to that measure by showing the Zulus any favour—yet only a few days before he must have received the telegraphic report of the Prime Minister's speech of April 18, 1882, showing that the Home Government was by no means averse to it; (c) *that the party had not reported themselves at once to Government, as they should have done, thereby showing disrespect*, which is an entire mistake, into which Sir H. Bulwer could only have been led by carelessness or inaccuracy on the part of his subordinates, since messengers were sent on, *as usual*, to report the approach of the Zulus to the authorities, as soon as they crossed the Umgeni river. And this error is the more remarkable since, although Mr. John Shepstone states (Sept. 8, 1882), "No message was sent to the Government by Undabuko or any of his party" [C. 3466, p. 230], yet in another Blue Book *appears their message* [C. 3247, pp. 60, 61], sent on to Mr. Osborn, then at Maritzburg,

as soon as the deputation crossed the Umgeni river, and reported by him to the Governor. Nothing could be more complete, respectful, and carefully correct than the message thus received.

“Six men,” writes Mr. Osborn, on April 16, 1882, “including Umfunzi—the names of the other five I do not know and did not ask [!]¹—appeared. One, acting as spokesman, said :—

““We are sent to you by the “Abantwana” [Princes, literally *children*], who know you are in town, to “kuleka ” to you ’ (salute you).”^{*}

Resident : “Who are the ‘Abantwana’ you allude to?”

Zulus : “Undabuko ” [brother of Cetshwayo].

Resident : “Where is he ? ”

Zulus : “At Umpisini’s, on the Umgeni. He is accompanied by Siwetu, Ishingana, and Siteku [half-brothers of Cetshwayo]. They are accompanied † by these three men sent by Seketwayo, Somkeli, and Faku ‡ [the three men pointed out]. The ‘Abantwana’ ask you to introduce them to the chiefs. § This is all we have to say.

Resident : “It is Sunday to-day. If you will come to-morrow, I will hear what you have to say.”

* “Salute” hardly expresses the full meaning of the word “kuleka” as used here. It is not a mere greeting, but implies the approach of one seeking help from a superior.

† The words used were probably better translated “They are brought by” the representatives of the appointed chiefs, and not “accompanied by,” the former being the expression repeatedly used by the speakers in this deputation.

‡ The three kinglets.

§ Governor, &c.

And on the following day Mr. Osborn writes :—

“MARITZBURG, Monday, April 17, 1882.

“The six Zulus who spoke to me yesterday appear again. They say they have nothing to add to what they said yesterday as coming from Undabuko and other ‘Bantwana,’ and ask me for a reply.

“Upon this, one of their number, who gave his name as Umpece, states: ‘I am sent by Seketwayo with these words to you the Resident: He, Seketwayo, was aware that you are in Maritzburg, and asks you to request the “Amakosi” (chiefs, meaning the Governor or Government) to restore Cetshwayo to the Zulus.’

“*Sobuza* says: ‘I am sent by Faku (Ka Ziningo), who, knowing you were here, told me to ask you from him to speak to the “Amakosi” and request them to give back Cetshwayo to the Zulus. A man does not wholly destroy his son when he has done wrong; he strikes him and says, “Do not do it again in future.”’

“*Matshobana*, speaking, says: ‘Somkeli, knowing that you had gone to Maritzburg, said he asks you to speak to the “Amakosi” for Cetshwayo, and beg them to return him to the Zulus. All the Zulus wish him back.’

“*Resident*: ‘I can give you no reply until I have reported to the Governor what you have said, and obtained his orders. The Governor went last Thursday to Durban. He is not here just now. He is expected back in Maritzburg soon, perhaps he will come to-day or to-morrow, or the day after. I do not know the exact day on which he will be here.’

(Signed)

“M. OSBORN,

“British Resident, Zululand.”

On the next day two more messengers arrived and spoke in much the same terms on behalf of “sixteen Zulu chiefs” [*ibid.*] who were with the Princes at the Umgeni. Yet in the face of the reports made by the Resident of these interviews, Mr. John Shepstone writes, “No message was sent to the Government by Undabuko, or any of his party,” and Sir Henry Bulwer persistently assumes his statement to

be correct. Probably, if challenged on the point, their reply would be that the messages should have been taken direct to the offices of the Secretary for Native Affairs, according to the general custom for many years past, and that, as this was not done, the Zulus had not, strictly speaking, announced themselves at all. But as it had been repeatedly impressed upon the minds of the Zulus, ever since the war, that *they* had no way to a hearing from the Government *except through the Resident*, their appealing to him in the first instance, far from arising from any intentional "disregard of rules," or want of due respect for the Government, as Sir Henry Bulwer insists on considering it, was dictated by an earnest wish to do whatever would dispose the authorities favourably towards them and their prayer. Had they passed over Mr. Osborn, and sent straight to the office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, there can be no doubt they would have been told, as they had been so often before, that they could get no hearing *because* they had "despised the proper way of entrance" [*supra*, p. 119], i. e. by means of the Resident. But their chief offence in the Governor's eyes, second only to their "prayer" for the King, was that they had sent privately, a day or two earlier, to inform their friend the Bishop of what they were doing. Sir H. Bulwer insists on speaking of this private communication with an unofficial friend and the formal announcement to the Government as though the messages were of the same class, and the priority of the former as a grave insult to himself. The offence taken upon

this point would be almost too childish to dispute were it not part of the general attempt to discredit the Zulu deputations by those officials who were averse to their success. Sir H. Bulwer's, Mr. John Shepstone's, and Mr. Osborn's despatches and reports in these two Blue Books are full of exaggerated or entirely unfounded accounts of what happened at Bishopstowe on this and like occasions; but no impartial reader could fail to see their worthlessness as they stand, since, while every absurd tale told by any stray calumniator was seized with avidity and swallowed unquestioningly, no opportunity was given to the Bishop to refute them, nor, when he supplied the true account of what he had done or had not done, was the slightest attention paid to his words. The truth did not fit in with the line of action which the officials desired to follow, and it was therefore crushed and hidden whenever it displayed itself.

The Resident himself a little later on (October 25, 1882)[C. 3466, p. 231] takes up the same tone, remarking that "it is important to note that this announcement [of the approach of the party] was sent to the Bishop (received by him on the 11th of April) and not to the Government, the Government being entirely ignored, and it was not until the 16th of April (Sunday) that messengers came to me in Maritzburg, and stated that the party had arrived, no previous intimation of their approach having been made."

It has already been shown that this *was* the first formal and official "intimation" of their approach, the previous private one to the Bishop being no more

than the natural, and surely very pardonable, outcome of their desire to let the one man in Natal on whose goodwill they could depend (although no "authority") know of the difficult and dangerous enterprise on which they were embarking. But the disingenuousness displayed in Mr. Osborn's use of the phrase "messengers came to me at Maritzburg and stated that the party *had arrived*, no previous intimation of their approach having been made" would not be apparent at the Colonial Office, or to readers in England. From the passage as it stands it could only be supposed that the Zulu deputation "arrived" at Maritzburg or its environs before sending on to report their approach, whereas in point of fact they had only "arrived" at "Umpisini's, on the Umgeni," [C. 3247, p. 61]—that is to say, about twelve miles off—where the whole party waited six days while their messengers went on to announce them.

This one sentence is a fair sample of the whole despatch [C. 3466; Enclosure 2 in No. 129] from the Resident in which it occurs, and which is a report upon the Bishop's account of the Fifth or Great Deputation "from a Zulu point of view." It has already been related how this account was obtained, taken down from the lips of men sent for the purpose, immediately after each interview they obtained with the Resident or Secretary for Native Affairs, checked and tested in every possible way, and afterwards verified by the Princes themselves.

A complete analysis of it, in double columns for comparison with the official report of the same inter-

views, will be found in the Appendix,* where it will be observed on careful perusal that the main points taken down by Mr. Osborn on the spot agree with the account given immediately afterwards to the Bishop by the Zulus themselves, and therefore corroborate the latter. The chief differences to be observed are—first, the omission from the official record of the respectful “Sir” (‘Nkos’), occurring in every Zulu sentence addressed to a superior, and which was certainly not omitted by the Zulus during the actual interviews; secondly, the absence from the official document of precisely the little points which tell most strongly against the officials; and, thirdly, the introduction into the official report of one speech, put into the mouth of Ndabuko, upon which Sir Henry Bulwer’s statements concerning that Prince’s overbearing and disrespectful language are based, and which does not appear in the Zulu account at all.

Now, there are various reasons for thinking it probable that Mr. Osborn was mistaken in assigning any such speech to the Prince Ndabuko. In the first place, both from the Zulu etiquette belonging to his rank, and from natural inclination, he was the least likely of the party to indulge in excited and determined language, and defiance of the authorities whom the Zulus had all risked so much to propitiate. At every interview in which he has taken part at Bishopstowe it has always been his practice to say very little, leaving it to the men of lower rank with him to express his sentiments for him, and merely guiding or

* Appendix (B).

checking what they said by an occasional quiet word or two. It is highly improbable that on so important an occasion as the interview with Mr. Osborn he should have thrown aside his ordinary habits in this respect; but, had he done so, it may be taken as certain that his speech would have been reported to the Bishop. It would have been far too important to be overlooked or forgotten by the messengers, and they would have had no possible object in concealing it from the Bishop, had it really been made.

It is possible that there may have been some confusion of voices, which misled Mr. Osborn's ear as to the speaker, and still more possible that, in interpreting the speech (whoever made it), a very much more "overbearing" tone was conveyed than was expressed by the actual Zulu words used.

Before closing this chapter, and taking leave of the great Zulu deputation in Natal, it may be as well to remark that Sir Henry Bulwer is utterly mistaken when he says [C. 3466, p. 224]: "Although the Bishop has written a dictionary in the Zulu language,* he is not able to talk the language well, and seldom trusts himself to speak in Zulu." From whom Sir Henry Bulwer obtained this singular piece of information does not appear, but the only actual grounds for it are that just because the Bishop did know the language well, not colloquially merely, but from thorough study, he was aware of the much greater importance of accurate interpretation than is

* He might have added, "and many other books, translations of the Scriptures, grammar, &c., famous for correct idiomatic Zulu."

generally understood in a colony where sworn interpreters of the Zulu language are by no means always sufficiently educated to know their own language correctly ; and he therefore made a point of having with him, at all interviews of importance, either his eldest daughter, or else some intelligent and trustworthy native from amongst his own people, or usually both, in order that his own notes of what passed might be verified by that of a second person. Miss Colenso could have acted as interpreter, had interpretation been necessary, which it was not, but as the natives, who frequently acted as witnesses or verifiers, knew very little English, they certainly could not have done so, beyond, perhaps, putting the speech of some native with a different dialect or accent, into that to which the Bishop was most accustomed, and which he could more rapidly follow.

There is only one possible excuse for the misapprehension into which Sir Henry Bulwer has fallen upon this point, viz. that, although formerly the Bishop was in the habit of preaching and teaching in Zulu, by word of mouth, of late years he had given up the practice, and had given his attention chiefly to the written and printed language. He was, therefore, out of the habit of speaking and following the most rapid Zulu diction, although the written words were still as familiar to him almost as his own tongue. And as he did not hesitate frankly to say that he had thus lost the habit, it is not unlikely that the fact may have reached Sir Henry Bulwer's ears, who, disregarding the evidence to be found in the long list of Zulu

works by the Bishop,* and not understanding that his “forgotten” knowledge would yet far more than bear comparison with that of many who would unhesitatingly say that they are “able to talk the language well,” assumed the want of acquaintance with it, on the Bishop’s part, of which he makes a point in this despatch. It is understood that Sir Henry Bulwer is himself totally ignorant of the language.

Mr. F. E. Colenso, who, during his practice in the Natal courts, found it impossible to escape the transaction of a great deal of native business, formed very strong opinions as to the part which faulty interpretation played in putting obstacles in the way of successful advocacy. He was compelled to acquire the power of conversing freely with his clients, and often found it necessary to address lectures to them upon points arising in their cases. He was admitted, in fact, to be one of the few members of the Bar who possessed a competent knowledge of Zulu, and he adds very emphatic testimony as to the unusual soundness

* List of Zulu works by the Bishop of Natal:—

First, Second, and Third Reading Books.

‘*Inhlanganisela*,’ a Medley of Geography and History.

Elementary Grammar of the Zulu Language.

Three Native Accounts of the Bishop of Natal’s Journey to Zululand, with Translations and Notes.

Zulu-English Dictionary.

The Common Prayer Book.

Book of Genesis, with Commentary, in Zulu.

Book of Exodus.

Two Books of Samuel.

Zulu New Testament. Also Harmony of the Four Gospels.

Bunyan’s ‘Pilgrim’s Progress’ (translated).

‘Umzimba Ozwayo’ (‘The Living Body’): First Lessons in Physiology.

of his father's knowledge of the language, repudiating Sir Henry Bulwer's theory in the strongest possible terms.

The Blue Book [C. 3182] throws much light on some points in the foregoing pages, especially with regard to the statement that "each of the eight appointed chiefs named by these men denies categorically having ever sent such a deputation," which, in the face of the undeniable fact concerning Seketwayo's *letters patent*, was at first incomprehensible.

The words would, naturally, be understood to mean that the eight chiefs had denied that they had ever sent the deputation in question, i. e. the *whole* deputation, consisting of two parties, who "visited Pietermaritzburg in July and August" 1881, and the impression left would certainly be one throwing grave doubt upon the genuineness of all the deputations, and "prayers for the bone" which had been reported on the King's behalf.

But perusal of the above-mentioned Blue Book brings to light the singular fact that the questions put and the denials made by the eight chiefs, referred solely to the three chiefs who came with or composed the *second* party of the second deputation, Ngcongwana, Posile, and Ngobozana. These three were expressly sent by Mnyamana and the Princes to ask that they might be sent to join Cetshwayo at Cape-town, and although, in one sense, and as belonging to the whole party which came to petition for the King's return, they might consider themselves "sent by" the eight chiefs who sent down their representatives with

the former party, yet the chiefs could say with truth, as each one of them does, with slight verbal variation, "I deny all knowledge of *Ngcongwana's Ngobozana's, and Posile's* mission to Maritzburg."*

And so far were the "authorities" from wishing or trying to discover the real state of the case that Mr. Osborn himself admits [p. 176] that he never asked these eight chiefs whether they had sent the other portion of the deputation, which, though not the highest in hereditary rank, was the most important from the Government point of view, as professing to be sent expressly by some of the appointed chiefs:—

"In communication to the chiefs, I only told them, *as briefly as I could*, that *Ngcongwana, Ngobozana, and Posile* had been to Maritzburg, where they stated to the Government that they were a deputation from eight chiefs (whose names I mentioned) to represent the following things. I then read over to them the statement of those three men to the S.N.A., and asked if they wished to say anything in reference thereto, adding that I should be glad to convey to the Governor any communication they might wish to make. *I made no allusion to Mfunzi,† Sidindi, and other Zulus having been to the Government on a similar or the same errand.* The chiefs voluntarily denied having sent these men [i. e. *Ngobozana, &c.*]. I certainly did not in any way say or do anything that could have influenced their answer. . .

"*The chiefs did not deny having ever expressed a desire for the restoration of Cetshwayo. This point was not referred to by any one. The question to which they spoke was the representation made by Ngcongwana, Ngobozana, and Posile to the Government at Maritzburg.*"

* [C. 3182, pp. 110–11.]

† Yet when Mfunzi appealed to Mr. Osborn against the seizure of his cattle by Siwunguza (appointed chief) the Resident told him that the eight chiefs denied having sent *him (Mfunzi)*! See *Ngcongwana's* account, p. 86.

Now, the serious question arises, on perusal of the above official statements, how far the Natal "authorities," at this time, were conscientiously endeavouring to carry out the wishes and instructions of their superiors in England. Judging the latter in the light of after events only, apart from considerations of party politics, &c., it must be conceded that they simply and honestly desired to know the true state of feeling concerning Cetshwayo amongst the Zulus themselves. Since the bugbear of danger to Natal had been swept away by experience and common sense, the only available pretext for the Zulu War, and for Cetshwayo's capture, and the only possible excuse for detaining him a prisoner, lay in the character of hated tyrant which Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Henry Bulwer, and a few others have so persistently invented for the Zulu King.

It was long since any but a very few Colonial alarmists had denied that *if the Zulus, as a whole, would welcome* back Cetshwayo with pleasure, he ought to be restored to them, and it may fairly be asserted that the general desire at home, in England, was to know the true state of Zulu feeling. But how has this desire been treated by the officials upon the Colonial side? Throughout the whole course of their policy, from Sir George Colley's declaration in early days, "that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed," and during all the subsequent brow-beatings and discouragement of the King's brothers and most devoted friends, down to this last-quoted instance of what can only be called

shuffling, the Natal "authorities" appear to have acted on the principle that, as from their point of view Cetshwayo's restoration would be inconvenient, at all costs, and by any means in their power, every demonstration by the Zulus in his favour must be stamped out, and concealed from the British Government and people.

It may be asked, Why, if these eight appointed chiefs really desired Cetshwayo's return, did they not speak voluntarily to Mr. Osborn of the men sent by them with the other deputations, and why did they not make their own wishes known plainly and boldly to him, and to the Government of Natal? That (as far as is known) they never did the latter has been repeatedly and triumphantly brought forward by the King's opponents as a proof either that they had no such wish, or else that they must have been men of such false and cowardly dispositions as to make their wishes of little moment. But it has already been pointed out that the circumstances in which they found themselves were such as might have tried their fortitude and loyalty had they been highly-educated Englishmen instead of poor ignorant savages. From them, especially as "appointed chiefs," defiance of Sir George Colley's prohibition and Sir Evelyn Wood's harsh repetition of it, first made at Inhlazatshe, might, they knew, be regarded as a very grave offence. In point of fact, two of them did name to Mr. Osborn the men whom they had sent with Mfunzi [p. 110, *ibid.*], but spoke of them in a timid and deprecatory way as only sent to *watch on their*

chiefs' behalf what the whole party was doing in Maritzburg. By careless interpretation, perhaps, they are made to use the past instead of the present tense in making this avowal, "I heard that Mfunzi, &c., *had gone*" and "hearing that people *had been sent,*" &c., and the impression is thereby given that they sent their messengers *after the party*, whereas they all started together. It is obvious that, had the chiefs really been opposed to the object of the mission, they would have sent their messengers to stop and turn back the people from their districts who joined the deputation instead of sending them to Maritzburg to "watch what they were doing," and in such a case they would at once and spontaneously have repudiated all participation in the matter, instead of keeping silence until a partial and reluctant denial was dragged out of them by the "authorities."

The same confusion of ideas is apparent in Sir Evelyn Wood's telegram [p. 93, *ibid.*] and subsequent despatches. The telegram runs thus: "Mnyamana states three of the messengers were sent to Maritzburg at Colenso's request." The same assertions concerning the Bishop of Natal's supposed instrumentality in summoning the Zulu deputations were made from time to time by the Colonial papers with their usual intemperate haste to attack the Bishop upon native questions, and upon more than one occasion he was obliged to set them right upon the point by stating (as in *Times of Natal*, October 22, 1881, and *Natal Witness*, April 25, 1882) that "the two deputations"—that in May 1880, and that in July–August

1881 —“ came entirely of their own accord, and were as wholly unexpected by me as they were by the Government.”

On October 27, 1881, a month after the telegram quoted above, Sir Evelyn Wood, sending to Lord Kimberley the Bishop's letter to the *Times of Natal*, remarks, “ Which shows that the allegations made by the Zulus, to the effect that Dr. Colenso sent for the deputation, are untrue.”

But it does not appear that any such “ allegations ” were ever made. The sole foundation for this accusation, including the telegram, “ Mnyamana states,” &c., appears to be contained in Ntshingwayo's reply to Mr. Osborn [p. 110, *ibid.*], in which occurs the statement that Mnyamana had said that “ *Ngcongwana and the others* [i. e. Ngobozana and Posile] *were sent in accordance with* ” a request from Cetshwayo, communicated through Sobantu (the Bishop), that Posile or some other suitable man of rank should be sent to take Mkosana's place upon the latter's return from the Cape. Mkosana took the same request from Cetshwayo direct to Mnyamana, and the letter received by the Bishop from the captive King, being countersigned by his “ custodian ” (Mr. Lister), was presumably sanctioned by the “ authorities ” at Capetown, and was therefore sent on by some Zulus returning at the time to Zululand. This is the message to which Mnyamana refers, and with respect to which he says that “ Sobantu had sent word that he was to find men and send them into Maritzburg at once.” Accordingly, Mnyamana and the Princes

“found” three men, Posile, Ngcongwana, and Ngobozana,* and “sent them into Maritzburg at once,” to ask to be sent to Capetown to stay with the ex-King.

Hence these men were chosen and sent expressly by Mnyamana and the Princes, with their own particular request to be allowed to go to Capetown. But they were sent also “*on behalf* of the eight chiefs,” “*in the name* of the eight chiefs”—not “*by* the eight chiefs”—in consequence of a meeting which had been held at Ndabuko’s kraal, Kwa’ Minya, upon Mkosana’s return to Zululand, in which those eight chiefs were represented, either in person or by their confidential men, and in which it was agreed to send a deputation to Maritzburg to pray for Cetshwayo’s restoration.

In the separate accounts from various Zulus, taken down and printed, as already stated, by the Bishop of Natal, there is ample evidence that these eight appointed chiefs, or “kinglets,” sympathised in the “prayer” for Cetshwayo, and supported it *as far as they dared*. But those (officials and Colonists) who, opposed to the Zulu King’s return, persistently represented the demonstrations on his behalf amongst his people as instigated and brought to pass by the influence of the Bishop of Natal, seem to lose sight of a fact which would certainly tell against their own object were there any truth in their assertions. Had the

* The first mentioned by Cetshwayo in his message to Mnyamana, and the second named by him in a subsequent letter as one of those whom he desired to go to England with him.

Bishop of Natal, by his suggestions only—unsupported by a shadow of authority, or even of power to protect those who acted upon his advice—been *able* to rouse almost the whole Zulu nation (or even a considerable portion of it) into pleading for Cetshwayo's return, in spite of Government prohibitions and threats which they knew by bitter experience to be anything but idle, such a power on his part would only more conclusively have proved the strong hold that Cetshwayo had upon his people's hearts. And by showing that the eight kinglets prevaricated, contradicted themselves, and repudiated the "prayer," they prove, not that they did not sympathise with it, since the contrary has been amply shown, but that they were made to understand that concurrence in it was an offence against the British rule, and that they dared not disobey. Great innocence is assumed in the pages of the Government despatches, and pressure of any kind most virtuously denied. But it is only by assuming universal, senseless, and persistent lying on the part of all the respectable Zulus, and by the exercise of a blind belief in all official statements, however improbable or even contradictory, that we can avoid coming to the conclusion that nearly the whole Zulu nation desired Cetshwayo's return, and that the whole strength and ingenuity of the Natal Government was employed to suppress the feeling and to conceal the fact.

In spite of the Bishop's public explanations above mentioned, the political party (in Natal) who opposed his views persistently declined to accept his plain

statement of facts, and repeated their accusations and insinuations upon every favourable opportunity. It was, plainly, useless to contend with people determined to uphold their own views against any proof that could be offered, but, less for his own exoneration than for the sake of the unfortunate Zulus whose actions and wishes were misrepresented as well as his own, the Bishop addressed a letter (dated June 8th, 1882) to Sir Henry Bulwer, not long returned to commence his second term of office, explaining to the Governor exactly what part he had really taken in the matter of these Zulu deputations. To give the whole of this letter would be to repeat the main points of what we have already recorded, but certain passages may be quoted with advantage, as a commentary upon the reply received a week later.

Having repeated the statement already made by him in the public journals, that the two deputations "came entirely of their own accord," &c., the Bishop adds:—

"I have never, at any time, sent 'messengers'—that is to say, men of my own, 'emissaries'—on any occasion, or for any purpose whatever, into Zululand; nor should I have thought it right to take any steps or give any advice which might originate a movement against Sir Garnet Wolseley's 'settlement,' however much, in common with the colonists generally, I felt that it could not possibly stand the test of time.

"But the case was altered when the Zulus had come down of their own accord, and again, after more than a year's interval, persistently urging their prayer for the restoration of Cetshwayo, and on the last occasion supported directly by three appointed chiefs, and indirectly by five others.

"The whole effect of the first deputation was marred, first by the Resident reporting that, in his belief, none of the appointed chiefs 'joined in or supported the prayer,' although one of them,

Seketwayo, had sent his letters patent in the hand of his messenger, and then by the war which broke out with the Transvaal Boers, and which prevented the inquiry being made into this and other statements, though ordered by Sir George Pomeroy-Colley, on the 5th of January, 1881, the Colonial Secretary having informed me five weeks afterwards (February 11th) that 'the present is not considered a propitious time for making the inquiries requested by you, as the minds of the Zulus are very much unsettled by Boer emissaries making certain statements relative to the return to Zululand of the late King.'"

After describing how the second deputation was also quashed and discredited through the (incorrect) "Reply" given in the Legislative Council, as already related (p. 48), the Bishop continues:—

"In conversation with these two chiefs, while awaiting here week after week, their summons to Capetown (Ngcongwana was sent to Capetown on February 7th, while Posile, who has since been exchanged for another, returned to Zululand on January 2nd), as also with Zulus who came to see them from time to time, I, of course, inquired carefully into the facts of the recent deputations, which had been so summarily disposed of in the reply of the Colonial Secretary. And I explained to them that it was of no use for the ex-King's brothers and his personal friends only to make application on his behalf; but, if it was really true, as they asserted, that 'all Zululand' wished for his restoration, they should go to the Resident and ask for leave to come down to Maritzburg, and make their wishes known in a proper manner to Government. I said also that, if what they said was true, I was sure that it would comfort the ex-King in his captivity to know that his people remembered him with affection, and wished to have him back again.

"They went to the Resident and asked for such permission, but were told (as they said) to wait ten days for his return from Maritzburg. And they did not come down defiantly, for they waited the ten days as ordered, and then, hearing nothing of the Resident, and fearing that the same thing might happen as on the former occasion (August 1881), when the Resident came back with orders not to prevent Zibebu and Hamu from calling out their *impis* for the support of their authority and the punishment of those who had just before taken part in praying for Cetsh-

wayo, they thought it best to go down after him—646 chiefs and headmen, as they informed me, after counting them up, and naming them to Mr. Osborn, and representing undoubtedly almost all the principal tribes in Zululand.* They came down peacefully, leaving their weapons behind in Zululand, and they behaved inoffensively, I believe, during their sixteen days' stay near Maritzburg and, I suppose, a full month's in Natal. They found the Resident still in Maritzburg, to whom the representatives of the three appointed chiefs immediately reported themselves, and asked from him, in a proper and respectful manner, an introduction to your Excellency.

“ I may say, however, that nothing was known to myself, or, I imagine, to colonists generally, of the ‘ declaration made by Sir George Colley, nearly two years ago, that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed,’ until it was mentioned in a leader of the *Natal Witness* on May 1st, 1882, which will explain sufficiently how it has come to pass that the expression of Zulu feeling upon ‘ the subject of Cetshwayo's return ’ has hitherto been systematically suppressed and stifled.

“ I need not say that I feel perfectly justified in having given such advice as I have stated, under such circumstances, when the first and second deputations had been rendered (as above) completely abortive—more especially after reading the recent utterance of the Prime Minister in Parliament (*Times*, April 18th, 1882): ‘ If it should finally appear that the mass of the people in Zululand are for Cetshwayo, so that something like unanimity should prevail, so far from regarding him as an enemy of England, and wishing him ill, and so far from being disposed to take anything but the most favourable course that the welfare of the country would permit, I should regard the proof of that fact with great pleasure, and that would be the sentiment of my colleagues.’ ”

The Bishop's letter concludes as follows :—

“ As Sir Evelyn Wood's statement † may, perhaps, have left a wrong impression on the mind of the Secretary of State, especially with reference to my assertion that, as far as I am concerned, ‘ the two deputations came entirely of their own accord,’ I respectfully

* A country the area of which, according to the last official map, would be much more than included within limits of Wales and four adjacent counties.

† See telegram, &c., p. 237.

request that your Excellency would be pleased to forward to his Lordship by the next mail a copy of this letter, which I will send for the purpose to-morrow or Saturday."

And this is Sir Henry Bulwer's reply, dated 16th of June, 1882:—

"MY LORD BISHOP,—I duly received your Lordship's letter of the 8th inst., and in accordance with your request I transmitted the copy of it, which I also subsequently received, to the Secretary of State by the mail of the 12th inst.

"In doing this it seems to me that I have probably met your Lordship's intentions in writing to me; and I do not think it will serve any useful purpose that I should enter into a discussion on any of the details with which your letter deals.

"I desire, however, to thank your Lordship for the explanation which you have been so good as to give me in that letter.

"At the same time I should be wrong, charged as I am with the responsibility attached to the official position I hold towards the Zulu country, if, in acknowledging your letter, I did not express my regret and concern on account of the part that your Lordship had felt yourself justified in taking in the political affairs of that country. It is difficult to overrate—though I am confident your Lordship never could have realised them—the inconveniences and the serious evils that may be caused by the interposition of others than the duly constituted and responsible authorities in the political affairs of a country situated as the Zulu country is and has of late been; and I fear the effect of your Lordship's intervention has been to gravely complicate the situation in that country, and to bring about a condition of things which adds greatly to the difficulties of the task that lies before me, and is the cause of much anxiety.

"I am, my Lord Bishop,

"Your Lordship's very faithfully,

"H. BULWER.

"To the Right Reverend the BISHOP of NATAL."

Only such jaundiced eyes and determined prejudice as Sir H. Bulwer brought to bear upon the Bishop's letter and explanations could have found any excuse

for the employment of such comments upon it as “*the part that your Lordship has felt yourself justified in taking,*” &c., “*the interposition of others than the duly constituted authorities,*” &c., and “*your Lordship’s intervention*”—of all which there was absolutely *none*. That he should have felt any objection to the one piece of advice given, and here quoted, viz. that “*if it was really true, as they said, that ‘all Zululand’ wished for his (Cetshwayo’s) restoration, they should go to the Resident,*” &c., that is, apply to the “*duly constituted and responsible authorities,*” is unaccountable, except on the supposition that Sir Henry Bulwer did not share in the sentiment expressed by the Prime Minister towards Cetshwayo, and was in fact untrue to those under whom he professed to serve. In that case, no doubt, the suggestion * that the Zulus should take the *right* course to obtain their end—the King’s return—would be an “*inconvenience*” and a “*serious evil*” from the Governor’s point of view, and a “*condition of things*” amounting to an almost universal effort throughout Zululand, to gain that end, no doubt “*added greatly to the difficulties of the task*” that lay before him, if that task was to prevent the restoration of Cetshwayo by inducing the Home Government to believe that the Zulu people did *not* desire his return.

* A piece of advice which any white trader in the country might, and probably would, have given, if consulted on the subject, and which was, after all, but a repetition of Sir Evelyn Wood’s own words in dismissing Zulus who came to him without a pass from the Resident: “*I tell you now, once and for all, that my ears are to be reached only through Mr. Osborn*” [C. 3182, p. 181.]

But the Bishop's reply speaks for itself, in short yet complete refutation of Sir H. Bulwer's charges:—

“ BISHOPSTOWE, June 20, 1882.

“ SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's letter of the 16th inst., and to thank you for having forwarded to the Secretary of State, at my request, the copy which I sent of my letter of the 8th inst.

“ I may be permitted, however, to say that the supposition that, in doing this, your Excellency has probably met my intentions in writing that letter, is a mistaken one. My main object in writing it was something very different.

“ I knew, of course, that in your despatch of Feb. 4, 1880 [2584, p. 141], your Excellency's views had been expressed very strongly in favour of Sir Garnet Wolseley's settlement and against the restoration of Cetshwayo; and it fell not within my duty or my desire, in writing that letter, to question the wisdom and justice of the policy there maintained.

“ But I believed that your Excellency's sense of right would be pained by the evidence produced in my letter from the new Blue Book* of the manner in which, in respect of previous deputations, the action of the Zulus, including several of the appointed chiefs, had been misjudged and misreported, so as necessarily to mislead the judgment of the Secretary of State. And I hoped that, by setting forth the facts in question, I might perhaps assist your Excellency in judging whether the recent deputation† was the mere outcome of party intrigues, or, as I myself believe, a genuine expression of the wishes of most of the appointed chiefs, as well as of an overwhelming majority of the Zulu people.

“ After your Excellency's letter, I have, of course, no thought of entering into any discussion of any of the details with which my former letter dealt. But as you express ‘regret and concern at the part which I have felt myself justified in taking in the political affairs of Zululand,’ and ‘fear that the effect of my intervention has been to gravely complicate the situation in that country, and to bring about a condition of things which adds greatly to the difficulties of the task that lies before you,’ I respectfully request to be allowed to say why the censure passed

* [C. 3182.]

† The Fifth or Great Deputation.

upon my action does not appear to me to be well-founded and just.

“The part I have taken, as stated in my former letter, was to say, in speaking to Zulus, that if ‘all Zululand’ really wished to see Cetshwayo back again, they should go to the Resident, and ask leave to go down to Maritzburg, and make their desire known to the authorities there. I do not doubt that such words of mine may have had some effect in Zululand, in helping to allay the angry excitement aroused in the minds of Mnyamana, &c., through the words spoken at the Inhlazatshe meeting, and the consequent atrocious action of Hamu and Zibebu, and leading them to seek still to bring their prayer in the prescribed manner, properly and peacefully, to the ears of the constituted authorities, instead of having recourse to arms, and deluging the country with blood. And, indeed, their patience and self-restraint have hitherto been wonderful, considering that the power at their disposal very far exceeds that of their adversaries, as is admitted by all who are well acquainted with Zulu affairs.

“But certainly far more effect must have been produced upon the Zulu mind by the return of Mkosana from Capetown, fresh from the ex-King’s company, and bringing with him plentiful information as to the interest felt by Englishmen on his behalf, derived either from sympathizing friends at Capetown, or from visitors direct from England. And, indeed, it is certain that the immediate consequence of Mkosana’s return was an outburst of joy throughout Zululand, which led to the deputation being sent down in July-August of last year, without any words of advice or suggestion from me.

“Still greater must have been the effect produced when the Zulus learnt from the Natal Government itself that arrangements had been made for taking Cetshwayo to England, Mr. H. Shepstone having been appointed to conduct him, and chiefs having been summoned from Zululand by the Secretary for Native Affairs to bear him company on the voyage.

“All the above facts appear to be ignored by your Excellency, and the consequences, which may undoubtedly follow the disappointment caused by the check suddenly put upon the arrangements already completed for the ex-King’s visit to England,* are attributed mainly—if not almost wholly—to my intervention.

“With all due respect, and with most sincere sympathy with your

* As will shortly be described.

Excellency in the present difficulties of the Zulu question, I must say that I cannot accept this censure, or regard it as reasonable and just.

“And I must add that, in giving the advice in question, I imagine that I was speaking in full accordance with the views of Sir Hercules Robinson, the then High Commissioner for the territories in South Africa adjacent to Her Majesty’s dominions, and therefore at that time the duly constituted and responsible authority in respect of Zululand.

“I have, &c.,

“J. W. NATAL.

“H.E. Sir H. BULWER, K.C.M.G.,

“Special Commissioner for Zululand.”

A few lines came from Sir H. Bulwer in reply to the above, and are dated June 24, 1882:—

“MY LORD BISHOP,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th inst.

“It is not my part to presume to pass censure on one holding the high position and dignity that your Lordship holds as Bishop of Natal; and I must disclaim the intention that you attribute to me of doing this.

“But when your Lordship takes a part in the political affairs of the Zulu country which I believe to be attended with great prejudice to the public interests, and with great danger to the peace of that country, I should have failed in my duty to the trust which has been committed to me, if, in acknowledging your Lordship’s letter of the 8th inst., I had not expressed the convictions that I feel in so important a matter.

“I am, &c.,

“H. BULWER.”

Courtesy and patient explanation of facts were plainly thrown away upon a person so wilfully blind to all that did not support the view of the condition of things in Zululand which he desired to present to the Government at home, and who from first to last

during his South African career has absolutely refused to avail himself of the Bishop of Natal's great knowledge of Zulu matters, and the comprehension of the real feeling of the Zulu people, which the Bishop owed to their thorough confidence in him as their best and truest friend.

CHAPTER IX.

THE Governor's determination to prevent Cetshwayo's restoration if possible was by no means lessened by the strong proof of how large a proportion of his people desired it, to be seen in the fact that in spite of all the difficulties and dangers of the enterprise, and all that official influence could do to check them, so many men had joined the last and Great Deputation. Rather, he appeared to take umbrage at their venturing to make any demonstration in favour of the King whom he had declared that the nation did not, could not, should not, want.* In accordance with the "Instructions" which he had received on his appointment, he had previously given the Colonial Office at home to understand that he would shortly pay a visit to Zululand, with the object of finding out for himself what the real wishes of the people were with regard to their King's return. But after the visit to Maritzburg of this great deputation, Sir Henry Bulwer thought fit to telegraph as follows to the Earl of Kimberley [C. 3247 p. 43]:—

¹ "April 26th.—I sent a telegram on 10th inst., proposing to visit Zulu country in order to ascertain personally state of affairs in

* [3174, pp. 15-18.]

country and feeling of chiefs and others, but cable broke. Now hardly time to complete visit within the time when my presence required in Natal. Resident also in consequence of a large demonstration which ex-King's brothers have brought into Natal, thinks my visit at present moment would be misunderstood and unadvisable, therefore the telegram is withdrawn. I have written about demonstration."

In spite of the peaceable and orderly conduct of the 2000 Zulus, of the proof which they had offered of their good intentions in the fact, almost unparalleled amongst their people, of their travelling so far without weapons, of all their anxious efforts to carry out their enterprise in such a way as to give no offence to the authorities, Sir Henry Bulwer persisted in regarding them as "engaged in an active agitation threatening the peace of the country" [3466, p. 76], writing in June 1882, "But if there is to be any restoration of the ex-King it ought not to be the result of agitation such as this, for if so it will be a premium upon agitation" [*ibid.*, p. 26].

The Governor, in his repeated use of the term "demonstration," seems to forget that the word in itself implies no turbulence nor lawless disturbance. The Zulu people truly desired to *demonstrate* their affection for their King, but they could not possibly have done it in a quieter or more orderly fashion, and Sir Henry Bulwer's anger against them arose precisely from the fact that they *had* "demonstrated" that devotion in which he did not wish to believe himself, nor yet to allow the Home Government to believe. The latter had plainly stated their view that the restoration of Cetshwayo should now

depend upon the wishes of the Zulu people, into which they had requested Sir Henry Bulwer to inquire, and at the very moment of the arrival in Natal of this expression of their views there appeared upon the scene this large deputation. The coincidence in time was a pure accident, although Sir Henry Bulwer consistently set it down to "intrigues" on the part of the Bishop. The wishes of the Zulus, then, were to decide the matter, yet Sir Henry Bulwer maintained that the very fact of their having ventured to express those wishes was a sufficient reason for refusing them. No fault could be found with the manner of their petition except that it and their visit were made without permission, and that was sufficiently justified by the fact that they had tried in vain to obtain such permission.* But the Governor was determined that they should gain nothing by their move, and he at once set himself to find reasons for delaying the proposed visit of Cetshwayo to England, which visit, it was generally understood by this time, would, if it took place, be but the prelude to his restoration.

As early as July 15, 1881, Lieutenant-General Leicester Smyth, Deputy Governor at the Cape, had forwarded a request from Cetshwayo "to be permitted to go to England, accompanied by certain named chiefs, for the purpose of pleading his case before Her Majesty," and concluded his despatch

* See Sir E. Wood's words to Ngeongwana, &c. [3182, p. 175]: "If you were refused a pass, I think you were justified in coming to me for one" [i. e. to Maritzburg].

with these words [3247, p. 1]: "It was a painful interview, for Cetshwayo was in great mental distress, and his dignified and gentlemanlike deportment always inspires sympathy."

Indeed, the letters dictated by the King himself to Mr. Gladstone and Lord Kimberley are truly noble and touching in their sentiments. It would be hard for a British statesman to express himself with more dignity, propriety, or indeed with truer Christian feeling and sense of justice than this uneducated Zulu King. The following is one of his letters [*ibid.*, p. 2]:—

"OUDE MOLEN, July 15, 1881.

"I am writing to you, Mr. Gladstone, to ask you why you keep quiet, and do not talk [speak] for poor sufferers like me. To whom can we poor sufferers resort, if you, so great a man and the great chief of the nation, will not talk kindly for us? Pray do not, even you, act like this, and keep me longer from my native land and family. In whom can I now put my trust? Talk kindly for me to the Queen, and retain the old friendship of the Zulu nation. Is it not good for the Queen to have friends and loyal rulers [under her]? Make me happy, and make me a stronger friend than ever of the English. Put me back with some good and discreet men, if you do not trust me. Let me now have a favourable answer to this letter, and do not leave me in the cold after having forgiven the Boers (that deserved much more punishment than I), the Basutos, and the Afghans. Make me a greater friend of the English nation.

"If you could split my heart, and understand it, I am sure I would be here no longer, but in my native land. Put me back with good and discreet men to look after me and direct me.

"I am sure you have no law by which you can rightly keep me here. You have not given me a chance of explaining for myself and of seeing those people that falsely calumniated me proving what they have said against me. I feel unwell, and am daily getting worse."

“OUDE MOLEN, July 15, 1881.

“I am writing to you, Lord Kimberley, to entrust you with my case. Do you kill me like this because I am a black man? My country would not have been destroyed, and I would not have been taken captive, if the Zulu matters had been from the very first properly looked into by the Imperial Parliament. When I was taken captive I had hopes of being released as soon as my case was properly known. I thought I was taken captive by a magnanimous nation, that would let me go free as soon as the mistake was ascertained. I thought the English valued a friend. My father was their friend, and I was their friend. Who could be a greater friend of the English than I, who remained quiet in my country till I was attacked and taken captive? I fought, when I was attacked, just to ward off a falling tree, as it were, even as any other person would do. I request you to look to my case, and not to my colour, and not to leave me to die here while my family is being scattered, and is dying off on the hills. One of my wives has died already during my captivity. I really do not know what to do now, seeing that I have stated my case and the causes of the war, and yet I receive such a heart-breaking reply from you. I also wished you to allow me to have all those that falsely calumniated me before me and you to prove their statements.

“I am dying here; but I am not told for what reasons I can rightly be kept here apart from my country and family. Your last despatch * has made me feel so heart-broken and despondent that I may, without thinking, do wrong to myself, and put an end to my miserable existence.

“The Boers who rebelled against the English, and attacked them, and did many more things punishable, you have left without the least punishment. Towards the Afghans and the Basutos you have acted in the same way as you did to the Boers. By what law are you punishing me so dreadfully, who never did anything against the English nation, and who was always their truest friend? I request you, if you even now do not trust me, to put me back into my country with good and discreet men to look after me till the Zulu nation tell you that they wish me to be

* [2950, No. 69] “. . . cannot encourage Cetshwayo to hope that he will be released from the detention which paramount considerations of policy render unavoidable.”—June 15, 1881.

again their ruler. In this way it will be proved whether I am one that ought to be ruler of the Zulus. I am sure you are a nation that ought not to bear a grudge. I used to think, and still think, that the English are a magnanimous and brave people. I do not know how you can think that I am a man fit to bear a grudge, especially against my great friends the English. How can you imagine that, if you restore me to Zululand, I would ever attempt anything against my benefactors, seeing I never once attempted, or intended to attempt, anything against the English? You are a Christian nation, and ought to know that we all are of one Father (i. e. God, who made us all). I am sure you cannot be told in the Bible to treat a person like you treat me. You are a nation of heroes, and ought not to act thus. How can a great and brave nation like the English ever entertain the idea that I would bear a grudge against them, seeing that they invaded my country, beat me, and took me captive, not willingly, but through misrepresentation? I say you can do at least this for me (although I am not equal to the sea): allow me to go to England, and, with some chiefs (if any will be bold enough to go with me), state my case personally before you. If you consider that the expenses of the voyage will be too great, I will try my best to refund you the money when I am, by the kindness of the English nation, restored."

These letters seem to have produced something of their due effect, for, on September 14, a telegraphic message was returned that "we are disposed to entertain Cetshwayo's request to visit England."

As it was already late in the year, however, it was explained to him that he must, of necessity, be content to wait until the English winter should be over, both because he certainly would not be able to endure the rigours of an English winter without great danger to his health, and also because "many things interesting to him cannot be seen during that that season" [3247, p. 5].

While these negotiations were taking place, Lord Kimberley, struck by General Smyth's foreboding

that the captive King would commit suicide if longer detained in custody without hope of release, asked the opinion of Sir Hercules Robinson [3247, p. 2], who had now taken up the reins of office again, as to the possibility, "by any means compatible with paramount public interest," of relieving "the irksomeness of his detention away from his own country," and requested the Governor to "consider whether a much greater degree of personal liberty might not be allowed him on his engaging not to make use of it to return without permission to Zululand," and the same letter asked Sir Hercules Robinson's opinion upon the proposed visit to England. The Governor's reply [*ibid.*, p. 6] shows his entire comprehension of the fact that the captive King was not to be coaxed, like a child, by indulgences and treats, into forgetting the fact of his captivity. "With reference to the advisability of his visiting England," he writes, "as this seems, from the telegram I yesterday received * from your Lordship, to have been determined upon by Her Majesty's Government, I need merely remark that I think the visit very desirable, provided it is not intended that Cetshwayo should, upon his return to South Africa, revert to his present condition of captivity at Oude Molen farm. His sole object in undertaking a sea-voyage, which he greatly dreads, is to secure his restoration to his country and to his family; and if his visit did not produce that result, I

* Quoted *supra*: "We are disposed to entertain Cetshwayo's request," &c.

fear it would only serve, by raising false hopes, to enhance the painfulness of his position," and he encloses a "minute" from his Ministers expressing the same opinion.

On the subject of a "greater degree of personal liberty" Sir Hercules Robinson writes [*ibid.*] that "if he is to remain in this colony" he does not seem to care for it. The unhappy King, in fact, cared for nothing but his hope of release, and if he were to be detained a prisoner at Capetown, it mattered little to him whether or not he might please himself in minor matters. He wrote repeatedly, by the hand of his interpreters, to Sir Hercules Robinson and the Earl of Kimberley, to the Prime Minister [3247, pp. 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15], and finally to the Queen and the Prince of Wales, and the burden of his prayer was always the same—to be allowed to go to England and plead his own cause, to be confronted with his accusers that he might prove his innocence. His keen understanding seized at once upon the fact that [*ibid.*, p. 13] "the same plans are now used to keep me in misery as were used when my country was invaded," i. e. that the truth about the wishes of the Zulu people was suppressed by "the Natal people," just as the slanders of the latter against him in 1878 had brought about the invasion of his country by the British. For he writes to Her Majesty on December 13, 1881 [*ibid.*, p. 12], "If you and the Home Government had known about the truth of the grounds of the Zulu war, the war would not have been made against me." Very touching

are all these letters, and it is remarkable with what sagacity he seizes upon and explains all the main points of his case, never allowing himself to be led away into side issues, or to waste time and strength on trivial questions. His entreaties to be allowed to make his voyage to England at once could not be entertained, for, although he writes "I do not mind the cold—the winter cold is as nothing to me, provided I can get to England, and state my case" [*ibid.*, p. 7], he had, of course, no conception of what that "winter cold" would be. But, though this one delay was imposed upon him out of kindness, the same cannot be said about the official inattention to the one other petition which Cetshwayo made repeatedly, viz. that some protection might be extended to his helpless family in Zululand, and to the loyal brothers who had already suffered so much through their devotion to his cause.

On May 2, 1881, he writes to Sir Hercules Robinson [*ibid.*, p. 1]:—

"I beg you to look with kindness on Zululand and me, and see how Zululand is now being ruled. I look on you as the father of my children,* and I beg you kindly to consider my case, and look at the situation of my poor children who are in trouble, seeing that the cattle that the English kindly left them (the children) have all been taken away by some of the present ruling chiefs."

* Amongst the Zulus, the term "father" is always that of greatest respect and affection, and is applied, indeed, regardless of age, or even sex; as, for instance, grey-headed old men will salute Bishop Colenso's tiny grandson, three years of age, as "Baba" ("Father").

And again, on October 18 [*ibid.*, p. 7]:—

“The news that I get from the papers about Zululand that my people are fighting among themselves, and especially that Undabuko and Usibebu are fighting, does not allow me to sleep. I am afraid that my family have now to sleep in the veldt [are now homeless] How is it that my family is being ill-treated by one of my subjects, Usibebu, who has been troubling my family so much, and is still doing so, and no one puts a stop to it? It is the same as death to know that my country and family are being so badly handled.”

And on December 21 [*ibid.*, p. 13]:—

“I know myself that the mouths of the Zulus are shut, and their feelings suppressed by the Natal people. . . . Malimati (Mr. Osborn) has done his best to keep back the Zulu wishes. Mr. Osborn soon [readily] allows men like Usibebu to go to Natal, but stops my brother Undabuko and those that wish me back, and wish to express the wish of the Zulu nation.

“My family has been allowed to be driven away from their homes and plundered by Usibebu. How is this? Why is it allowed by the English Government? Why does the English Government listen so much to Natal lies; and why does it not see to matters more carefully? I beg you to let Lord Kimberley know about my family that is now in trouble. . . . I was attacked and taken captive because it was said that I shed blood, although I did not. How now, when so many people are killed in Zululand, what do you English say to it? I am not in Zululand now. . . . Be careful about John Dunn: he does not wish me back because he has appropriated all my property. Be careful: he wishes to cheat and blind you.”

On September 27th (five months later) Sir H. Robinson wrote to Sir Evelyn Wood as follows [3247, p. 10], after recording Cetshwayo's anxieties and unhappiness about the position of his family in Zululand, and his fears that they were almost in a state of starvation:—

“He states that he is informed that the cattle which were left for their maintenance have since been seized by the chiefs John

Dunn, Usibebu, and Hlubi, and that he is, in consequence, very anxious to obtain intelligence as to the health and welfare of his wives and relatives.

“I will feel obliged if you will instruct Mr. Osborn to inquire as to the alleged seizure of the cattle, and to ascertain the present whereabouts and condition of the various members of the ex-King’s family.”

Yet upon March 3, 1882, more than five months later still, he writes again [3466, p. 10], this time to Sir Henry Bulwer:—

“SIR,—I have the honour to forward a letter addressed to your Excellency by Cetshwayo, which has been transmitted to me, together with a letter to myself, in which the ex-King renews his inquiries after the condition of his family.

“In connection with this question I have the honour to observe that Sir Evelyn Wood, in a despatch of the 10th of October, 1881, in reply to my despatch to him of the 27th of September, 1881, stated that he had instructed the British Resident in Zululand to make inquiries on this subject; I have not, however, as yet, been furnished with the information which Cetshwayo is so anxious to receive.”

The King’s letter to Sir Hercules Robinson (enclosed) gives an account of Zibebu’s violent ill-treatment of his (Cetshwayo’s), family and their people, and relates how he and his followers “drove away my family from their homes; he deprived them of all their goods. Much corn he took away; some he spilt along the roads; into a great quantity he threw dead cats and dogs, and many other dirty things; some he burned with fire. The people that act so badly in Zululand say that Sir E. Wood and Mr. Rudolph told them to do so at the Inhlazatshe meeting. . . . I tell you for a truth

that the Zulu nation is in great distress. They know not what to do because they are ill-treated and have their mouths shut. They never receive a proper hearing from Mr. Osborn or from Mr. Shepstone when they get the luck of coming so far; when the Zulus talk about me they have all their cattle taken away from them, and some [are] driven away from their homes by Usibebu, at the instigation of John Dunn, for he is the one who instigates those who do wrong in Zululand to do so. . . . Sotondose, Mr. Osborn's Zulu chief officer, has told the Zulu chiefs and people that if they talked about me,* an English army would come and completely destroy them. He also said to the chiefs and people, 'Do you see how strong and large the English nation is? If you wish to live well, you must do the same as the English; for they have built up their nation by deceit: they say a thing one day, and deny it the next. Now do the same always, and deny that you have asked for the King.' . . . By such people is Zululand being ruined. By J. Dunn was Sir E. Wood cheated when he said that the Zulus did not ask for me. To the Inhlazatshe had the Zulus gone to ask for me, but a report was spread by Sotondose that Sir E. Wood had come to kill any one who asked for me by means of his soldiers. In this manner, then, are the Zulus treated. They have their mouths shut by terrorism. They have what they say misrepresented."

* This should probably read "speak *for* me," in the sense of asking for his restoration.

Sir Henry Bulwer writes in reply to Sir Hercules Robinson, on March 19th, 1882, as follows:—

“I ascertain that a report was made by the British Resident in Zululand on the 29th of October last, to the effect that twenty-five of the ex-King's wives had come to the Residency, complaining that they had been driven away from their homes by Usibebu, and asking the Resident for a place where they could live. They expressed a wish to go to Natal. They apparently considered themselves as belonging to Undabuko,* the brother of the ex-King Cetshwayo; and as Undabuko had been obliged by the chief Usibebu to leave the latter's territory,† they, as belonging to Undabuko, had been obliged to leave also. Undabuko was, at the time the Resident wrote, about to proceed to Natal,‡ and the women wished to proceed also. The Resident informed them that before he could give them permission to go over into Natal, it would be necessary for him to communicate with the Natal Government; and in the meantime he proposed an arrangement by which they could remain among the people of the tribe of the late Lukwasi, in the territory of the Zulu chief Umgitjwa. The women appear to have been much pleased with the proposed arrangement, and expressed their wish to remain among Lukwasi's people until the return of Undabuko. †

“On the 31st of October the Resident reported that the women were with Lukwasi's tribe, at no great distance from Inhlazatshe, where the Resident was established; that they were not suffering from want,§ although he believed it was the case that the grain belonging

* Naturally, as he was their brother-in-law: who else should have cared for them? Amongst the Zulus, a married woman returning to her father's house during her husband's lifetime is looked upon as disgraced.

† This is a somewhat mild way of putting it, seeing that they were harried with fire and steel.

‡ From these expressions it would certainly appear that the Resident was aware of Undabuko's intention to “proceed to Natal,” and had allowed if he had not approved it; yet, as has already been pointed out, he had refused to let him go.

§ If this were so, it was due solely to the loyalty of the people who sheltered them, since the King's family had been stripped, first by their British conquerers, and again more thoroughly still

to the family had been taken from them at the time they had to leave Usibebu's territory; * that he had every reason to expect they would receive kind and generous treatment among Lukwasi's people.†

“In a letter which I received from the Resident two days ago, dated the 8th day of March, he refers to the wives of Cetshwayo who had been living with Undabuko, and says that they are still living among Lukwasi's people.

“I will write to ask him for further information about them.”

It is difficult to believe, what is nevertheless proved from the official despatches, that the unhappy man whom we had torn away from his home and his people, was thus quite needlessly left by British officials in painful uncertainty as to the fate of his family for ten months, in spite of his earnest entreaties for information; the latest he had received being that they had been driven out of their homes to starve upon the hill-side, if even none of them had fallen victims to the assegais of Zibebu's men.

Mr. Osborn does not appear to have been guilty of the delay, which would probably be attributed officially to the fact that during the ten months through which Cetshwayo was left in this cruel uncertainty, Sir Evelyn Wood gave place to Sir

by Zibebu, of all their possessions. It was by no care of the British officials that they did not die of want.

* From this and the previous expression, “They *apparently considered* themselves as belonging to Undabuko and as Undabuko had been obliged by the chief Usibebu to leave the latter's territory, they, as belonging to Undabuko, had been obliged to leave also,” it might be supposed that the royal women had *some choice* in the matter. Such of them as found favour in Zibebu's eyes may have had the one alternative of becoming his wives (while Cetshwayo still lived), but they certainly had no other.

† Yes, because Lukwasi's people were very loyal to the King, and gladly spent their substance upon his family.

Henry Bulwer, who certainly seems, for his part, to have lost no time in making the necessary inquiries, and forwarding the result, as soon as Sir Hercules Robinson appealed personally to him.*

But there is no such excuse for those in power at the office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, which, through its misrepresentations, either from carelessness or else from interested motives, and through its utter ignorance of the value of truth and justice, has for many years been at the root of all the misery wrought in this part of South Africa.

Even after consent to the Zulu King's visit to England had been obtained from the Colonial Office, difficulties were repeatedly thrown in the way of a speedy fulfilment of Cetshwayo's wishes besides the one touching on his own health, and the rigour of the English winter. It is true that at this stage no *direct consent* is to be found in the Blue Books, the nearest approach to it being the telegram of September 14th, 1881, "We are disposed to entertain Cetshwayo's request to visit England," &c., and on September 23rd, "Inform Cetshwayo that his wishes have been considered, but a visit to England at

* It is a curious fact that no single despatch of Sir H. Bulwer's shows the least touch of relenting towards the unhappy captive King, or even his destitute family. The anguish of Cetshwayo never seems to have touched his heart, nor the dignity and sincerity of his demeanour to have excited his admiration; and he even refused to see him when at the Cape on his way to Natal, although the King had written to request him to give him an interview. In this respect Sir Henry Bulwer and Sir Garnet Wolseley appear to have been singular amongst the British officers and gentlemen who have been brought into contact with the Zulu King.

approach of winter is for various reasons very undesirable. Besides the danger to his health, many things interesting to him cannot be seen at that season. He must leave it to Her Majesty's Government to determine when it will be best for him to come."

Yet, although consent is throughout rather implied than plainly expressed, the intention to consent is made sufficiently clear, by such telegrams as the above, and by the various despatches which follow, debating the questions of the *time* of the proposed visit, its conditions, and the chiefs to be summoned from Zululand at Cetshwayo's request to accompany him to England.

The first of these difficulties arose from the discovery that, if once the Colonial authorities released their hold upon their captive, they could not legally resume the custody of him again without a special Act of Parliament enabling them so to do. As the Zulu King had not been at war with the Cape Colony, and had committed no offence against its laws, it had been found necessary to pass a special Act, after Cetshwayo was brought to the Cape, in order to transfer him, a British prisoner of war, from the custody of the Imperial to that of the Colonial officers. This had been done partly because of the great inconvenience of keeping him at the Castle,* but also in order that he might have more "freedom of movement" (i. e. air and exercise) than he could obtain within the Castle walls. The Act provided that Cetshwayo should be detained in safe custody

* An old Dutch castle, now the military quarters at Capetown.

“*during the pleasure of the Governor.*” The Government, therefore, was competent to put an end to his custody by ordering his absolute release, or by handing him over to officers appointed by the Crown to receive him, and for this purpose, of release or transfer, the assent of the Legislature was not necessary. But, the Colonial custodians having once given him up, all that was provided for by the Act would be accomplished: there was no provision in it allowing the prisoner to be temporarily removed from Colonial custody and again restored to it. Once released from it, Cetshwayo, would be free, certainly as regarded the Cape Colony, and perhaps altogether [3247, pp. 17, 18]. Such is the gist of the opinion given by Mr. Advocate Cole, Q.C., when appealed to by the Cape Ministers at the request of Sir Hercules Robinson, whose attention was drawn to the subject through a published letter, signed by the late Attorney-General of Mr. Sprigg’s administration. Plainly, as matters stood, if Cetshwayo went to England, and returned to the Cape, he became a free man, and could go back to Zululand at his own will and pleasure, unless illegally coerced.

Now, the authorities at home in England were by this time convinced that actual cause for our invasion of Zululand in 1879 there was none, and that an immense deal of trickery and misstatement had been employed to bring it about. Yet they were still under the impression about Cetshwayo’s personal character which had been created by the despatches of high South African officials—Sir Bartle Frere, Sir

G. Wolseley, Sir H. Bulwer, and Sir T. Shepstone. It was indeed true that each accusation of cruelty, tyranny, enmity to the British, and intentions to attack Natal, brought against Cetshwayo, had been challenged, and in every investigated case had been disproved, but nevertheless the general impression remained that he *was* bloodthirsty and tyrannical, that he *had* nourished a secret hatred against the British, and that he would at some later date have attacked Natal, if Sir B. Frere had not forestalled him by declaring war against him first. It would hardly have been reasonable to expect that the British Ministers should have felt otherwise, when an old and trusted servant like Sir Bartle Frere spoke of the "grinding despotism" of this "cruel sovereign" [3222, p. 5], of his "faithless, cruel character" [*ibid.*, p. 29] his "atrocious barbarities" [2260, p. 24], whose "history is written in characters of blood," [2318, p. 183], and another like Sir Theo. Shepstone (long regarded as *the* authority in native affairs) gave the same impression, although, according to custom, in more vague and general terms. Although every instance brought to prove these cruelties, this despotism, this faithlessness, had broken down on trial, the general accusation remained in force. The natural supposition was that *on the whole* Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Theophilus Shepstone and Co. must be right although they had been proved wrong in every part. In fact, though each count in the indictment had been disproved in turn, the verdict was one of "guilty" because the accusers were such eminent men.

The question, therefore, as to whether this victim of other men's exalted reputations might not become a free man accidentally, through the unintentional lapse of the law framed for his detention, became a serious one indeed. It does not quite appear of what use mere freedom would have been to a man who would still have been practically a captive in the midst of his enemies, and who, without their consent and assistance, could not possibly have regained his distant native land. It was, however, thought necessary to guard against the chance of his claiming those legal rights of which as yet he knew nothing, and measures were taken to that end. The law officers of the Crown in England were consulted, and, while agreeing with the views of their Colonial brethren, they discovered a way out of the difficulty. They were of opinion that by visiting England in the custody of persons named by the Imperial Government [3247, p. 21], Cetshwayo would not cease to be a prisoner of war. He could, they said, during and after the termination of his visit, be dealt with (legally) for all purposes as if he had, from the moment of his capture, been treated in all respects as a prisoner of war. They thought, however, that it would be expedient, if not necessary, that he should be replaced in the Castle, and restored to Imperial custody there, before being brought to England. This decision was communicated [*ibid.*] on March 9th, to Sir Hercules Robinson by the Earl of Kimberley, accompanied by a second despatch [*ibid.*, p. 22] on the same subject, showing that some

anxiety still remained in Downing Street lest we should inadvertently set our prisoner free. In the first place, it was considered necessary to point out to Cetshwayo that a visit to England would not necessarily be followed by his liberty being restored to him, and that he might afterwards still be kept in custody [3247, p. 14]. Again, the Earl of Kimberley asks, "*Would there be any difficulty in procuring the enactment of a further Act, authorising the detention of Cetshwayo in the Cape Colony on his return from England?*" Sir Hercules Robinson's opinion on this point had been already fully stated,* and on April 29 Lord Kimberley telegraphs [3247, p. 43] for a reply to the above question to which Sir Hercules answers [*ibid.*, p. 47]: "I have received a minute from Ministers stating that, having given careful consideration to your request, they regret they are unable to submit to Parliament a measure of the nature proposed; they add that not only are they themselves averse to such a course, but that in their opinion Parliament would not sanction a proposal for giving effect to your suggestion;" and the Earl telegraphs again, on May 8 [*ibid.*, p. 47], "As your Ministers cannot propose measure for replacing Cetshwayo in the same position, it may become necessary after visit to place him in Mauritius or other British possession. Inform Cetshwayo, and if no change in his wish for visit, and he adheres to undertaking given, arrange for his early departure, telegraphing me date."

* See p. 256 *supra*.

The "undertaking" here mentioned referred to one further precaution taken by Lord Kimberley in his second letter of March 9th, quoted above. He writes [*ibid.*, p. 22]:—

"You will explain to Cetshwayo that Her Majesty's Government have not departed from their intention of allowing him to visit England, but that various questions have arisen which must be fully considered and settled before he can leave the colony.

"Among these questions is the position in which Cetshwayo will be placed on leaving the Cape. It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government to accord to him as much personal freedom as possible when he has been again transferred to the care of Her Majesty's officers. He must understand, however, that to this end it will be necessary that he should give a formal undertaking that when he has passed out of the jurisdiction of the Cape Government, he will loyally and faithfully obey and adhere to all instructions and rules which may be laid down as to his conduct and movements, and will without question or hesitation conform to all the requirements of Her Majesty's Government. Unless he gives full assurances to this effect, and understands that he will be honourably bound by them, it would not be possible to allow his visit to this country."

So that, after all, it appears that the best resource of all the politicians and authorities of England for keeping their prisoner safe was to ask him—Sir Bartle Frere's "faithless" king, his "irresponsible, blood-thirsty, and treacherous despot" [2079, p. 140], Sir T. Shepstone's "crowned robber, murderer, and breaker of his word" [2144, p. 191], his "thief, murderer, and perjurer" *—to *pass his word* not to avail himself of any possible chance, whether legal or otherwise,

* Sir Theophilus Shepstone does not, indeed, himself make use of these words, but they occur in an "Address" from some of the Boer encroachers on Zulu territory, which address Sir T. Shepstone forwards (February 1878), with a sympathetic despatch [2079, p. 138], in which he speaks of the "strong language" of the memorialists without a shadow of dissent.

of obtaining his freedom against the will of his captors. It is to be observed that this was not merely putting him on *parole*, as a prisoner of war might honourably be, not to escape or allow of a rescue, &c., Cetshwayo was required to promise that he would not avail himself of his *legal rights*. Had he been such a man as his enemies represented him to be, of what use would it have been to obtain his *promise*? As a matter of fact, he was a man of a singularly loyal and sincere nature. He gave his word, as required, and the matter rested there.

Meanwhile two fresh difficulties arose. The first in point of time was a somewhat mysterious matter, the whole truth concerning which has never been made known. Mr. Shepstone, eldest son of Sir Theophilus, had been appointed to take charge of the King during his visit to England. His name first appears in this connection in a telegram from Sir Hercules Robinson to Lord Kimberley [3247 p. 4], received on September 16th, 1881, in which he says, speaking of "some one to take charge of the party":—

"Two names have occurred to me, either of whom would do to take charge—Henry [Henriquez] Shepstone and Colonel Hassard, R.E. The former speaks Zulu, is unemployed, and wishes to visit England. Colonel Hassard is a great friend of Cetshwayo's and had charge of him after Poole's departure. He is also shortly going to England. Have spoken to neither of them as yet, so do not know if they would undertake the duty."

Some one must, of course, have suggested these names, and informed Sir Hercules Robinson of Mr. Shepstone's wish to go (for the first time) to England; but it is somewhat strange that, under the circum-

stances, it should have been thought that any member of the Shepstone family would be a suitable person to fill the post. Mr. H. Shepstone, in particular, had been markedly amongst the King's opponents before the Zulu war. He had been Secretary for Native Affairs for the Transvaal during the British occupancy of that country, which fact would in itself identify him in the minds of the Zulus with the Boer, i. e. anti-Zulu, interests; he was at the Blood River meeting with his father, when the latter thought to persuade the Zulus to resign their just rights to the "disputed territory," his previous support of their claim to which had been the foundation of that confidence in him on which he would then have worked to deprive them of the land. Mr. Shepstone was also one of the messengers sent, after the Blood River meeting, to endeavour to persuade Cetshwayo personally to give up to the Boers what his representatives at that meeting had refused, and he was the man who on this latter occasion twice brought down upon himself a word of rebuke from the King for the want of courtesy and ceremony with which he addressed him. And, finally, he was one of the delegates who pleaded the Boer claims to the disputed territory before the Border Commission of 1878.*

* It must always be remembered that at this Border Commission, Colonel Durnford, R.E., and his two colleagues decided the dispute entirely in favour of the Zulus. The Report of the Commissioners giving the grounds of this decision is so clear, simple, and conclusive, that its perusal [B. B. 2220, p. 383] is sufficient for every unprejudiced reader, and it remains unshaken by all the flood of objections and sophistries poured upon it by Sir Bartle Frere.

Mr. Shepstone was, therefore, not a man whom the King would have been likely to choose to accompany him to England, especially as the object of the King's visit was to plead his own cause against accusers of whom Sir T. Shepstone was one. In face of Cetshwayo's own words about the latter [spoken in a message to Sir H. Bulwer in January 1878], that "he wishes to cast Cetshwayo off; he is no more a father, but a firebrand" [2000, p. 138], it would certainly have been wiser to select some one in no way connected with him. The choice, indeed, should have fallen on some one who was distinctly and actively a friend to the King, taking his views of the points which he wished to plead in England, or at any rate one who had not been concerned on the other side; and however desirous Mr. Shepstone may have been to do his duty both by his employers and by Cetshwayo, it was, of course, impossible that he should, in that sense, take the latter's part. Amongst the King's friends there can be no doubt that the appointment created some regret, and when a letter, supposed to be from the Zulu King, appeared in the *Morning Post* of January 26th, containing a passage complaining of the appointment of one he could not trust, those who were aware of all that had previously happened did not at first doubt that he had really thus expressed himself. As it turned out, however, he had not done so, the passage in question having been interpolated without his knowledge. Cetshwayo was far too wise a man to raise useless difficulties, or to offend those on whom his future, and that of

his people, might depend, and he was also too just to remember against Mr. Shepstone the offences towards himself which had been committed under authority, and by virtue, of his office as Transvaal Secretary for Native Affairs, Transvaal Delegate before the Border Commission, &c.; and he was too generous to cherish displeasure on account of the one small personal offence already mentioned, which failure in due respect was, perhaps, owing rather to nervousness and ignorance of etiquette than to any intentional discourtesy.

Cetshwayo, therefore had no ill-will towards Mr. Shepstone, and if he would have preferred a caretaker of another name, he was wise enough to keep the feeling to himself. Indeed, he would probably fancy that there was much to be gained if one of the family—so important to South African ideas—would really be his friend, and from the following letter it would seem that Sir Th. Shepstone had succeeded in justifying himself to the King, although upon what he rested his justification is known only to himself. As it was made quite plain that Cetshwayo had said nothing against Mr. Shepstone, the latter consented to resume his charge. The King's letter to him [3247, p. 34] ran as follows:—

“OUDE MOLEN, March 4, 1882.

“I am writing to you . . . to tell you that I am very sorry when I hear that bad words about you have appeared, since it is said that I say that I do not like to go with you to England, and that I distrust you. I have not made mention about you by the words with which it is said I mentioned you. I do not know why I should distrust you, since we have explained ourselves to one another with your father, Somtseu (i. e. I have explained

myself to your father, Somtseu, and he has explained himself to me), and I saw well that he sympathised with me. Again, I should be an inconsistent person if I said now that I did not like to go with you, since I have already talked to the Governor, and agreed that you should go in charge of me. It would not be manly of me to do this inconsistency. You should not listen to that saying which it is said I said about you. You simply come; I am certainly expecting you in bringing the chiefs here, and then pass with you on to England. I say you must come. Don't think of staying (lit., do not attempt to stay). How could I say you must stay [away], since I have already approved of you? Again, you belonged to the house that handled my matters from the first. For what should I distrust you, since I, too, know that you sympathise with me? The only word by which I mentioned you, even at Government House, is the one that says that I should be thankful that you went in charge of me, above this my interpreter* that I am staying with, but that I should like that this my interpreter be the one to interpret for me. I would acknowledge those words that mention you if I knew them; but I deny them because I do not know them. What should I be afraid of, since the white people would not force me to go with a person that I did not like? Give my respects to all those of your family."

But it is impossible to overlook the fact that the King's own letters, temperate and straightforward as they are, courteous and even kind towards Mr. Shepstone, are not such as justified the choice of the latter for this particular post. The King plainly states [3247, p. 28]:—

"I told him (Mr. Henriquez Shepstone) I would be glad to go with him *if Mr. Samuelson was allowed to go also.*† I wished Mr. Shepstone to take me to the Queen, and Mr. Samuelson to go too, to talk (interpret) for me. . . . I do not want to go with Mr. Shepstone alone. *He cannot talk Zulu well. He cannot speak so well as Mr. Samuelson.*" †

These words were spoken when Cetshwayo was called upon to explain (and repudiated) the disputed

* Mr. Samuelson.

† Author's italics.

passage from the *Morning Post*, and were what he had said at the time to Mr. Shepstone, and had repeated since; and, although the plain-spoken words "he cannot talk Zulu well" are omitted, out of politeness to Mr. Shepstone, the sense of the phrase "but that I should like that this my interpreter be *the one to interpret for me*" is palpably the same, while the whole letter gives rather the impression of a desire to make the best of the matter and of the man, than of hearty and entire confidence in the latter.

It is not possible within our space to enter into the controversy concerning the disputed passage in the *Morning Post*, nor is it necessary, since the main point affecting the present narrative, viz. that Cetshwayo was not its author, has been admitted by both friend and foe.

But the matter entailed one very serious and unfortunate consequence upon the unhappy Zulu King, who was certainly the last person who should have been made to suffer on this occasion. His interpreter, Mr. Robert Samuelson, who had been with him for a long while, and was thoroughly acquainted with the Zulu language—who had become, during their joint captivity (for so it might be called), sincerely attached to the King, and had, of course, had more opportunity than any one else of learning to know and understand Cetshwayo's *own point of view*, his thoughts and feelings, and his own explanations of points contested before the Zulu war—was dismissed by the authorities on account of this affair. His principal, or only, fault, as gathered from Sir Hercules

Robinson's report [3247, p. 35], was that of having written and posted "clandestinely" three letters for the King without entering them in the letter-book or sending them to the Native Department for transmission, "as he was bound to do by the regulations."

Mr. Samuelson's excuse for his action [3247, p. 28] was that "the Governor, some short time before, told the ex-King he should have much more personal liberty than he had before, provided he did not make use of it to return to his country, and I thought from that that he was entitled to write or make me write letters for him to be despatched direct by me, and no record kept in the letter-book." Lord Kimberley's words were, it will be remembered [3247, p. 2]: "I should be glad, by any means compatible with paramount public interests, to relieve the irksomeness of his detention away from his own country, and remove from his mind the sense of injury from which he is suffering; and with this object I should wish you to consider whether a much greater degree of personal liberty might not be allowed him on his engaging not to make use of it to return without permission to Zululand."

If this "much greater degree of personal liberty" did not include the power to write letters to England without official supervision at the Cape, it was a mockery and a pretence indeed. Mr. Samuelson may have been in error in assuming this intention on the part of Government officials, and acting on his own responsibility without direct permission; but, at all events, he was a true friend to the Zulu

King, and had already proved his faithfulness by remaining for many months in most dreary imprisonment at Oude Molen, solely out of regard and pity for him.* Cetshwayo was about to embark on the sea-voyage of which he had so great a horror, to venture upon a visit to that far-away land from which he had already received much injury, and to plead his own cause, and that of his people, before the rulers of the all-powerful nation which had conquered him. At this momentous epoch, this great and trying crisis in his life, he was deprived of the interpreter for whom he had an affection, and whom he trusted, and was forced to submit to the substitution of a stranger, in the selection of whom he had no voice. The whole responsibility of what he meant to say, and how he hoped to plead his cause in England, now rested upon his own shoulders, whereas Mr. Samuelson, with whom he must many times have argued out every point, would have been a great assistance, both in aiding his memory, and also in rightly understanding and interpreting his meaning. The loss of his favourite interpreter must have been a great additional trial to Cetshwayo, who, although he is reported to have "expressed his concurrence" [3247, p. 37] in his removal &c., did so upon receiving official assurance that he was not trustworthy, and must afterwards have understood from Mr. Samuelson's own account that, in whatever he had

‡ "This is a terrible place," writes Mr. Samuelson on Jan. 3, 1882 [3247, p. 16.], "and were it not out of pity for this poor man, I could not remain." Langalibalele's life drags on hard by.

done, or left undone, he had, at all events, meant well and loyally by him, Cetshwayo.

To an impartial person it might also appear strange that, however undeserved the imputations cast upon Mr. Shepstone might be, the choice of a new interpreter should have been placed in his hands, and it would certainly have been better for the vindication of his own integrity that the post should have been given to some one of Cetshwayo's own choice, and over whom no one could accuse Mr. Shepstone of exercising undue control. Nevertheless, on March 1st, the "Private Secretary, Capetown," telegraphs to Mr. Shepstone [3247, p. 30], "*Cetshwayo appears to be quite free from all charge of duplicity or blame, and the Governor sees no necessity for your making any alteration in your plans. If required, could you get another interpreter in Natal?*"* and on May 13 Sir Hercules Robinson announces the appointment of Mr. "Dunn,† *who was strongly recommended by Mr. Shepstone.*"*

The last difficulty in point of time, though the most important in respect of its results, was one raised by Sir Henry Bulwer, who, when all else seemed satisfactorily arranged, put in his oar from Natal. The Great Deputation, of which a full account is given in a previous chapter, had arrived, and Sir Henry Bulwer seemed determined that this "demonstration" in Cetshwayo's favour should do him harm

* Author's italics.

† No relation to J. Dunn, as Sir H. Robinson took care to ascertain.

rather than good. On April 26 he took the first step in this direction by sending this telegram to Lord Kimberley [3247, 43]:—

“I sent a telegram on 10th inst., proposing to visit Zulu country, in order to ascertain personally state of affairs in country, and feeling of chiefs and others, but cable broke. Now hardly time to complete visit within the time when my presence required in Natal. Resident, also, in consequence of a large demonstration which ex-King’s brothers have brought into Natal, thinks my visit at present moment would be misunderstood and unadvisable, therefore my telegram is withdrawn.”

This was shortly followed by another, which does not appear to have been published, but the purport of which can be gathered from Lord Kimberley’s allusions to it. On May 10th the Earl telegraphs to Sir Hercules Robinson [*ibid.*, p. 50]:—

“Inform Cetshwayo report having been received from Governor of Natal that visit used for purposes of agitation in Zululand, and interferes with due consideration of future, Her Majesty’s Government consider it necessary to postpone visit for a time. This decision founded on telegram received from Bulwer since mine of 8th.”

And, on the following day, May 11, he writes more fully [3247, p. 51]:—

“The telegram from Sir Henry Bulwer to which I referred in my telegram to you of yesterday was to the effect that the intended visit of Cetshwayo to England had led to the report of his restoration, and was used to create agitation; that it had been the cause of the recent demonstration of the ex-King’s brothers, and was producing uneasiness in Zululand; that this state of affairs interfered with the settlement of the country, and with the due consideration of the future policy to be pursued; and that in these circumstances Sir Henry Bulwer suggested postponement of the visit for some time. . . .

“Her Majesty’s Government trust that they will before long receive from Sir Henry Bulwer a full report on Zulu affairs with

his recommendation as to the future policy to be pursued, and I have requested Sir Henry Bulwer to inform me when his report may be expected."

Sir Hercules Robinson made one last effort to spare the King this terrible disappointment, for, before carrying out these instructions, he telegraphed again to Lord Kimberley that Cetshwayo had been informed only the day before, as directed in the telegram of the 8th May [3247, p. 52], that he (Sir H. Robinson) "would at once arrange for his early departure. Shepstone," he continues "was accordingly telegraphed to yesterday, to come down from Natal with the chiefs. Before intimating to Cetshwayo this further indefinite postponement, I think it right to let you know how far the matter has gone, as I fear he will be so bitterly disappointed that his life may be in danger;" but he only received the answer, "I must adhere to decision to postpone Cetshwayo's visit," and the direction, "Stop departure of Shepstone and chiefs at once" [*ibid.*].

There was no longer any help for it, and Cetshwayo was informed that the promises that had been made to him were all withdrawn, and that, at the very moment when all difficulties seemed removed, and himself on the eve of his departure for England, the chances of his ever paying that visit, and obtaining the fair hearing of his cause which he so ardently desired, were removed once more into the uncertain future.

The sad shock which this was to the unhappy man is described by Mr. G. Bower, Private Secretary

to Sir Hercules Robinson, who had sent him to break the news as kindly as might be, and to express the Governor's sympathy with him in his disappointment.

"Cetshwayo," he reports [*ibid.*, p. 80], "who had since the beginning of the interview appeared very dejected, complained of a spasm in the heart, and a glass of water was brought by the interpreter. When he had sufficiently recovered to speak, he said 'I am in despair; I can say nothing.'" And again [*ibid.*], "Cetshwayo was completely prostrated by the intelligence of the change in the plan for his early departure, and seemed to be almost stunned with grief." On the following day [*ibid.*, p. 81] Mr. Bower, being again sent by the Governor to inquire after the King's health, found him in the same melancholy condition. "My heart is sore," he said, "I am in despair. My friends have deceived me—whom can I trust now? I do not wish to take people by surprise, but I think I shall soon be dead." The interpreter explained that the King had eaten nothing since he had heard the news the day before, and had spoken of taking his own life.

Mr. Bower endeavoured to explain to him that "the English only wish to do what is best" for him and his country, and that they had no interest in the matter, except the quietness and contentment of the Zulu people. "You yourself," he added, must wish for that—you would not desire to see bloodshed in Zululand" [*ibid.*, p. 81]. Well-intentioned as was his visitor's reasoning, it must have sounded a bitter

mockery in Cetshwayo's ears, as he answered, “There has been more bloodshed since I have been a prisoner than during the whole of my reign. The bloodshed in my reign was, to the bloodshed since, as an ant in a pond of water.”

This was a difficult speech to answer, as, unhappily, it was true; and Mr. Bower falls back upon asserting that “the English wish to avoid bloodshed now and in the future,” and then assures him that his cause is well advocated by his friends in England, and that he must not suppose that they had deserted him.

“What crime have I committed?” exclaimed Cetshwayo. “I have never done wrong. Why am I a prisoner? My wives and daughters—the women of the Great House—have been taken and distributed amongst my enemies in Zululand. Zibebu has taken five of the women of the Great House as wives, and has given others to his chiefs and headmen. The thought of this is eating into my heart. It will kill me. I wish the whole of my family collected where they can be taken care of. Let them be brought together in one place. My property has been stolen; my house has been broken up; my family have been either distributed amongst others or driven out on the veldt. My heart is sore. Let my family be brought together, and the chiefs of the country will contribute towards their support.”

Mr. Bower [*ibid.*] promised to tell the Governor what he had said, and concludes this report: “Cetshwayo seemed so distressed at the thought of the position of his family that, fearing a repetition of

the heart attack of the day before, I changed the subject, and led him on to other topics. After about an hour's conversation I left him less depressed. I urged him, on parting, to take food, but he said his grief was so great that he could neither eat nor drink."

And indeed Cetshwayo's affection for his family and people had frequently been shown during his captivity [*vide* p. 56, *supra*].* His consideration in not asking for three of his greatest chiefs and most loyal supporters to accompany him to England [3247, p. 4], "because they are too old to travel by sea," and his request that some one might be left to interpret for the women who would remain at Oude-Molen during his visit to England, are officially recorded. He was also very anxious for the comfort of one of his household, an invalid girl, who, having been with him when he was captured, accompanied him to Capetown, and was sent back to Zululand in a bad state of health. His inquiries about her welfare, and that of other members of his household in Zululand, made through the Bishop of Natal, were the main grounds for the absurd story which reached Sir Henry Bulwer's ears, of messages, sent for the Zulu King by the Bishop, of a political and dangerous character, stirring up agitation, and fomenting intrigues.† The

* Cetshwayo when in London begged Mr. F. E. Colenso to inform the women at Oude-Molen of their master's health.

† The only message thus sent which could be imagined by the most jealous eye to step beyond the bounds of family matters, was one "of condolence and counsel for his friends and relatives, his brother Maduna and the Aba Qulusi, under the terrible calamity

Governor should have taken for granted that *if* the Bishop *had* forwarded any messages for the Zulu King, they were certainly of a harmless or family nature, but, in his insane suspicion of "interference" on the Bishop's part, no story was ever too palpably false to be credited by him. It would be an endless matter to analyse and confute the many frivolous and groundless charges laid against the Bishop in Sir Henry Bulwer's despatches during 1882 and 1883, and the proof of his folly, however conclusive, would be most tedious to the general reader. The Governor, like most people when they mount a favourite hobby, is perpetually carried away from the real question into side issues affecting his own particular mare's-nest—"unofficial (and especially episcopal) interference"—and expends pages in making out that the Bishop had brought down the Great Deputation, oblivious of the fact that if the influence of any one man could produce such an effect, that fact in itself would show how very strong the (Zulu) national feeling must have been. The Bishop's last published letter*—that addressed to Lord Derby in answer to some of Sir H. Bulwer's accusations—completely demolishes each one upon which it touches, and the reader may gather from it

from which they had suffered [in the massacre of most of the Aba Qulusi by Hamu], as he had now heard fully from Ungeongwana, and of consolation and advice for his family in their great sorrow" [3247, p. 48], [the advice being principally "Stay quiet, and be of good heart"]. For the whole of the Bishop of Natal's letter in which the above passage occurs, see Appendix.

* See Appendix for this "Letter."

that, were it necessary so to do, the remainder might be disposed of in the same way.

The letters which Cetshwayo wrote on the occasion of this great disappointment are most touching and pathetic; he was truly nearly broken-hearted, and the perusal of his words cannot fail to create much sympathy with him and a feeling of indignation against those who persecuted him so wantonly. He wrote repeatedly to his kind friend Sir Hercules Robinson, who had already done what he could to help him, to Sir Henry Bulwer, and finally to his brothers and the other Zulu chiefs, warning them against the "agitation" of which he had been told, and, bidding them lay their grievances before the Governor of Natal, instead of trying to obtain redress by force [3274, p. 88]. But what he desired them to do was, alas! precisely what they had already attempted, and would please Sir Henry Bulwer as little as the King's earnest entreaties to him to allow his people to have interviews with the Natal Government. "Try and do good for me," he pleads to Sir H. Bulwer [3274, p. 89], who certainly evinces not the smallest intention to comply with the request.

His Excellency, meanwhile, having succeeded in making the King's visit to England depend on his own proposed journey to Zululand, hastened to put off the latter as long as possible, and on May 12, in answer to Lord Kimberley's request to be informed when his report might be expected, he telegraphs [*ibid.*, pp. 52, 53], "Native Legislative Council meets

soon, and I shall not therefore be able to visit Zululand before August."

He persistently declared that the "feeling of unsettlement and uncertainty among the Zulu people" at this time arose out of the reports of the King's approaching visit to England, and his possible subsequent restoration; and he writes of "disturbances" caused by the Princes and Umnyamana, which, he feared, were "encouraged from Natal,"* and asserts that the "party" desiring the King's return was in reality a small one. "I am speaking," he says [*ibid.*, p. 58], when writing of "the Zulu people," "of course, of the great majority of the Zulu people. Left alone, free from agitation from within or from without, the thought of the ex-King's return or restoration would not so much as occur to them. Wishes or hopes on the subject they have none, unless they foresee that the course of coming events obliges them to express wishes or hopes which may in no way represent their real sentiments. The evil that most presses on the country at the present moment is the agitation that has been set going by the party to which I have referred, encouraged by the reports introduced from Natal, and the hopes held out to them; and it is this state of things, these reports, this uncertainty, which have created an uneasiness, a disquiet, that are in the highest degree mischievous and to be regretted."

One is tempted to ask what proof Sir Henry Bulwer would have chosen to accept that he had been

* i. e. by the Bishop.

misled in this opinion of the sentiments of the Zulus, but the only answer is that he would have accepted *none*, having once for all made up his mind on the subject. He took no means whatever to obtain an impartial and disinterested view upon it, accepting as the truth whatever he heard from people already committed to the existing state of things, and to preventing, if possible, Cetshwayo's return. "Free from agitation *from within*" the Zulus could not be while their own hearts longed for their King, and no doubt Mkosana's return from Capetown,* bringing the welcome news that he was alive, and even hopeful of seeing them again some day, fanned the smouldering embers of their love for him into a brighter flame. But the hope kept them from violence, instead of leading them to it, and the disturbances in Zululand which followed were due, first to the delay in Cetshwayo's proposed visit and their growing suspicion that their hope would be disappointed, and secondly to the violence and ill-usage sustained by the Princes and other great men at the hands of the disloyal chiefs Hamu and Zibebu, and the traitor chief Dunn, with his unpopular "taxes," and his fines levied on those who spoke for the King [3270, p. 10]. They endured their wrongs with wonderful patience, because they hoped that, by persistence in forbearance, they might, in the end, gain their hearts' desire—their King's return. If they took up arms, even in self-defence, it was only when those hopes had temporarily vanished,

* See pages 34, 35.

and the news that he had at last started for England, in addition to Cetshwayo's own admonitions, did more to prevent their using force of arms, even in self-defence, than all Mr. Osborn's influence and advice [3247, p. 88].

But Sir Henry Bulwer was determined not to see anything on their side of the case, and his telegram of May 12, putting off his own departure for Zululand till August, plainly shows that he meant to prevent the King's return for another year at least. He was well aware that, if he delayed his visit to Zululand till August, and if Cetshwayo's visit to England was not to take place until after that, another winter must come and go before the Zulu King could start for the British shores, and another year must be passed in that captivity which was killing him by inches.

Some such view of Sir Henry Bulwer's conduct would appear to have struck the Earl of Kimberley, for on May 25 he writes as follows [3247, p. 64]:—

“You were informed by telegram on the 10th instant that, in compliance with your suggestion, it had been decided to postpone Cetshwayo's visit to England pending your report upon Zululand. I asked you at the same time when you would be able to visit that country and report, to which you replied . . . that . . . you would not be able to visit Zululand before August.

“The agitation and uneasiness which you describe as prevailing in Zululand, and which it is obvious if prolonged may lead to very serious dangers to the peace of the country, render Her Majesty's Government extremely anxious to receive with as little delay as possible, the expression of your views as to the policy which should be pursued, and, if your means of information should be sufficient to enable you to form an opinion, I need scarcely say that it would be desirable that they should receive it at once, without waiting for your proposed visit.”

The desired report not being immediately forthcoming, after the delay of another month, Lord Kimberley writes again, on June 29th [3270, p. 19], to say that although, in deference to his opinion, Her Majesty's Government had postponed the ex-King's visit, they had done so with reluctance; and, after careful consideration of Sir Henry's despatch [3247, p. 58] and Mr. Osborn's report of affairs in Zululand, they did not feel justified in further delaying the fulfilment of the promise which had been made to Cetshwayo, "unless [Sir H. Bulwer] saw urgent reasons against it" (? *new* reasons).

"To have waited until your report had been received and considered would have been practically to put off the visit to another year, as the season would be too far advanced," Lord Kimberley writes [3270, p. 20], and he recapitulates the telegrams which he had recently sent and received on the subject thus:—

"On the 21st of June I addressed a telegram to you to the following effect:—

"The delay of Cetshwayo's visit to England does not appear to have averted disturbances in Zululand,* and it is not easy to justify further postponement, especially as the favourable season will soon be over. We think that the promise to him should be fulfilled, and that his visit should take place without further delay, unless you see any urgent reason to the contrary.'

"You replied by a telegram dated the 23rd instant, of which the following is the substance: 'The disturbances in Zululand are caused by agitation, which is the result of interference by persons in this Colony who desire to see the ex-King restored. What has taken place respecting Cetshwayo has been used in a way that stirs

* On the contrary, it had *caused* them.

up agitation. But if Her Majesty's Government think it necessary for the reason given by your Lordship, not to further delay the visit, I do not wish to oppose. It should be understood that it does not in any way commit us to the course to be adopted in regard to Zululand.'"

These "reasons" were certainly neither new nor "urgent" and so Lord Kimberley appears to have thought, for on the same day (June 23) he telegraphed [*ibid.*] to Sir Hercules Robinson:—

"After communication with Sir Henry Bulwer, have decided not to postpone further Cetshwayo's visit. He may, therefore, start whenever ready. Remind him that visit no way commits us as to future course respecting Zululand."

What was really the nature of the "agitation" and "disturbance" in Zululand after the return of the Great Deputation from Natal, must be considered in another volume, in which it will also be shown how truly Cetshwayo's own words [3247, p. 13], "I know, myself, that the mouths of the Zulu people are shut, and their feelings suppressed by the Natal people [authorities]. The same plans are now used to keep me in misery as were used when my country was invaded [i. e. to bring about the war]," applied, not only at the time of which he was speaking, before his visit to England, but also to the period of, and subsequent to, his "restoration." The misrepresentations and false reports, the suppression of all that told in Cetshwayo's favour, the encouragement of his enemies, the browbeating, and tyranny exercised over his friends, which have characterised all our official dealings with Zululand since 1878, deceiv-

ing the British Government and public, and continually bringing fresh misery upon the Zulus, is still at the present time, in as full force as ever, although the King himself is now beyond the reach of his persecutors. It slandered Cetshwayo anew before his death, it nullified the good intentions of the Home Government towards him, depriving him of half his territory, and tying his hands even from self-defence by conditions and promises. It forced numbers of his loyal people into unwilling obedience to other rule, scattering and disheartening his many supporters, consolidating, strengthening, and encouraging the small body of his real (Zulu) opponents, and finally driving him to appear in the eyes of England a fugitive from his own people, deserted, unloved, unhonoured—triumphantly proving, as those who have brought it about declare, that they were right in always protesting against his restoration, and in denying the assumed devotion of his people. It will now be our by no means difficult task to expose the trickery and tyranny by which this appearance has been created and to prove once more what has so often been asserted in this work, that the great majority of the Zulu people keenly desired and rejoiced in Cetshwayo's restoration, and that had he been restored in a proper fashion, peace and satisfaction would have reigned throughout the land, and all would have been well. But his restoration was managed by the man whose deep and unreasoning prejudices against the Zulu King had been displayed in innumerable forms, who had strained every nerve to prevent it, and undertook

it only under protest, with the unshaken idea that it could not, and the fixed determination that it should not, succeed. This, and not any fault of Cetshwayo's or inherent weakness in his cause, has brought about the present wretched state of things in Zululand.



APPENDIX TO VOLUME I.

(A.) *Suppression of the Second and Third Deputations, taken from Zulu account.*

“And now Maduna prepared to come down again to Maritzburg, to pray a second time for the ‘Bone.’ He was coming with those who formed the first deputation, with additional members, namely, *Siwunguza*, one of the thirteen kinglets in his own person, *Bubesi*, the brother of a second, *Somkele*, whom he represented, and several (eight) others of importance. All had agreed with Maduna to go down and pray the white chiefs to give them their ‘Bone.’

“But, when Maduna went to Malimati (Mr. Osborn, the Resident) to ask for a pass for them to go down to make their prayer, and also to complain of the way in which Zibebu had eaten up their cattle, Malimati refused it, saying that Maduna was setting himself up when, forsooth, neither he nor Cetshwayo was a chief, but they were merely *abafokazana* (common men, poor people), and Maduna must stay at home and leave it to him (the Resident) to report for him to the authorities.

“But Maduna replied that he did not see how that would help him, since his property had been carried off, and though he had reported the fact to Malimati, no help had come to him in consequence. Besides which, he wished to go down to Maritzburg because on his last visit he had told the authorities there that he was coming again. But after some further words about the cattle of which Zibebu had robbed the Princes, the Resident bade Maduna go and speak with Zibebu on that subject, and meanwhile gave no further reply

to the petition to go to Maritzburg to pray for Cetshwayo, which was what they desired to do at once, caring little by comparison for the loss of their property.

“Maduna sent down messengers to Natal to tell the Bishop what they had wished, and what had happened, and they reported as follows:—

“‘Maduna sends us to say all this, and also that he is anxious not to disregard Sobantu’s (the Bishop’s) advice in any way * or to strike out a new path for himself; he wishes to follow in the steps of his brother (Cetshwayo), who took Sobantu as a counsellor in the affairs of the Zulus. Maduna also sends an entreaty that Sobantu will ask leave of the authorities for some Zulu to go to Capetown, to set eyes on Cetshwayo for them, and to return; for his (Cetshwayo’s) wives and children lament themselves to him (Maduna), and so does all Zululand, saying ‘If only some one might go and return, saying, ‘It is true! he is alive,’” whereas many people now declare that the ship in which he was put was overturned into the sea, and he was drowned, and that this is what will happen also to any who venture to go down and pray for him. Maduna also would be very thankful if Sobantu would send some one belonging to him to live with him (Maduna) in Zululand, a trustworthy person, who can bear witness for him, because he sees that he will be continually accused of wrong-doing without a cause.’ †

“Maduna’s visit to Zibebu had exactly the result which all concerned must have expected. He went accompanied

* The Bishop’s advice, i. e. that “patient continuance in well-doing,” refraining from violence even in retaliation, which the Bishop of Natal always taught them, and which lesson they nobly obeyed, perhaps too well for their *temporal* welfare.

† Maduna had good reason to fear this. His loyalty and devotion to his brother Cetshwayo marked him out from the first as a target for the King’s enemies and maligners. Every description of false accusation has been brought against the Prince, his (white) enemies even declaring that in reality he was intriguing for the Zulu crown for himself.

by his brother Ziweddu and all the Zulus of the Usutu tribe. And Zibebu said, 'Just let me hear now what you went down Maritzburg to say.'

"Said the Prince, 'We went down to ask that we might be allowed to pray for our "Bone."'

"Said he, 'Is that a thing, pray, that you would (dare to) speak about openly? Speak the truth about your going, that I may hear.'

"Said Maduna, 'That is the truth.'

"Said Zibebu, 'That is the truth, do you say, when I know all your words?'

"Said Maduna, 'Tell us, then, you, since you know them.'

"Said Zibebu, 'Yes, you went and told tales of us to Sobantu—I hear that from four quarters. You said that I too prayed for the "Bone."'

"Said Maduna, 'I never mentioned your name for the "Bone" to Sobantu, and you accuse him falsely. From whom did you hear this?'

"Said Zibebu, 'I heard it from Malimati, who says that he denied for me to the authorities, saying that I did not want the "Bone," and he has told me to deny for myself also, since I am going down (to Maritzburg), as he has already denied on my behalf. Only last week there came policemen saying, "Are you in this scrape, Zibebu (le'ngozi eyako, Zibebu na)?" I answered, "I know nothing about this scrape," and the policemen continued, "So it's Maduna (taking upon himself to do it), because we left him his cattle and family and land! Eat him up now, Zibebu." I do not know, since I have been given power by the English, why I should not just trample you down. *My* father* never went

* Zibebu was a cousin of the reigning line of Princes. His extreme insolence to them, when placed by the English in a position of power to which otherwise he could never have attained, shows in itself the absurdity of Sir G. Wolseley's scheme of shuffling up the Zulus, their prejudices and hereditary rank, to deal them out afresh, bringing all the knaves in the pack to the top—Zibebu, Mfanawendhlela, Hamu, and J. Dunn.

crossing the Tugela to the white men; it was your father, Mpande, who did that, and you are just following his steps. Your father's son (Cetshwayo) is across the water, and you are going in the same direction, swimming the Tugela like little ducks, going down to speak with the white men. Why should we not smash in their little head-rings at once [i. e. knock them on the head]? Let them be off!

"At this Maduna was going, but Ziwedu said, 'Let us first go to him into his hut, and see if he will not be more pleasant when we are by ourselves.' But Zibebu, when he saw them, only said, 'What have you come for? I have nothing more to say to you;' and so they went away.

"A day or two later, Maduna, by Ziwedu's advice, sent to Zibebu to say, 'Since we have now spoken together on this matter, fix a day on which we shall both go together to Malimati about it.' But Zibebu replied that he should not go to Malimati about it; he might perhaps send a message to him, but, if he did, it would not be until he (Zibebu) came back from Maritzburg, whither he was going at once.

"Thereupon Maduna sent two sets of messengers to ask Malimati for the pass, since he had obeyed his directions and had gone to speak to Zibebu about the cattle. But Malimati refused both sets of messengers, saying, 'No! Maduna must just stay at home, and make his complaints through me.' But Maduna, seeing that Zibebu had gone on ahead to give his own account of things, set out to follow him to Maritzburg without a pass, with a considerable party as before, but with additional members.

"'But the whole Zulu people,' said Maduna's messengers to the Bishop of Natal, 'is only hampered and held back by these four chiefs, Zibebu, Mfanawendhlela, Hamu, and John Dunn, from coming to pray for their "Bone." The whole people entreat for their King to be sent back to Zululand. If it were only a fine or ransom that was wanted, there is not a man but would find a beast towards that.'

Hamu and Zibebu did much to repress this prayer of the people by fining them for their loyalty, the latter even "eating up" the cattle of some who had gone to pay

their respects to the Prince Maduna on his return from Maritzburg (after the previous deputation), because they had done so, whereas, he said, they now belonged to him, Zibebu. These people belonged to Cetshwayo's own tribe of rescued *abatagati*,* which was divided by Sir G. Wolseley between Hamu and Zibebu.

Maduna and his party recrossed the Tugela into Natal at the Lower Drift, and came to Mr. Fynney, the Border Agent, who told them to wait there, until he should have reported them by wire to Maritzburg, and got an answer to say whether the authorities would allow them to come on or not; since he had been blamed when the first deputation had come down, both by the authorities and by Malimati, for allowing the Prince to cross the drift and go on to the city without sending them word first.

The reply was, of course, a refusal. They were to go back and get a pass from the Resident (who had already refused it). "And I, too, my son," said Mr. Fynney, "I forbid you. To go on now would be to act in defiance of the English. Never mind Zibebu, my son; just go back and remain quiet. I see that you believe that Malimati does not speak on your behalf. But I assure you, all the matters which you report to him, he writes them every one." If this were so, it would but prove that, not the Resident only, but the Natal Government also, was entirely indifferent to the miseries of this

* The Zulus who brought the first message from the great Zulu chiefs on Cetshwayo's behalf, after the war, gave the following account of the formation of this remarkable tribe:—

"As for the King killing a great number of people—who are they?" they asked. "We do not know of them. It is false. Why! there is his kraal Ekubazeni! While his father was still alive, he (Cetshwayo) began saving any one who was accused, either by the King or by the indunas, of being an *umtagati* (evil-doer), saying, 'No! do not kill him! give him to me!' and he sent him to that kraal to belong to the Usutu (Cetshwayo's own people). That kraal, when he began, consisted of three or four huts only; and now it has four circles of huts, and every man in them is an accused person whose life Cetshwayo has saved!"

injured and innocent people; and though it was easy to advise them not to "mind Zibebu," Mr. Fynney's council was somewhat difficult to follow while Zibebu was so shamefully ill-treating them.

Their story continues: "Then Maduna assented with a heavy heart, saying, 'Very well, sir; I, too, see that I should not go on in defiance of two *amadoda* (*men* in a complimentary sense, i. e. Mr. Fynney and Mr. Osborn), who warn me not to go. I have no wish whatever to assert myself (*qwaga*, "bluster"), and I will go back—but not home, for I have no home left to go to. To what home should I go back, since I have no place (given to me) at all? Sir, if you send me back, it is you who should find a place for me to live in [i. e. me and my people]. And although I shall ask for the pass from Malimati, as I am told to do, will he give it, since he has already refused it more than once?'

"Said Mr. Fynney, 'No! what I say is, just go back. All this [trouble from Zibebu] is nothing. Do not, because you see a three days' rain frowning upon you, suppose that it will never be fine weather again. Just go back. I am giving you good advice. I wish that you should not put yourself the least in the wrong. You imagine that I have given you up (thrown you over). No, son of Mpande, I am just as before (as much your friend as ever).'

"Said Maduna, 'Sir, I speak because I really do not see where I am to go back to.'

"Mr. Fynney replied, 'That will be for you to decide [that is your own affair] when you have been to the Resident. When he has given you the pass,* it will be for you to decide whether you will rest for a few days, or whether you will come back here at once [and cross over into Natal].'

Of course they never got the pass. The object of Government was to make it appear that Sir G. Wolseley's

* But what if Mr. Osborn should *not* give them the pass, as in fact he did not?

settlement was a success, that Cetshwayo's return was not desired, and that the Zulus were becoming quite contented under the rule of the thirteen kinglets.

The advice given by Mr. Fynney that they should go back and remain quiet, however kindly meant, played into the hands of Government, as perhaps even did that of the Bishop of Natal, with this difference that he could (and did) show them how rightly and peacefully they might obtain the favours for which they begged, whereas for Mr. Finney to do so would have been for him to act in opposition to the wish of the Government under which he served, who did not desire that the petition for Cetshwayo's restoration should be brought forward, whether peacefully and properly or the reverse.

(B.) *Official and Zulu Accounts of Interviews between Mr. Osborn and the Great Deputation, compared.*

OFFICIAL ACCOUNT.

Notes of an Interview with Cetshwayo's Brothers and Zulu Chiefs by the British Resident [3247, p. 67], Maritzburg, April 21, 1882.

The Resident states: "I received the communications by Umfunzi and others on last Sunday, and subsequent days.† But before saying anything further, I

ZULU ACCOUNT.*

On Friday, April 21, sending on messengers to announce them, the whole party set out to present themselves to the authorities. They were met first by Mr. Osborn's induna, who hurried back to him; whereupon Mr. Osborn himself came out and met and stopped them at some distance from the city. He

* Given also in Blue Book [3466, pp. 29, &c.].

† This is in allusion to the messengers sent on beforehand by the chiefs of the deputation to announce its approach to the Government, and to beg Mr Osborn to introduce them on their arrival [p 168].

wish to know who are present from Zululand."

Undabuko (Maduna), brother of Cetshwayo, and Usiwetu (Ziwedu), Tshingana (Shingana), Siteku, and Dabulamanzi, half-brothers, then gave the names of the chiefs and headmen present.

In answer to Resident:

Undabuko and his half-brothers state:—

"We were on our way to Maritzburg when you met us here just now.* We were going to see the Governor about the matters reported to you in town by Sobuza and the others who were sent by us. We sent to ask you to introduce us to the Governor. It was our intention to go first to you, and ask you to take us to the Governor. We wish you to open the gate for us to enable us to see the Governor [i. e. to use your influence on our behalf]."

Resident: "How can I do this? You came here without any reference to me, and against the directions I gave

took aside the representatives of the three kinglets, the five Princes, and all the chiefs and headmen. First he blamed the Princes for coming down without his leave; but they reminded him that they had asked him for a pass, and had sent again to tell him that they must now go down without one, and they stated further that they were now brought down by the three appointed chiefs.†

Mr. Osborn admitted that they had sent to tell him. Then he asked what had the deputation come for? What word did they wish to speak? Said they, "We have already reported to you, sir, our object. We have come to pray the English Government to give us back Cetshwayo. That is the one thing which we have come down about, for as to our other troubles, they all arise from want of him. And, besides, we have continually reported them to you, sir, and we say that all those

* Observe the correctness of the beginning of the Zulu account, omitted from this one.

† i. e. by their representatives, the appointed chiefs having a right to the Resident's permission to communicate with the Governor. (See "Instructions to Resident" [2482, p. 261, &c.])

you when you applied for my consent to come to the Governor. You know that you have done wrong in this, and that you should have awaited the Governor's reply.

Usiwetu: "It is true you said we were to wait for the Governor's reply to your letter; but, as you know, we are in great trouble, as I reminded you at the time. We did not like to wait, in consequence. We came here. We could not wait."

Resident: "Are the chiefs and representatives of chiefs who are present come here with the consent of the appointed chiefs in whose territories they live? I speak to you all."

Undabuko: "We all are here for the Zulu people to ask for Cetshwayo's return. We all have come of our own accord to ask for him who was the prop (*insika*) who kept up the Zulus."

Usiwetu: "We wish to speak to the Governor about two matters: the one, to ask for the Inkosi (*Cetshwayo*); the other, to tell him of the

matters are now in your hands." Mr. Osborn wrote, and then asked who were represented in the deputation, and wrote their names down as they were pointed out and named to him, all the chiefs and all the headmen. But when they said, "And we count also the other five appointed chiefs: we say that all the eight are with us, as before," he said "What is the good of your counting those, since they will deny it as before?" Said they "No, sir, they are with us at heart, and, when they denied, it was because they were frightened by Sir E. Wood, and by Sotondose (late induna at the Resident's), who warned them to deny." Then said Mr. Osborn, "Well, I hear your words, and I do not refuse to report you; but I do not know what the Governor will say, since you have broken his law by coming down without my leave. He will ask me, 'Where is their pass from you?'"

Then a man of *Seketwayo's* spoke, and said "No, sir!"

* Either "Yes" or "No" is frequently used as an exclamation at the beginning of a Zulu sentence, without any actual affirmative or negative meaning.

killing and ill-usage to which we are subjected. We did not think that we were doing wrong in coming here without a letter [pass], as we knew we should find you here, and that we could talk to you, and tell you our pressing wish to see the Governor, and we considered [? thought] that the Governor would see us. We are in such trouble as no other people ever have been. We have no homes, and we have the difficulty of providing food for our children before us. We had everything taken from us. You know the great trouble we are in. We all ask you to help us to get permission to see the Governor."

At this stage several of the chiefs present stated they

You should not find fault with the Princes; they have no word (responsibility) in this matter. They have not come down independently, in defiance of you, but are brought by these three appointed chiefs, indeed by the eight appointed chiefs; for did they not send down messengers and money [i. e. on the former occasion]?* And even Hamu, sir, ought to be counted, since he prayed for Cetshwayo's return to Sir E. Wood when he came to Zululand with the lady [the Empress Eugénie], and that fact was told to Cetshwayo by Sir E. Wood himself."† Mr. Osborn wrote again, and said, "Well, I will take your words to the Governor, and you shall hear

* The Zulus had at last learnt the necessity of putting the kinglets forward as the most important of the petitioners, but for a long time their respect for the King's family had made it very difficult to realise this, and no doubt the fact of their asking for passes in the name of Maduna (Ndabuko), in their eyes the greatest man in the country, had often supplied a plausible excuse for the Resident's refusals. He must have known the difficulty, and could readily have set them right had he wished to help them to obtain their desire, but, as that would have been quite contrary to the wishes of the Government, such kindness on his part was hardly to be expected.

† They had heard this from Mkosana, on his return from Capetown. Hamu, though a worthless fellow, would never have rebelled against Cetshwayo had he not been put up to it, and "egged on" by his white advisers.

and all there have come to ask the Governor to give back Cetshwayo to the Zulus. All the Zulus want him restored as their Inkosi. They, the chiefs present, ask to be allowed to speak to the Governor.

Resident: "You have broken the rule well known to you in coming here as you have done without a reference from me. By introducing you to the Governor as you wish me to do I also would break the rule.* This I cannot consent to do, and I therefore tell you that I cannot comply with your request. I cannot bring you to the Governor. If you, Undabuko and Usiwetu, had followed my direction when you made your application, things might have been different now.† Had you

from me. I do not know if I shall see him to-night or to-morrow, as there is a great deal of other business going on. You can send in some one to hear if I have any word for you." So on Saturday (April 22) they sent in Mfunzi, with some men whose names had not been taken down, and with the word which the men from chief Dunn's territory brought in addition to their prayers for Cetshwayo, viz. that they had heard on all sides that Dunn had said that they had paid taxes to him wishing to prevent Cetshwayo's return. They came to protest against this, as they earnestly desired to have their own King again and utterly disliked J. Dunn.‡

* In reading these and the like plausible sentences, it must be remembered how persistently the Resident had refused them passes or evaded their requests.

† Easy to say so, but not so easy to persuade these men to believe it, after the uniform repressive treatment from which they had suffered.

‡ It is to be observed that this feeling against J. Dunn and his misrepresentation of their motives in paying the taxes he imposed was strongly put forward at every interview, which fact is enough in itself to show how absurd were the suspicions to which Sir H. Bulwer tenaciously clung, in spite of the Bishop's full explanation, that Dabulamanzi and his party were prompted in their repudia-

waited a few days, the Governor's answer to your application would have been received, and I told you at the time I should ask him to grant it.* You have acted, knowingly, outside of my direction and the rule well known to you. I therefore cannot help you now. This is my answer so far as your request to me is concerned. I have informed the Governor of your messages received by me in Maritzburg and of your desire to see him. The Governor says you have come here without my consent and against the direction I gave to Undabuko and Usiwetu to await his reply to the application. Also that I was not informed of what now appears to be the main subject on which you all seek to see him, and which is a very important question.† He says that you have disregarded the

tion of J. Dunn at Bishopstowe, where, in fact, until after all these interviews, except the very last between Sir H. Bulwer and Dabulamanzi, the latter and his party had never been.

* And did so with the rider, "I must, however, at same time point out that Sir Evelyn Wood, in his despatch [3247, p. 60] to me of the 7th of November last, refused to grant a similar application from the same persons on the grounds therein stated by him."

† It is only necessary to read over Sir H. Bulwer's and the Resident's own despatches in Blue Books, 3247, 3466, and others, to see that this professed ignorance of the real desire of the petitioning Zulus was a mere farce.

rule well known to you all in coming here as you have done, and that for these and other reasons [? what other] he declines to see you."

Usiwetu then addressed me very earnestly. He dwelt upon the urgency and seriousness of the question upon which all the chiefs present wished to see the Governor—that they are not come for themselves alone, but are here for all the Zulus. He urged me to represent this to the Governor. They want to tell him the words of the Zulus. They have come to see the Governor and have "arrived at the gate." If I cannot open it for them, they wish me to tell the Governor these their words in order that some means may be found by which "the gate may be opened" for them. Siteku and Undabukospoke to similar effect but more briefly.

Several of the chiefs said they wish to see the Governor to tell him the request of all the Zulus. They ask me to say this to the Governor.

Resident: "I have heard your words, and I will tell the Governor what you have said."

(Signed) M. OSBORN,
British Resident, Zululand.

Notes of Interview between British Resident, Zululand, and Cetshwayo's Brothers and Zulu Chiefs this day, April 24, 1882, p. 70.

Resident: "I have informed the Governor of what you said to me on Friday last. The Governor says he cannot see you, but at same time he is willing to hear what you wish him to know. He says you must tell me what you want to represent to him, and I am to bring your words to him. You all know that, as the eyes and ears of the Government,* I have to hear for the Governor anything any one may wish him to know. I am now prepared to hear and write for the Governor to read the words you wish him to know."

A pause ensuing, the Resident said to Umpece, Sobuza, and Matshobana: "The Governor directed me to tell you that if the chiefs Seketwayo, Faku, and Somkeli † wish to see him, he will be glad to see them and hear them. If they cannot come personally, he has no objection to receive

On Sunday (April 23, 1882), Mr. Osborn's induna came and told them that Mr. Osborn said that "on Monday he would come out to them as before, but they must not bring the whole party to meet him." But when he came on Monday (April 24), the bulk of the people objected to being left out, saying, "We came of ourselves, we are all interested in the matter, we cannot be left out;" and sent Mboko to say so to Mr. Osborn. So he agreed, and called them, and they made a semicircle around him and the four indunas from the S.N.A. Office (Luzindela, Kilane, Dabe, and Tom), and a white youth who accompanied him. He then told the heads of the deputation to speak.

So Mbenge began, saying, "We have come, sir, I from Seketwayo, bringing these Princes. Seketwayo says, 'Sirs, you have corrected us enough; give us back Cetshwayo.'" Sobuza said, "I, sir, come from Faku; I bring these Princes because Faku

* Truly they had found him to be blind eyes and deaf ears hitherto to their side of the story.

† The three kinglets represented by the men addressed.

and hear any of their chief men they choose to send to appear for them provided the visit of the chiefs or their representatives be first arranged through me as you all know it is necessary should be done.*

says, 'Sirs, you have given us a lesson; a child is beaten, and then forgiven by its father. We say, it is enough, sirs; give us back Cetshwayo.' Then Matshobana said, "I come from Somkele. He says that he brings down these Princes. He says, 'It is our own friends who have so hurt us [i.e. our friends the English], but the child is now sufficiently corrected.' We ask for Cetshwayo, sirs, that you should give him to us into our hands." Mbenge then spoke again, saying, "We name these three chiefs, but they all [all the eight kinglets of the previous deputations] say the same. They are silenced only by that announcement that Cetshwayo was a scoundrel (ishinga), who had been turned out of his kingship."

Malimati: "But those chiefs themselves deny it. When they are asked they deny."

Mbenge: "Those chiefs saw that you, sir, punished people for that [praying for Cetshwayo's return]. How

* And which the Resident had refused to do, in spite of his "Instructions."

could they approach you with that word, when they saw others had been punished for it?"

Malimati: "I have spoken all your words to the Governor. I named the three appointed chiefs, and said that they had brought the Princes. He said to me, 'They have come by a bad road since they have come without your leave. Let the three representatives go back, and let the chiefs themselves come to me, or, if they cannot come themselves, let them send their chief men to speak to me.'"

"As you have come here without any such previous arrangement, the Governor cannot receive you."

Sobuza: "We, who are sent by Faku, Somkeli, and Seketwayo to pray for the 'Inkosi' (Cetshwayo) are chief men — there are no greater men. No others can be sent."

Resident: "The Governor would not object to see you if you are properly sent. In this case you came here without previous arrangement with me."

Umbenge: "I come from Seketwayo and am his brother. Sobuza is the brother of Faku, and Matshobana of Somkeli. Our chiefs said

Mbenge: "No, sir, they have no men higher than ourselves to send. Seketwayo sends me (his brother) of his own flesh. It is himself who has come, since I have come. Pray, sir, get leave for us to reach the Governor, since truly Seketwayo himself has come in me."

Sobuza: "And at home there is no headman better than I. I am Faku's own brother, and he himself as come, since I have come. We say, sir, that we have fulfilled all the con-

we are to ask you to help them in their prayer for Cetshwayo, and to enable us to approach the Governor to prefer the prayer. They say when a man beats his child he afterwards wipes his child's tears."

Resident: "I have already told you that I cannot take you to the Governor. The Governor will not see you unless you come to him in accordance with his conditions, which, although known to you, I have again explained to you."

Umbenge: "We heard that you were here, and we came to you to help us into the way to approach the Governor. We did not come here with the view of not applying to you in the first place."

Resident: "I have already told you what I have to say about this."

Sobuza: "We are all here, and we have found you here, and we ask you as a favour (ngo moya umuhle) to obtain for us an interview with the Governor. We have come

ditions,* since we have come to you here, you being the right person to introduce us to the Governor."

Matshobane: "We are, then, in the right, sir, since we have come to you, and ask you to take us to the Governor. We pray you to do so, sir. I am Somkele's own flesh—his younger brother; he has sent a piece of himself in sending me."

Resident: "Yes, I understand what you say there, and I must take these words back to the Governor."

And he first wrote, and then read over to them what he had written, all their words, and said, "Yes, I will go again, and ask the Governor to see you, as I did also the day before yesterday."

Then the whole assembly said, "We thank you, sir. We have not come in disregard of you, but have come to you, for you to take us on to the Governor."

Resident: "Very well, men! I understand that you have not come in disregard of me, but have come to me."

* The conditions, i. e. first, that the representatives of the kinglets should be chief men; secondly, that they should be introduced by the Resident, and come with his sanction.

here to see him, and cannot return till our hearts are satisfied."

[The following speech seems to have been accidentally misplaced, and should probably occur at page 309, opposite the speech of Mbenge, commencing: "Those chiefs," &c., in the Zulu account.]

Umbenge: "We, who are sent by the three [appointed] chiefs, would have gone first to you at the Inhlazatshe, but, hearing that you were here, we came straight to you, and we ask you, as 'umoya umnandi'* (favour or kindness), to help us to obtain an interview with the Governor. We came to you, and did not go to others first,† and we are still talking to you; we, and all of us here, wish very much to see the Governor to pray for our 'Inkosi' (King). The other (appointed) chiefs who joined our three chiefs in the former prayer for the Inkosi got frightened at General Wood's words, spoken

But I cannot take you in all at once, whether the Governor wills it or not. I am under him you know, and must ask him properly on your behalf. Let two men come in, that I may ask in their presence; for I am not deceiving you in any way, and the day before yesterday also I spoke your very words."

* "*umoya umnandi*" = "pleasant breeze."

† This is strictly true, in spite of Sir H. Bulwer's groundless assertion that they came, not to the Government, but to the Bishop, simply because they let him know, as their friend, that they were coming to Government.

at the Inhlazatshe meeting, and they therefore denied having joined in the prayer."

Sobuza: "Nothing wrong has been done [by us]. We found you, our chief, here. We came to you first. We ask you to help us to see the Governor, that we may satisfy our hearts. We ask you to do us this kindness."

Uvunda: "We thought that this time we were doing right, as you are here. We found you here, and seek through you an interview with the Governor."

Resident: "You have heard the Governor's decision. The Governor is willing to hear what you have to say, but it must be said through me."

Undabuko: "Will you tell us whether you reported to the Governor all our troubles as reported to you by us? Will you enumerate them to us now, so that we may judge whether you did report them?"*

Then he said: "We have now finished speaking of your prayer, so let us speak of your troubles up to to-day."

Mjubane (induna of Mnyamana): "But why, sir, should we begin and tell you our troubles all over again, when

* The Zulus do not report Undabuko as speaking here at all, and it is most improbable either that they should have omitted anything said by one whom they all held in such honour, or that he should have spoken himself in this way, instead of, according to Zulu custom, allowing his followers to speak for him. Whatever speech is here represented, is probably mistakenly put into the

Resident : “ I will not enumerate, but I can tell you that I did report to the Governor all you reported to me.”

Umtyupana (Mjubane) : “ I will give an account of our grievances : first, Uhamu, before he seized our, i. e. Umnyamana’s, cattle, sent word by Kwabiti and another to Umnyamana that the Resident had told him that he must use force against Umnyamana (bamba ngamandhla), and that he does not do so because Umnyamana is his father [figuratively speaking. This old Prime Minister of Umpande always calls the latter’s sons his own children]. Umnyamana said at the time he did not believe it, and suspected Uhamu of planning some evil against him. Uhamu demanded cattle from him for living in his territory [made his only by Sir G. Wolseley]. Umnyamana sent him 100 head. Umnyamana then sent to the Resident first 70 head and then 30 head of royal cattle. After

we have told them all to you from the beginning?”

Malimati : “ That is just why you must repeat them to me now, that I may report them to the Governor.” And he insisted that they should do so.

Mjubane : “ Mnyamana’s trouble is Hamu, who began by making us pay cattle for living in his land, and Mnyamana paid 100 head. Next came messengers from you, sir, saying to Hamu, ‘ Why do you not eat up Mnyamana? Do you not see how Zibebu and John Dunn are acting?’ But Hamu objected, saying, ‘ How can I eat up Mnyamana, who is a father to me, and has always protected me?’ But at the fourth messenger from you, sir, he did it, and ate up 2800 head of Mnyamana’s cattle. Mnyamana then reported it to you, and you told him that you would speak to Hamu, and then would call him, Mnyamana. And when you called them, Hamu sent indunas, but Mnyamana

mouth of Undabuko, who, possessing much of his brother Cetshwayo’s quiet dignity, was most unlikely to make a hasty or defiant speech such as this is made to appear.

that Uhamu sent an impi to Umnyamana, and ate him up with his tribe. A large number of kraals got all their corn, &c., taken by the impi. The impi seized altogether over 2800 head of cattle from Umnyamana and his people. You, the Resident, inquired into the matter, and said you could decide nothing about it, as you are there only to see and hear. You would report to the Governor. Uhamu said he did all this on the Resident's order, but we could never find any messenger from the Resident with the eating-up parties. The appointed chiefs say they are sent by the Resident to eat us up. When we spoke to the Resident about this, he denied having authorised them to do this. He asked if we saw any of our seized cattle come to him, and we

came himself. And you questioned them, and heard, and denied that you had sent those messages; and a man of Hamu's jumped up and said, 'Did you not say it to me, sir, when I was at the Residency?'"

Resident: "Yes, I know that they say that they were set on by me."*

Mjubane: "And you said, sir, that it was not your affair, you had only to report, and would report this to the Governor. And at last Mnyamana sent me to you with a young ox, to ask what had become of your report. And you said that the report was lost with the Governor, who was killed by the Boers, and that it was then four days only since you had sent a fresh copy. Then we waited, and waited, until Sir E. Wood came [to Inhlazatshe], who

* The Resident himself says on Sept. 27, 1881 [3182, p. 118]: "If it be true that the Aba Qulusi have eaten up Msebe's tribe, I am unable to advise Hamu against the adoption of such measures as to him may appear necessary, and within his power, to uphold his authority, and prevent rebellion within his territory." Yet the seizure of the cattle of the Msebe people (unattended by slaughter) was made in retaliation for the seizures made by Hamu the day before. And such words as those quoted by the Resident as his own, although a negative form of permission, would certainly convey a distinct consent to Hamu's proceedings.

answered 'No.' When the inquiry was over, the Resident said he would send the report to the Governor. Some delay occurred by the Boer war breaking out, and the Governor getting killed, and the matter remained over until Lukuni (General Wood) arrived at Inhlazatshe, when he decided it. He said the 'Inkosi' (Cetshwayo) was '*ishinga*' [a scoundrel], who was deposed for his wrongdoing. He also spoke badly of the 'Inkosi's' brothers. John Dunn and Usibebu he thanked for having killed Sitimela's party. To Umnyamana he awarded 700 head of cattle against Uhamu, leaving over 2000 still in Uhamu's possession. Awhile after this, the Resident, at Umnyamana's request, sent messengers with Umnyamana's men to ask Uhamu about the 700 head of cattle he had to hand over to Umnyamana. Uhamu's reply was that he would not restore the cattle, as he seized them from Umnyamana on the express order of the Resident. He had no wish to harm Umnyamana, as he was his father, but the Resident insisted on his eating him up.

said, 'Mnyamana, Hamu has done wrong in eating you up when you had not quarrelled, he shall give you back 700 head of cattle [out of 2800, of which he had been robbed by Hamu]. And when Mnyamana wanted to speak, and to say, 'Sir, what we want is Cetshwayo,' he was stopped, and was told to be silent. And at last, sir, you told Mnyamana to tell off four men, who should go with two of your policemen to Hamu for the cattle. And when they came to him he said, 'What have I done that Malimati takes the cattle from me to-day, when he ordered me to eat them up at first? It was altogether his doing, and he is responsible.' And you told Mnyamana to be quiet, and you would see about it, and that is the last that we have heard of it, sir."

Malimati: "Yes, but what can I do, since you heard that he accuses me? who can bear witness for himself? It must be done for him by others."

Mahubulmana: "And Hamu says that a fifth and sixth messenger came from you, sir, telling him to kill the Aba Qulusi."

Uhamu asked to have sent to him the messengers of the Resident who brought the orders to him. He also said that if any trouble arose out of what he had done, he would not be blamed alone. The Resident should also be blamed. The Resident had told him to use force, as Usibebu and John Dunn did. After this we heard that the Resident had sent again to Uhamu on the matter, but we do not know what reply he got. We have also heard that Uhamu asserts that the Resident ordered him to kill the Aba Qulusi, and that he will not give up the 700 cattle of Umnyamana, as decided by General Wood. The appointed chiefs eat us up and kill us, and they openly say that they do so by order of the Resident. Uhamu sent to say this to the Resident by his, the latter's, own messengers, and he did nothing about it. Uhamu asks to have the messengers sent to him who brought to him the Resident's orders that he must eat up Umnyamana, and they were not sent. You, the Resident, tell us that you did not give these orders to the chiefs, but we wish you to say this to

the Governor in our presence, to satisfy us. We therefore want to see the Governor."

Utyanibezwe (son of Umnyamana): "We did not believe that you did order Uhamu to 'bulala' (destroy) us; but as Uhamu openly says you did, and said so to your own messengers, and as you take no notice of it, we do not know what to think."

Resident: "I reported to the Governor everything Uhamu said about the matter."

Umtuyupana [Mjubane]: "Umfanawendhlela sent Umpumpa to eat up some kraals of Umnyamana's people. This, it was said, was done on the Resident's order. Umnyamana spoke to Umpumpa, who told him that he personally received the order from the Resident himself. Umnyamana informed the Resident hereof, and he denied any knowledge of Umpumpa and having given any order of the kind. He also said that he would send for Umpumpa to inquire about it, but we have not heard that he has done so."

Uvoko: "The Chief Umgojana seized my cattle immediately after he left the Inhlazatshe at conclusion of

Mjubane: "And Mfanawendhlela also ate up cattle belonging to eight chiefs (naming them), and he said the same thing, that you had told him to do it. And Mnyamana reported this to you, sir."

Malimati: "Yes, that's what they all say, that I told them to do it." (Malimati was writing down all the time.)

Mvoko: "Mgojana himself told me, sir, that you had ordered him to eat up my cattle, because I had gone

General Wood's meeting. He said the Resident ordered him to seize my cattle because I worked with Undabuko in praying for the Bone, and that he, the Resident, gave my cattle to him (Umgojana) to keep for himself. The appointed chiefs do these things to us always after they have been to see you, and say they do them on your orders."

Marubulana: "Umfunzi's cattle were seized by Siunguza, who said he did so on order of the Resident. The chiefs oppress us and kill us, alleging that you order them to do these things. You will see now how proper it is that we should see the Governor. The chief Uhamu told us that it was on your order he acted."

with Ndabuko to pray for Cetshwayo, saying to him, "Eat up Mvoko, who has been reporting to the authorities that you too pray for Cetshwayo! Eat him up, since you deny it! For the authorities say that I should eat you up if you have prayed."

Malimati: "Who is this speaking?" They said, "Sir, it is Mvoko." Said he, "Yes, I know him," and was silent.

Mahubulwana: "And Siwunguza, when he ate up Mfunzi, said that you, sir, had sent to him, saying, 'Eat up Mfunzi—who has been going with Ndabuko to pray for the bone of that scoundrel (ishinga) whom we have turned out—since Mfunzi is under you!' Here, sir, is Mjwapuma, who was sent to say this to Mfunzi. And to me myself Siwunguza said, 'Malimati says, "How will you draw the spear out of your own body* if you do not punish Mahubulwana and Mfunzi, who have gone praying for the 'Bone'?"' Siwunguza went with us to the mis-

* Meaning, "How will you prove that you did not send the men to pray for the King, if you do not now punish them for going?"

Undabuko : “ You wrote down the reports we made to you about our troubles, and said you would send them by letter to the Governor ; after that we saw and got nothing but ‘ impis.’ ”

Usiwetu (Ziwedu) : “ We wish you to show us your letters to the Governor. Let all of us here know what you wrote. We heard that you did send letters, but we do not know what answer was received about our having been eaten up. I ask an answer.”

Resident : “ The letters reporting the seizure of your cattle by Usibebu were sent to the Governor, and General Wood decided the matter. He was Governor at the time, and you all asked to have the question submitted to him.”

Usiwetu (Ziwedu) : “ I was not allowed to speak to

sionary Zimela (Mr. Robertson), and spoke before him, saying, ‘ I am under orders to eat up Mfunzi, because he went with the Princes to pray for the Bone ! ’ Zimela said, ‘ I have no voice in the matter if you have been ordered to eat him up ; but I will write a letter to ask about it.’ And he sent a letter.

Makulumane : “ Mfanawendhlela said that you ordered him to eat us up for going to meet [protect] Ndadabuko when he fled from Zibebu.”

Malimati said “ H’m ! ” only, but wrote always.

Ziwedu : “ Before we go on, sir, you should tell us what has become of the report which you wrote when you heard us and Zibebu together since you told us that you had reported them. But Zibebu sent to tell us that ‘ we need not think that *our* words had gone in that letter, for that you, sir, had deceived us, and sent his words only.’ And then we were called to meet Lukuni (Sir E. Wood), and then indeed it appeared that Zibebu’s words had come true. It is of no use for us to speak here to you on the hillside, since

General Wood about the matter, and know not whether your letters to him contained the words I spoke to you. It must be on the words contained in your letters that we lost [our cause] before General Wood, and I do not know that my words were properly set forth therein, as I spoke them to you. When General Wood gave his decision, we were at once followed by destruction. Your letters, I suppose, will be with the Government, and it is therefore also that we should be allowed to see the 'Makosi.' We want your letters to the Governor about us to be laid open before the 'bandhla' (assembly) in the presence of the Governor, that we may see the things they contain, which caused our destruction immediately after General Wood's decision. Nothing but killing and eating up followed us."

Undabuko : " I agree in this, and say we cannot be satisfied with speaking to you as we are doing here. We are going in there [pointing to the town], and will speak to the Makosi, to satisfy our hearts. We will not talk over matters here in the

you yourself say that you cannot bear witness for yourself. But take us, sir, to the Governor, and let the whole business be made plain, since the persecutors all say that it is your doing."

Malimati : " I am quite willing. I will ask the Governor properly for you. You can only come if he allows it, and then perhaps I too shall get cleared."

But he did not write down Ziwedú's words.

veldt (sikoteni) with you. We want to talk before all the great men in town. We have come here to do this, and we are going to town at once with this object. You have always prevented us from seeing the Governor, and you are now doing it again. We will not be prevented. We are going into town to see the Makosi." Usiteku then spoke, several others speaking at the same time. No consecutive account could be taken of what he said. I distinctly heard him say, however, that I was purposely preventing them to get to the Governor [*sic*] to screen myself. I heard similar remarks by others.* Order being restored, Usiwetu (Ziwedu): "I was very sorry, as I knew not what I had done to merit the trouble

* For the reasons already given it is highly improbable that the speech above assigned to Ndabuko was actually spoken by him. Perhaps the remark which occurs at this point in the Zulu account (see p. 321), "*But he did not write down Ziwedu's words,*" may explain the mistake. If Mr. Osborn paused in his note-taking just here, as, apparently, he did, and wrote down one or two of the speeches from memory afterwards, such an error might easily occur; and, if a particularly vehement speech were recalled with any doubt as to the speaker, it would probably be set down to Ndabuko, whom Government, without, however, the smallest grounds except his near relationship to Cetshwayo, persisted in regarding as a most turbulent Prince.

that overtook us immediately after General Wood's decision. General Wood did not write the letters. You wrote them. They are with the Government. I want to see them in Maritzburg, not here in the veldt (open field)."

At this stage several exclamations came from the assembly: that they have come to see the Makosi in Maritzburg, and not to talk to me in the veldt, and they will not be prevented by me, but will all go straight into town.*

Resident: "You all know the Governor's words in reference to your coming here, as I have delivered them to you. I did not know that you were going to say these things against me. Under the circumstances I will report to the Governor what you have said. I advise you not to go into town, but send two men to me to-morrow to hear what words may be sent to you. I do not say that there will be anything to tell you by them, but there may be. As the sun is near setting, I

* It is curious, however, that they did not make the slightest attempt to do so, and that their *actions* throughout were characterised by the utmost patience and docility.

think the meeting had better disperse."

Undabuko and *Usiwetu* together: "We agree to your suggestion, and will send in two men to you to-morrow."

Dabulamanzi: "I and all these with me here are from chief John Dunn's territory. We pray for our Inkosi (ex-King). A man beats his child and says he is warned. When we left our kraals we heard John Dunn had said he would call to account any one from his territory who came to join in the prayer,† as he will not allow it. We hear that John Dunn says we pay taxes to him because we like him, and do not want our Inkosi (Cetshwayo) back. It is not true: we do want him back. Let John Dunn be sent for and confronted with us before the Governor. When we return, we fear, we shall be killed, as John Dunn killed the Umtetwas under Sitimela. He spared none. We want you to say this to

Dabulamanzi: "Yes, sir! * I speak for all the people living under John Dunn. We have come after you, sir, to beg you to speak for us to the Governor. We have come to pray for Cetshwayo. I speak for the whole of us. We have been deceived. For when John Dunn ordered us to pay taxes we did it for peace, that our huts might not be burnt over our heads; whereas now we hear that John Dunn says that we paid them to prevent Cetshwayo's return. He has hereby slandered us, and we are indignant at it, for our whole desire is for Cetshwayo."

Malimati wrote here.

Dabulamanzi continued: "We should like John Dunn to be called, and let him speak to our face, and let us

* A common form of commencement, not implying that anything has gone before.

† John Dunn had told them that they would "need a rope to reach from heaven to earth to climb to safety by," which speech was afterwards quite wrongly put into Ndabuko's mouth by Sir H. Bulwer.

the Governor. We told him (Dunn) we were coming, and did not hide it from him."

answer him. We do not wish to accuse him behind his back. The truth is that we are in trouble—unhappy—just for want of Cetshwayo." And the whole party from J. Dunn's district here held up their hands, saying, "Yes, sir, that is our word! We have come to the authorities to tell them our great grief, for our heart was broken when we lost Cetshwayo, and it has never healed. But as we crossed the Tugela to come here, John Dunn's *impi*, we heard, was arriving at our homes, saying, 'And, if you do go, let us see where you will come back to, if you fail in getting what you are going to ask for. We shall kill you!' And we see, sir, that we shall be killed,* as John Dunn has already killed people in Mlandela's tribe, men, women, and children. All this we pray you to speak for us, and let it be known that we have nowhere to go back to peaceably.

"Some of us went to tell John Dunn that we were coming here, and he answered

* In what page of history can be found devotion truer and deeper than that of these men who, for the sake of a shadowy hope of their King's return, thus risked homes, families, lives and all?

nothing. It was only afterwards that he sent to say he should punish us."

Malimati: "I have heard you, men. Let two men come into town with me."

The following comments are made officially upon these interviews:—

Sir Henry Bulwer writes [3247, p. 65] (April 29th, 1882), "The tone adopted by Undabuko and Usiwetu towards the Resident at the second interview was exceedingly disrespectful and overbearing. They charged him with not reporting their words to the Government. They demanded that his letters to the Government about them should be laid open before their assembly in the presence of the Governor. They said they would not talk over matters in the veldt with him, but *would* go into town and see the Governor, and talk before all the great men in town. They had come to do this and would do it.

"The behaviour of these men towards the Resident on this occasion accords well, I am told, with their general character and the pretensions to which, as brothers of the ex-King, they lay claim, Undabuko especially being well known for a most overbearing disposition;* and it will be remembered that it was their rebellious conduct towards their

* There are not the slightest grounds for this accusation. Undabuko (well known to the present writer) is a man of dignified but gentle manners, not unlike those of his brother, and his extreme forbearance and patient endurance under the most trying circumstances is only to be explained by his devotion to his brother's cause, and determination to do nothing to its prejudice. Of course, if the white men set over him by the fortunes of war expected *servility* as well as courtesy from him, and that he would naturally play the part of the "common person" whom they had the ill-breeding to tell him that he had now become, they would be disappointed.

appointed chief, Usibebu, which led to their being obliged to leave his territory." *

Again, Mr. J. Shepstone writes, on April 28th, 1882, "I informed them that Mr. Osborn had reported . . . that at the second meeting they had behaved discourteously towards him," &c. [*ibid.* p. 73], but closes his account with the words, "These men were most respectful in their behaviour," &c., while his memorandum of his interview with the Zulus two days later contains the following passage from their mouths [*ibid.*, p. 74]: "We are told particularly to say that there was no desire or intention to behave disrespectfully to Mr. Osborn, for Undabuko and others, at his (Mr. Osborn's) request, simply repeated the grievances that had been repeated to him in Zululand. † . . . We see that we have done wrong [in coming without a pass] now that it is pointed out to us by you, but, in following Mr. Osborn into Natal, we did not think we were doing wrong. We have nothing further to say. All we had to say, and have had to say, even in Zululand, we have stated to Mr. Osborn, and it was on being asked by him what we had come about that led us to think [*sic* in Blue Book] that the grievances that we had reported to him in Zululand had not been forwarded to the Governor."

Again, at page 229 of Blue Book [3466] appears a despatch from Sir H. Bulwer to the Earl of Kimberley, enclosing reports from Mr. J. Shepstone, Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, and Mr. Osborn, upon the "Account of the great Zulu deputation from a Zulu point of view," namely,

* Not at all. On the contrary, it was Zibebu's wanton ill-treatment that obliged the Princes to leave his territory, i. e. Zibebu drove them out with fire and sword, without provocation on their part.

† This mention of Undabuko's name does not necessarily imply that he was one of the actual speakers upon the grievances. His name, in this "statement," is put forward throughout, owing to the ineradicable feeling of the Zulus, that the King's immediate relatives were the most important persons amongst them.

the "Zulu account" given in these pages, and Sir H. Bulwer writes, "The British Resident points out and corrects the more important inaccuracies and errors which the account contains."

On turning to the "reports" [*ibid.*, p. 231], it may readily be observed that the objections made to the Bishop's account are either simply frivolous, or else absolutely without foundation. In illustration of the former assertion may be quoted the following passage from the Resident's report [*ibid.*]: "In the statement of Mvoko and Umsutynana to the Bishop it is alleged that I had refused to grant a pass to the applicants for it (Umsutu and Umyamana), but told them that, as 'I was going down myself to Maritzburg, I would speak of their affairs and troubles to the new chief, Sir H. Bulwer.' That this version of the reply given by me is untrue I need scarcely say. Your Excellency is aware that my answer to the applicants for the pass was as follows:—

" 'I am going to Maritzburg at once, and will lay your application before the Governor, and recommend him to grant it. I will tell you his decision when I return. It is necessary that I should first ask the Governor whether he will permit you to come to him.' "

The unofficial mind will find it somewhat difficult to understand in what lies the *untruth* of the first version quoted. It may be said to be condensed, or even incomplete, but why "untrue"? Mr. Osborn himself has made singularly *incomplete* quotations on this same subject, as when he writes to Sir H. Bulwer* as follows, on April 11th, 1882, upon the application of Undabuko and Usiwetu for a pass to go to Maritzburg and see the Governor: "I told them that I would recommend their application to your Excellency's favourable consideration, which I have now the honour to do. I must, however, at the same time point out that Sir Evelyn Wood, in his despatch to me of the 7th November

* Alluded to in note to p. 306, *supra*.

last, refused to grant a similar application from the same persons on the grounds therein stated by him."

It would have been impossible to more completely neutralise the effect of his professed "recommendation," yet he had told the Zulus that he would give the said recommendation, and takes credit for having done so, afterwards, in his speech to them on April 21st, 1882: "I told you at the time I should ask him to grant it" [3247, p. 67].

As an instance of entirely groundless assertions may be quoted the following from Mr. John Shepstone's report [3466, p. 230], that the deputation had "sent messengers to the Bishop *from Zululand* to say it was on its way"; in another place that "those messengers (i. e. the ones who came to Hamu and Zibebu professedly from the Resident, with suggestions for the punishment of those who prayed for Cetshwayo) did not inform the Resident nor the Secretary for Native Affairs that they were sent by any one," and that "no threats were used towards chief Dunn in the presence of the Governor as stated." While, amongst many other errors in the Resident's report, it will be enough to quote the monstrous statement, "I say it distinctly, that Umnyamana is opposed to Cetshwayo's restoration as King," and that "the announcement [of the deputation's approach] was sent to the Bishop (received by him on 11th April), and not to the Government, the Government being entirely ignored, and it was not till the 16th April that messengers came to me in Maritzburg and stated that the party had arrived, no previous intimation of their approach having been made."

Umnyamana's devotion to Cetshwayo, from first to last, has been proved a thousand times, and the statement about "the Government being entirely ignored" is too absurd, seeing that it rests on the simple fact that, *five days only before* the official announcement of the deputation's approach was made to Government, a private message was received by their friend the Bishop, telling him what they hoped to do. Mr. Osborn, by his phrase, "the party had arrived," without the words, "*at the Umgeni*," which should have followed, greatly exaggerates the situation, making it appear that the

Zulus had actually "arrived" at Maritzburg without giving notice of their approach, whereas they had only arrived at the Umgeni, ten or twelve miles distant, and waited there for permission to approach the city.

Of the really important differences between his own and the Zulu report, Mr. Osborn makes no mention, beyond asserting that he "made full and accurate report of everything. . . . All that was said at the different interviews on both sides was carefully written down by me at the time the words were spoken, and I took especial care to omit nothing. The account of the interviews given by the Zulus to the Bishop, I know not how long after they occurred, was from memory, and I assert that it is incorrect in every particular wherein it differs from the reports furnished by me."

This is an easy statement to make, but it is necessary to examine the two reports before giving it entire credit.

In those of the first meeting between the Resident and the whole body of Zulus, and the first portion of the second interview, it is plain enough that there is no serious divergence, nothing beyond a fuller report given of certain things, sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other, with the one serious exception, that the Zulus describe the Resident as *obliging* them to speak of their minor grievances (i. e. those other than Cetshwayo's absence, although resulting from that), while the Resident's report implies that they forced their complaints and accusations upon him.

As reasons for confidence in the accuracy of the Zulu report on this point may be mentioned, first, that they repeatedly allude to the fact of Mr. Osborn's having expressly questioned them upon these grievances;* secondly, that throughout their visit to Natal they showed keen anxiety to induce the Resident to stand their friend, and were, therefore, very unlikely to offend him if they could avoid doing so; and thirdly, because the Government policy throughout had been, and continued to be, to ignore as much

* See Blue Book 3247, p. 74, &c.

as possible all prayers for Cetshwayo, and to drag other matters into the foreground to the exclusion of his cause. It would have been so entirely in keeping with his own and Sir H. Bulwer's behaviour throughout* that the Resident should endeavour to divert the attention of the deputation from that great and inconvenient question to those smaller but more immediate troubles which were making the applicants' daily lives a burden to them, that it is hardly possible to doubt that he did so, perhaps hardly supposing that the Zulus would dare to speak out as they did when forced to speak at all.

This point of difference is the only one which has any bearing of the smallest importance on the real merits of the case until we come to the angry speeches attributed by Mr. Osborn to Undabuko, Ziwedu and Siteku,† towards the end of his report of the second interview.

English readers—not apt to expect or require absolute *servility* from the princes and chiefs, even of a conquered race, and taking into consideration the injuries these men had received, and all their vain efforts, during several years, to obtain a fraction of justice, or even mercy—may not readily discover the so-called insolence and disrespect of these speeches, as reported by the Resident. But in point of fact, there are certain reasons for thinking that a very much modified form of the said speeches might have been given with greater accuracy, and that even in the modified form they may not have been spoken by the men into whose mouths they are put in the official report.

It will be observed that up to a certain point (p. 320) the Zulus report that the Resident wrote down their words, and then occurs the mention of his ceasing to do so. Further on (p. 324) they say again, "Malimati [the Resident] wrote here." Now it is a fact worth remarking that it is in the

* Notably in the latter's interview with Dabulamanzi and his party.

† Three of the five Princes.

portion of Mr. Osborn's report which precisely corresponds with that which, according to the Zulus, *he did not write down at the time*, that the greater divergence between the two reports, and the angry speeches attributed by the Resident to the Princes, occur. It is impossible for any one to suggest that the Zulu account is garbled to produce this effect, for it was given immediately after the interviews, written down by the Bishop and Miss Colenso, and sent to England months before the publication of the official report.

What does seem probable is that this part of the Resident's report was filled up from memory afterwards, and was coloured, perhaps unconsciously, by his own annoyance at the charges which he had brought down upon himself, and the stedfast attitude of the Zulu petitioners. The universal omission of the respectful "Sir" ('Nkos'), also greatly takes from the air of respect with which the Zulus would certainly speak on such an occasion, all the more, perhaps, that they feared that what they had to say might not prove altogether palatable to those whom they desired to propitiate for Cetshwayo's sake, as well as for their own.

It is not difficult to account for the speeches which, in the Resident's account, directly accuse him of having instigated Zibebu and Hamu to "eat up" Cetshwayo's loyal subjects, but which, in the Zulus' own account, draw the delicate (and probable) distinction of *quoting the accusations of the persecutors*. We need not accuse Mr. Osborn of deliberately and distinctly bidding any of the four unpatriotic kinglets—the "knaves" afore-mentioned, chiefs Dunn, Hamu, Zibebu, and Mfanawendhlela—to punish those who "prayed for the King." Without any such definite action on his part it is easy to imagine that—steeped to the lips, as his every despatch and action show him to have been, in the (Natal) Government policy of prejudice against Cetshwayo and suspicion of all who favoured his cause—his every-day conversation, shared, of course, by Zulus, since there was hardly any white companionship at hand, would be coloured by his opinions on these subjects. Aversion to Cetshwayo, annoyance against those who especially upheld

his cause, approval of the summary (and violent) proceedings of chief Dunn & Co.,* and, perhaps, implied contempt for those kinglets who did not follow his example in crushing out the fire of devotion to Cetshwayo from the hearts of those Zulus over whom they ruled (or destroying them, if their loyal hearts resisted)—all these feelings are freely displayed in the correspondence between the Resident in Zululand and the Governor of Natal, and were assuredly not banished entirely from the daily conversation of the former; and there would be but little difficulty in construing such expressions into distinct encouragement, or even command, on the part of a people so given to figurative language and suggestive speech as the Zulus, and the only certain safeguard against such results as actually followed would have been a sincere regard on the Resident's part for the exiled Zulu King, and an honest desire to discover how large a proportion of the Zulu people would pray for his return if they dared speak out their minds.

There are such overwhelming proofs that the Natal Government (including the "Resident" in Zululand) did *not* desire to elicit the real feeling of the Zulu people but to force them to submission to Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement," and to, at all events apparent, forgetfulness of Cetshwayo, that it would seem wasted labour to demonstrate so self-evident a fact, but for the tone of professed impartiality adopted, and the virtuous indignation displayed by the authorities when accused of directly or indirectly coercing the Zulus. It is absolutely necessary to show what their real policy was because their repudiation and denial of it has been made to serve the turn of the King's opponents. Sir H. Bulwer throughout assumes that the 2000 Zulus who formed the Great Deputation had no right to that title on the grounds that they were not a party selected to represent a larger whole, but were themselves all the Zulus who, by every kind of

* Already (let us hope, under very mistaken notions of their nature) highly commended at the Inhlazatshe meeting by Sir Evelyn Wood.

pressure, could be persuaded or deceived into praying for the King, including amongst them, according to Sir Henry's view, many who did not really desire the King's return, but, believing it would take place, thought to be on the safe side. Mr. John Shepstone supported this view, stating that "Undabuko busied himself in inducing all he could to accompany him" [3466, p. 230]; while Mr. Osborn takes the same tone, putting into Undabuko's mouth J. Dunn's well-known speech that "defaulters had better manufacture a very long rope by which they might escape up to the sky," &c. [*ibid.*, pp. 83, 84], and stating that he had "ascertained that Undabuko fined two men one head of cattle each for having failed to take part in the demonstration at Pietermaritzburg," by way of showing what Sir H. Bulwer calls [*ibid.*, p. 82] "the means employed by Undabuko to collect people to accompany him into Natal." Supposing Ndabuko really to have fined two men one head of cattle each, whether for this or some other offence, it could only have been done amongst those who voluntarily elected to obey him, and it is far more probable that the real explanation of the circumstances is that the two head of cattle were brought to him as offerings to show the good-will of men who had been unable, or perhaps afraid, to join the deputation to Natal. This supposition, with the number of the cattle, is much more in keeping with Zulu customs than would be the explanation given by the Resident. On the other hand it cannot be denied that the four disloyal chiefs, J. Dunn, Zibebu, Hamu, and Mfanawendhlela, *did* fine the people under them heavily, not in one but many head of cattle, in some cases amounting to complete "eating up" and in others including terrible slaughter of the people themselves, for joining in the "prayer." Mr. Osborn, in a despatch dated March 15, 1882 [3247, p. 44], says that four chiefs* "have

* The four chiefs here mentioned are Zibebu, Hamu, Mfanawendhlela and *Chingwayo*, their names being brought in about another matter (to be considered later), but the sentence quoted above would be more accurate were the name of Dunn substituted

strictly prohibited, under severe penalties, any of their subjects or persons living in their territories from having any communication with the Government or others with the view of effecting Cetshwayo's restoration." While even the one or two kinglets who,* out of fear and (what, at all events, they *believed* to be) obedience to their white conquerors, inflicted fines on their own messengers on their return from Natal did so to an extent before which the single head of cattle said to have been demanded by the Prince from each of two of his followers sinks into insignificance.

It is necessary to enter thus minutely into this subject since it makes all the difference whether, as Sir H. Bulwer asserted, the 2000 Zulus who composed the Great Deputation were all who could possibly be brought to express a wish for Cetshwayo's return, many even of that number having been coerced or frightened into doing so, or whether, as from all the facts of the case there can be no doubt was the actual truth, every form of coercion had been used to prevent and suppress the "prayer," and the 2000, instead of constituting Cetshwayo's adherents "all told," were simply those amongst them who were brave and devoted enough to disregard all threats, and to dare all danger and loss, and who represented a great number of others who, although they feared to speak out, would every one of them have voted for Cetshwayo's return could they have done so under the ballot system, and would all of them have done it willingly, and most of them joyfully. In fact "All Zululand" *did* pray for their King's return, but only a comparatively small number, the 2000 of the Great Deputation, were ready to risk all on the chance of procuring it.

To express shortly the view of the whole case which the foregoing pages are intended to prove, the Government policy

for that of Chingwayo, who was with the King at heart, though afraid to show it by his actions since Sir Evelyn Wood's "meeting" at the Inhlazatshe, and what followed.

* See p. 84, *supra*.

was to uphold Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement" at all costs (to the Zulus), to suppress every sign of a desire for Cetshwayo's return amongst them, yet to parade before the eyes of the British public that the utmost possible freedom was allowed to the people, and the strictest justice and impartiality exercised towards them as far as British authority interfered at all*—in fact, that the nation generally did not pray for Cetshwayo because they did not want him instead of because they were coerced into silence from the time of the Government declaration in 1880, that the subject of Cetshwayo's return was forbidden to be discussed. The rule which forbade Zulus to visit the Government without a pass from the Resident was quite in keeping with this object, for, if they obediently waited for permission to go to Maritzburg, they did not get it, and therefore had no chance of speaking, and if they went without the pass their having done so was a sufficient reason for refusing to hear what they had to say. It must be apparent to every reader that although, if Sir H. Bulwer wished for an excuse for not showing the smallest favour towards any Zulus who desired Cetshwayo's return, their coming to him as they did provided him with plausible grounds for refusing to see them, yet that it would have been quite as easy to find sufficient grounds for putting aside the strict letter of a purely arbitrary law, had he felt one spark of kindness or pity for the brave and devoted followers of a conquered and imprisoned king.

One further comment may close this painful portion of a painful subject. The official despatches and reports already quoted [3247] lay great stress upon what the writers seem to consider unpardonable insolence on the part of the Zulus in daring to suspect the Resident of having suppressed their grievances and messages to the Natal Government. Judging from the Blue Books, Mr. Osborn and his superior officer were

* Directly and openly but a very little way, but indirectly enormously.

sufficiently of one mind on these Zulu matters to exonerate the former from this charge, but it was perfectly natural that the Zulus should have the suspicion. Indeed, their having it was a strong proof that they still believed in and respected the Governor of Natal, as representing the British Government, since to exonerate the Resident from the charge was simply to transfer it to the Governor. The Zulus could not believe that the latter would play so false and heartless a part towards them as would be the case if all their miseries had really reached his ears, yet months and even years went by bringing neither comfort nor redress. They, therefore, naturally suspected that the middle-man had played them false.

As to the supposed insult to the Resident of the suspicion on such matters, the Natal Government reaps only what she herself has sowed, notably in the treacherous attempt in 1858 by Mr. John Shepstone to seize Matshana (who escaped into Zululand), which was proved before Sir George (then Colonel) Pomeroy-Colley in 1875. Nor was the effect of that shameful lesson decreased by the mock indignation expressed by the Court which, in 1874, pretended to try the chief Langalibalele against that unhappy man * for *daring* to suspect bad faith on the part of Government officials, although the Crown Prosecutor, Mr. John Shepstone, and at least one of the judges, Sir Theo. Shepstone, while they nevertheless kept silence, were well aware that the grounds of the prisoner's plea, *fear on remembering what happened to Matshana at a friendly meeting with Mr. Shepstone*, were perfectly true and valid. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the principal men of the Great Deputation were not people of no account, fearing to raise their eyes to the white man's face, or to speak for themselves in a firm and manly way, but Princes and men of rank, for the most part courteous and quiet in manner, but certainly with no notion of cringing or slavish fear to speak what they believed to be the

* Still a miserable prisoner at the Cape, and said to be now out of his senses.

truth.* In judging of these reports and their differences, it must not be forgotten that although one is given by a British Government official, whose word has been accepted by his superiors, the other also demands and deserves consideration, in that it was ratified by a number of men of rank and respectability, some amongst whom at all events are considered by those who know them well, as incapable of intentional falsehood as an Englishman—should be.

(C.) *The Bishop of Natal's Letter to Lord Derby.*

BISHOPSTOWE, April 7, 1883.

SIR,—I have the honour to request that your Excellency will be pleased to forward the enclosed letter to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, together with three printed copies of the same, which are also enclosed as more convenient for reading.

I have, &c.,

H. E. SIR H. BULWER, K.C.M.G.
&c. &c. &c.

J. W. NATAL.

BISHOPSTOWE, NATAL, April 5, 1883.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to request your Lordship's consideration of the following statement in reply to certain charges which His Excellency Sir Henry Bulwer has brought against myself and my daughter in the Blue Book [C. 3466] which has just reached this colony. I very much regret that His Excellency did not submit to me these accusations, and thus give me an opportunity of explaining or

* Very different men from the native witnesses—one of them half-witted, two others paid subordinates of the S.N.A. Office, and spies—all men of no position or rank, whose absurd stories Sir H. Bulwer persisted in believing against the Bishop of Natal, in spite of the latter's direct contradiction and full explanation.

rebutting them, before sending them to the Secretary of State, six or nine months before I could know that they had been made. But their publication in the new Blue Book happily enables me, as it also makes it imperative for me, to contradict emphatically without delay some of the statements in question, and to rectify others, in respect of which His Excellency has been misinformed. I shall confine myself, of course, only to those passages which reflect upon myself or my daughter personally, and (not to trespass unduly upon your Lordship's time and patience) only to the most important of those.

I. On page 103 there is printed a letter of mine, dated July 22, 1882, in which I had said that His Excellency had been misinformed when he had stated in his despatch to Lord Kimberley, of May 12 [C. 3247, pp. 85-6], that on Wednesday, May 3, "a meeting of the principal Zulus, at which Dabulamanzi was present, took place at Bishopstowe," and implied also that Dabulamanzi, &c., were counselled by me or mine on this occasion to reject on Thursday, May 4, the advice which His Excellency had given them on the previous Tuesday, viz. to submit themselves to the rule of chief John Dunn. I stated that no such meeting, and, in fact, no meeting of any kind, had been held on Wednesday at Bishopstowe—that the Princes had arranged to come to be photographed, but, the day being very wet, had sent to excuse themselves, as Dabulamanzi and party did to the Secretary for Native Affairs. I said also that, as no Zulus were present when the photographer with his companion drove up, I sent for two old men, lodging about a mile away, who came and were photographed, as Ziweddu and Siteku, and afterwards, when they had gone, Ndabuko, Shingana, and many others, were the next day, without Dabulamanzi and party, who on that day took in their reply to the Governor.

His Excellency at the time was pleased to reply [p. 127]:—

"I accept, of course, your Lordship's assurance that no meeting of Zulus took place at Bishopstowe on Wednesday, May 3, and Dabulamanzi's rejection of the good advice that I gave him on the previous day could not, it is clear, have

been decided at a meeting which, as your Lordship says, did not take place."

In transmitting this reply, however, on August 1 to the Secretary of State, His Excellency says [p. 126] :—

"I concluded that some mistake had been made by those from whom my information was derived regarding the date of the meeting. Strange to say, however, those who informed the Government adhere most positively to their statements that a meeting did take place on that day, and will not admit that they have made any mistake as to the day."

Thus, in face of my positive denial, His Excellency still implies that a meeting was held at Bishopstowe of the principal Zulus, at which Dabulamanzi was present, and at which he was counselled by me or mine how to reply to His Excellency's advice, though his informants may have made a mistake as to the day.

I must say, therefore, that it was impossible that they should have mistaken the day, inasmuch as Wednesday was the *only* day between Dabulamanzi's receiving His Excellency's advice on Tuesday evening and returning with his reply on Thursday morning. And I may add also that at the time, in consequence of some remarks in the *Times of Natal*, supposed to be under quasi-official influences, the photographer, Mr. Ferneyhough, stated in a letter to that journal the main facts of the case, exactly as I had stated them to His Excellency, and mentioned, moreover, the name of his "companion"—which I had suppressed—viz. Captain Colville, of the Grenadier Guards, Lieutenant-General Smyth's aide-de-camp, to whom I might have referred the Private Secretary during some months afterwards, though he is now stationed at Capetown. Captain Colville, I am sure, would have confirmed my statement that the day was wet and blustering; that no Zulus were present when they arrived, and only two old men, with their three or four attendants, came some time afterwards when called; and that these were photographed by himself and Mr. Ferneyhough, together with one of Cetshwayo's female attendants, just sent

back invalided from Capetown, who was sleeping at Bishopstowe, while waiting to be taken back to Zululand by her brothers forming part of the Great Deputation.

II. But, three months afterwards, on November 7, His Excellency writes again [p. 223]:—

“The meeting of chief John Dunn, Dabulamanzi, and other people belonging to Dunn’s territory, took place at Government House on Tuesday, May 2. Dabulamanzi delayed making his answer to the advice which I gave him at the close of that meeting till Thursday; and *I never had any doubt, and have no doubt now, that his answer, rejecting my good advice, was influenced by advice received outside during the interval.*”

I can only say that there is not a shadow of ground for the above opinion (italicised) of His Excellency as regards myself, or any member of my family, or any one acting under my instructions or within my knowledge.

“I mentioned in my reports at the time that two meetings of the principal Zulus had been held at Bishopstowe—on Wednesday, the 3rd, and on Thursday, the 4th of May—at one of which photographs were taken of the party. Bishop Colenso afterwards denied that two meetings had taken place. *He said that the meeting which was to have taken place on Wednesday had, on account of the rain, been put off, and that it took place on the Thursday;* and he implied that, therefore, the inference which was to be drawn from my reports, that Dabulamanzi had been influenced by the Wednesday meeting, could not be sustained.”

I may here observe that I did not say in my letter [p. 103] that “the meeting which was to have taken place on Wednesday took place on the Thursday;” for I totally deny that any “meeting,” in the serious sense in which His Excellency uses the word, ever took place at Bishopstowe either on Wednesday or on Thursday; and I said that the coming together of Zulus merely to be photographed “was the ‘meeting’ on Thursday of which your Excellency speaks in the above extract”—thus, in fact, plainly demurring to the use of the expression, as applied to such a motley crowd,

as if met for deliberation, when one of the five Princes was absent altogether, and, of the other four, two left at noon, before the arrival of the other two, and not a word of advice of any kind, as I assert, was spoken.

His Excellency continues (*ibid.*):—

“I, of course, accepted the assurance of Bishop Colenso that no such meeting had been held on the Wednesday. I must mention, however, that the natives, whose statements I enclose, are positive on the point of a meeting having been held at Bishopstowe on the day following the meeting at Government House. — lives on the Bishopstowe lands, and both he and — declare they saw the Zulus going that morning to Bishopstowe. Some of the Zulus forming the party even slept at —’s kraal, and these also, — says, went to the meeting. However, it is quite certain from Bishop Colenso’s denial that, if there was any meeting that day at Bishopstowe, it was without his knowledge. But Miss H. Colenso, who is the eldest daughter of the Bishop, has taken a very active part in the movement for Cetshwayo’s return. . . . And it was Miss Colenso, according to the testimony contained in one of these statements, who told Dabulamanzi what he was to say in reply to me. Whether this was done at a meeting, or not, does not perhaps much matter, as Dabulamanzi was actually staying at a kraal on the Bishopstowe lands at the time, and I have no doubt that the influence that guided him in his answer to me, as well, I may say, as the influence which guided his conduct and proceedings generally at that time, was Bishopstowe influence.”

With all due respect for His Excellency’s expression of opinion, I may be allowed to say that it does “much matter” whether Miss Colenso advised Dabulamanzi, as asserted, at a meeting, or not; because the same witness, on whom His Excellency relies for proof that such advice was given at all, states also [p. 225] that on the Wednesday in question he “saw Dabulamanzi, Ndabuko, Ziwedu, Shingana, and Siteku”—i. e. the five Princes, who had never been at Bishopstowe together—“go to Bishopstowe, accompanied by many of

their people. Those of them who slept at my kraal also went. It was on that day that the Bishopstowe natives were not allowed to be present at the meeting"—every portion of which statement, I assert, is absolutely false, and, if so, then not mistakenly, but deliberately and of set purpose, false. Probably, having given at first a false or mistaken report, they stuck to it, when questioned three months afterwards, perhaps adding a few embellishments. But if His Excellency does not consider my own categorical denial to be worth more than the testimony of these native informants, I must refer, as above, to Mr. Ferneyhough, living in Maritzburg, for confirmation of it; since it is hardly likely that, if the five Princes came to Bishopstowe on Wednesday or Thursday, they would not have been all photographed, as four of them were on Thursday, or that, if they came "*accompanied by many of their people,*" they should have escaped altogether Mr. Ferneyhough's notice.

III. But your Lordship will perceive [p. 225] that the *names* of the natives, whose statements have been taken down and reported to His Excellency by Mr. John Shepstone, are, for some reason or other, *suppressed*. It would be absurd to suppose that they have been suppressed because the authorities feared that, should the facts become known, I might wreak my vengeance upon them, as a supreme chief might have done. The only punishment I could have inflicted, if I thought proper to do so, would have been to turn off my tenant, as a Government spy, from the Bishopstowe land, when, of course, he would have been protected by the Government and provided with land to live on elsewhere. I can only suppose, therefore, that the names have been suppressed because it was not desired that the men should be made known—as being not independent natives, but mere underlings of Mr. John Shepstone.

For your Lordship will observe that one of these two natives says [p. 225], "Those of them that slept at my kraal also went"—a statement wholly false, as I have said, but which has helped me to identify them both as being, one (*Mtungwana*) a petty official under the Government, and the

other (*Tom*) an induna of Mr. John Shepstone, the former being described [p. 225] as "residing on Bishopstowe lands" the latter as "staying in ——'s kraal on Bishopstowe lands." Accordingly "*Tom*" was staying at the time in the kraal of "*Mtungwana*," though both have been absent, for some months past, with Mr. John Shepstone in the Zulu Reserve, in which they have been promised lands, according to the current native report both in Natal and Zululand. In fact, the *three* statements [pp. 225-6], which seem as if made by *three* different men, appear to have really come from these *two* natives, who belong to the office of Mr. John Shepstone.

I have long had reason for believing that *Mtungwana* was a spy, who reported to S.N.A. Office whatever he thought he had discovered as to my doings in Zulu matters. Having had nothing to conceal, I have not cared to take any steps to prevent his reporting anything which he really had seen or heard. In point of fact, as will be seen from the Blue Book, he has not been able to report anything of this kind which is of the slightest importance. But, certainly, I did not expect that he would report a mass of falsehoods, or that Mr. John Shepstone would receive and report them to His Excellency in July and August [pp. 225-9], or that, three months afterwards (November 8), His Excellency would transmit them to the Secretary of State as important and truthful statements, without inquiry being made in the interim either from myself or from the two Europeans close at hand, who would have told the whole truth upon the subject.

IV. The first native statement [p. 225] was made on July 13 by the induna "*Tom*," who repeats some words said to have been spoken to him by Magema, "who lives on Bishopstowe land," "some three weeks since," when he ("*Tom*") "told him the news which he had heard in town [at the S.N.A. Office] about Zululand." I am not responsible for Magema's expression of opinion, which, however, I believe to have been shared at the time by many, both white and black, in the colony.

The second statement [pp. 225-6] was made evidently by *Mtungwana*, and (except the first two and the last three lines) is false from beginning to end. I have shown this

already with respect to lines 3-7, as also with respect to lines 19-23, in which he makes one of my native printers, "Masoja," say that "Miss Colenso had [on Wednesday, May 3, 1882] advised Dabulamanzi what to say in reply to the Governor's words to them the day previous," professing to quote Masoja's words, and adding, "On hearing this, Dabulamanzi came in here the next day [Thursday, May 4] and spoke as he did." All this has been already, as I have said, shown to be false.

With respect to the statement in lines 8-18, where Mtungwana states that he "went to the printing-office at Bishopstowe, and entered into a conversation with two printing-office boys named 'Christian' and 'Masoja,'" it may be enough for me to say, after the above disproof of the rest of this man's statement, that "Christian" is not a "printing-office boy," and never was in my employ, but is merely a waggon-driver, one of the tenants on Bishopstowe land—that "Masoja" and "Christian" both positively deny that they ever were together with Mtungwana in the printing-office, though "Masoja" had often been at Mtungwana's hut, where beer-drinking was pretty frequent, and, no doubt, plenty of gossip went on about Zululand, and Mtungwana had come to the house of "Christian" (a native convert), expressly to inquire about Zulu matters—and that "Masoja" denies ever having said the words about Miss Colenso attributed to him. In fact, *he could not have said them*—unless, indeed, he merely *invented* them, which, from comparing his character with Mtungwana's, I do not believe—since, being only a junior and inferior printer, he has never been called in to assist when I myself or my daughter have spoken with Zulus.

The last three lines of this statement are correct. But "the station people" were in the habit of going for their own convenience for the afternoon service on Sundays to the girls' school attached to the house of Jonathan, "the Bishop's Catechist" (not "induna," as Mtungwana says); and on the Sunday referred to (April 30) they were told to go there for the morning service also—not for any purposes

of secrecy, as the formal mention of this otherwise unmeaning and insignificant fact would seem to suggest, but simply because three of the Princes, Ndabuko, Shingana, and Dabulamanzi, had notified that they were coming to take leave that morning, and the school chapel was wanted in which to receive them, as also the service would have been disturbed by the babble of their numerous followers—the whole Deputation not “numbering, followers and all, some 800 people,” as His Excellency states [p. 75], but 2000, as reckoned by myself [p. 28], as also by Mr. John Shepstone, who says that Ndabuko “actually brought the large party of 2000 people with him” [p. 230].

The third statement is, apparently from “Tom,” who is reported to have said [p. 226], “As I was leaving —’s kraal to come into town *I saw many Zulus going to Bishopstowe. I myself did not see Mpande’s sons; but I know that they were at Bishopstowe on that day [Wednesday].* The weather, though overcast, did not prevent my coming to town, nor was it sufficiently damp to deter any one from travelling.” The statements, italicised by me above, are absolutely false, as Capt. Colville and Mr. Ferneyhough would testify. And they would also state that, as they left town, about 9 A.M., the hour when the duties of “Tom,” as induna of Mr. John Shepstone, would begin at the S.N.A. Office, the sky, which was lowering, seemed likely to clear, and so they started, but, before they reached Bishopstowe (five or six miles), the weather changed to a heavy downpour.

I need hardly say that it would have been easy for His Excellency to have asked me to bring in my two men, “Masoja” and “Christian,” to the Office of the Secretary for Native Affairs, where they might have been confronted in my presence with the two Government informants, and the true facts of the case would have been elicited.

V. On the second of the above worthless statements, however—and on that alone, as far I can see—His Excellency has based a conjecture [p. 224] that, whereas Ndabuko had “said over and over again in the Zulu country,” after his return with the Great Deputation, that

he had been authorised to "take up arms" by the "Amakosi at Pietermaritzburg," these "Amakosi" must mean—not myself, who, "His Excellency was convinced, would not deliberately and intentionally counsel any of the Zulus to proceed to an open act of violence, which could not but be attended with bloodshed," but—my daughter!—who is as utterly incapable of giving such advice as I am myself.

That His Excellency can ever have persuaded himself to make such an accusation, based on such flimsy evidence, I confess, amazes me, as also that he should have been allowed to do this by his chief adviser in Zulu matters, Mr. John Shepstone, who must know perfectly well that the plural word "Amakosi" could never have been used by any Zulu of a mere individual like myself, unconnected with the Government—whose only power of helping them, as they had often been told by myself and others, lay in his caring for them in their troubles, and speaking the truth on their behalf—but could only have been employed with reference generally to the "Government" or "authorities," as it is usually translated in official papers, or to the Governor and other high officials, such as Mr. John Shepstone, Mr. Osborn, or magistrates. It seems highly probable (from the evidence given in this Blue Book) that the assertion, that Ndabuko, &c., had been authorised to "take up arms" by the "Amakosi at Pietermaritzburg (N.B.)," was freely made at the time in Zululand, as it was in Natal. But the phrase can only have referred to Government authorities, as above. And I think it very possible that such an assertion may have been based upon the circumstance recorded towards the end of their own account of their interview with His Excellency and the other "Amakosi at Pietermaritzburg," as follows [p. 35]:—

"Then John Dunn asked 'But, if one of them refuses to submit to me?'

"The Governor: 'In such a case he can leave your district, taking with him all his property.'

"But at this we exclaimed, 'No, sirs! Listen to that! Do you not perceive that this is how he means to eat us up, one by one? But we will not have it, and we wish you to

know that the first one of us whom he attacks we shall defend, and shall turn out John Dunn, and drive him out of the country back into Natal.'

"At this the Governor said nothing."

It may be that they took this silence of the Governor to mean consent. They started on their return on Sunday, May 7, intending to go straight, as ordered, to the Regency, and there repeat their prayer for Cetshwayo. "They feared, however, that they might meet with opposition from John Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu, and might be perhaps obliged to defend themselves, and get rid of those three chiefs, though they have no wish or intention to fight, if they can avoid doing so" [p. 36]. And it is only right to say that Mnyamana and the Princes have never "taken up arms" for the purpose of attack, but only in self-defence, having reason to fear that themselves or some of their party would be attacked, when they returned, ignominiously sent back by His Excellency, as John Dunn, Zibebu, and Hamu had threatened beforehand.

VI. Some pages of this Blue Book are filled with a charge, which (on incorrect information) His Excellency has alleged against me, of having sent a secret message to Mavumengwana, by a Natal native, Faneyana.

I was not in the least aware, until I saw the statements in the Blue Book, that His Excellency entertained such a view, on the report (originally) of chief John Dunn, who stated that this man had come with a message to Mavumengwana and Mnyamana "from the Amakosi in Natal (this was private)" [p. 53], and had admitted that he had been "a constant messenger of Sobantu (the Bishop) and Mr. Offy Shepstone, sent to different headmen at different times in Zululand" [*ibid.*]. Accordingly His Excellency reports the matter to the Secretary of State on July 22, 1882 [p. 101], adding:—

"When before the Resident, Faneyana denied that he had been sent by the Bishop with any message, and moreover denied that he had admitted having said so a few days before. *There can be no doubt that the man has been frequently at*

Bishopstowe; but whether he was ever sent by the Bishop of Natal with this message is best known to the Bishop." And a certain Zulu headman states [p. 156] that Faneyana "came repeatedly from Sobantu." So Siwunguza says [p. 162] that "the Natal Kafir Faneyana, who was arrested by chief John Dunn, came to him last summer [? Jan. 1882], and told him that he was sent by Sobantu to call Ndabuko and his brothers and Mnyamana, as *Cetshwayo had arrived and was with Sobantu. Faneyana said that he had with his own eyes seen Cetshwayo at Sobantu's.*"

One might have thought that so absurd a statement as the above (italicised)—if really made (as I suppose) by Faneyana—would have satisfied the authorities that this man was *lying*. Accordingly a correspondence was given [pp. 167–9] between His Excellency and Mr. Offy Shepstone C.M.G., M.L.C., in which that gentleman indignantly repudiates, as far as he himself was concerned, a statement made by chief John Dunn in the *St. James's Gazette* of July 12, 1882, on the authority of Faneyana, that "the Bishop, Mr. Fynney, and Offy Shepstone are the cause of all the troubles of Zululand," and asserts [p. 167], "I have no knowledge, either personally or otherwise, except that gained from the public newspapers, of the messenger alluded to." His Excellency replies [p. 169] that, "in view of Mr. Shepstone's universal disclaimer," he "attaches, of course, no importance to the statement of Faneyana that he was 'once sent by Mr. Offy Shepstone,'" and describes Faneyana himself as "a Natal native of *apparently doubtful character.*"

In like manner, when I found that Mr. Saunders, M.L.C., had stated in the Legislative Council that this supposed emissary of mine had been caught "red-handed," I wrote to one of the Maritzburg papers, stating that I had never sent Faneyana to Zululand on any business or with any message whatever—that, in fact, I knew little or nothing about him, and should not be likely to make a confidant of a mere stranger. Faneyana came first to Bishopstowe at the end of 1880, during the absence of myself and eldest daughter in the Cape Colony, professing

to be able to bring an eye-witness of the digging up of Mpande's grave, and was told to come again, when I should have returned to Natal. He came a second time, on December 1, bringing two sons of the chief Musi to school, but no "eye-witness." He came a third time, on January 6, 1881, and was dismissed at once, his information being only hearsay evidence, and therefore useless for my purposes. He went away, saying that he would go to bring an eye-witness who lived at some distance from Bishopstowe, and appeared a fourth time, on March 1, 1881, but without his man, and was finally dismissed as worthless. Since that time I had no further communication with him for seventeen months, so that His Excellency must have been misinformed when he wrote on July 22, as above, "There can be no doubt that the man has been frequently at Bishopstowe." But on August 7, 1882, he appeared once more, *after* his visit to Mavumengwana, and then gave an account of it, in which, of course, there was not a word to show that he had said that he had been sent by me, which he strenuously denied, though I myself did not believe him.

His Excellency's attention may very probably not have been called to my public disclaimer of having ever employed this native "of apparently doubtful character"—if not half-witted, as some think—to carry a secret message to Mavumengwana or any one else in Zululand. But it must surely have been seen by the Private Secretary, or by one or more of the officials. Yet no mention of it is made in the Blue Books. And whereas on August 29 the Earl of Kimberley "thought it would be desirable that some inquiry should be made into the truth of Faneyana's statements" [p. 115], there is no sign in the Blue Book of any such inquiry having been made, and certainly no inquiry was made of me.

VII. His Excellency further adopts without inquiry [p. 154] the erroneous statement of Ntshingwayo, that "Magema, a Natal native, in the employment of the Bishop, was sent by him, together with the Zulu Mfunzi, to look for a watch taken from an officer who fell during the war," the effect being to discredit my assertion made repeatedly, but

evidently disbelieved by His Excellency, that I have never at any time during my residence in the colony, for nearly thirty years, before or after the Zulu war, sent a Natal native as an emissary to Zululand. And Ntshingwayo's statement [p. 192], as reported by Mr. Osborn, is transmitted to the Secretary of State, without any further comment or explanation, as if it had been ascertained to be a true statement of facts. "He (the Bishop) has all along been in communication with the Sutu party, who made the disturbances. He commenced shortly after the war, when he sent in Magema and Mfunzi to look for a watch and other property taken from an officer who fell during the war. He sent a message by those two men to the Zulus, to say he wanted to recover the late officer's property before Mr. John Shepstone did so, as he will then be able to take it to the Queen, and thus obtain an opportunity to pray for Cetshwayo's release."

If His Excellency had applied to me for information on this matter, I should have at once explained that Magema was not sent by me at all, but by the then Administrator of the Government, Major-General Sir H. H. Clifford, who sent Magema, recommended by me as intelligent and trustworthy, and, I believe, other messengers, white and black, giving him a pass, with instructions to search in Zululand for the watch of the late Prince Imperial (which was found, I heard, by one of the parties, but with the works destroyed), and paying his expenses on behalf of the Empress. Moreover, Magema was not sent "together with the Zulu Mfunzi;" but, being in Zululand on this business, he made a call on his old friend Mfunzi at his kraal, and received from him, with its envelope unbroken, the last offer of terms of peace which Lord Chelmsford proposed for Cetshwayo. This (I may mention as an historical fact) was the *only* offer which he could have entertained, since it required only the surrender of arms, and not (as all the others did) that the King should send in a regiment of his warriors in person to lay down their arms, an act of authority utterly beyond his power at the time. This document, however was never delivered to him, the

messengers not having been able to reach him, and is now in my possession.

Of course, the message said to have been sent by me to the Zulus by "those men" is a pure fiction.

VIII. But the most serious charge which His Excellency has brought against me, without my knowledge, is one of direct breach of faith, based merely on a report from the Zulu chief Siwunguza [p. 227] that "a Zulu, named Nhlebo, had arrived at his kraal from Sobantu [the Bishop of Natal] with a message from Cetshwayo," and His Excellency adds:—

"On the 8th of April last, Bishop Colenso wrote to me as follows: 'I shall, of course, comply with the desire expressed by your Excellency, that I should not send any more messages on the part of the ex-King to any one in Zululand. Should any such messages reach me from Cetshwayo, which may seem to me such as may be sent, I shall avail myself of your Excellency's permission to forward them to yourself, to be sent, if approved, through the British Resident.'"

His Excellency makes no comment on the above, nor did he bring the matter to my notice in any way; but he leaves it to be understood by the Secretary of State that I had committed a deliberate breach of faith.

I have to reply that, since I gave the above promise, which I did out of respect for His Excellency's wishes only, I have never received from the ex-King any letter except through the Offices of the S.N.A. at Capetown and in Natal; that no such letter contained any message from Cetshwayo to the Zulus; that I have not received from Cetshwayo any message for them in any other way; and that I have forwarded none whatever.

The simple fact is that Nhlebo was sent down by the friends of Ngobozana, Siwunguza's cousin, who went with Cetshwayo to England, to ask if there was any news about him, as the time was very long (to their minds) since they had lost him out of their sight. He was informed that Cetshwayo and party had just reached the Cape, all in good health, with some dogs and four waggon-loads of goods, as

stated in a Cape telegram—facts which became at once public property, being known already throughout Natal to white men and black, and certainly to John Dunn and other white men, who read the newspapers in Zululand, and some of whom, no doubt, passed on such news to their Zulu neighbours. These facts, most probably, Nhlebo communicated to Ngobozana's relative and chief, Siwunguza.

There are other statements made in this Blue Book respecting myself and my doings, which I could show to be equally unfounded, and many others respecting the Zulus, in which I am indirectly concerned, which also require correction.

Thus, Mr. Osborn, writing about the Great Deputation, says in reply to an assertion of mine [p. 185]:—

“Nor is the assertion true that they waited the alleged ten days for me. It can be proved that, almost immediately after I started from here on the 29th of March, preparations for their journey were proceeded with and completed, and that they were fairly on their way to Natal three days after my departure.”

To which the Prince Shingana and other headmen with him, now in the colony, reply that it is true that they themselves and other northern Zulus left their homes three days after Mr. Osborn's departure, but they did not leave Zululand, and cross over into Natal, until the twelfth day (about April 9), which agrees with the fact that they reached the Umgeni on April 15 [p. 28].

Again, Mr. Osborn writes [p. 186]:—

“With reference to the statement in the Bishop's letter that Ndabuko and the others, ‘fearing that the same thing might happen as on the former occasion (August 1881), when the Resident came back with orders not to prevent Zibebu and Hamu from calling out their *impis* for the support of their authority, and the punishment of those who had just before taken a part in praying for Cetshwayo, they thought it best to go down after him,’ &c., I can only say that this statement also is entirely void of any foundation in truth, and I am at a loss to know how it could have originated. I received and brought no order of the kind at any time, *neither did I, of*

my own accord, inform any one that those chiefs would not be prevented from calling out their impiis."

But Mr. Osborn quotes his own reply to Hamu's messengers, on Sept. 27, 1881, as follows [3182, p. 118]:—

"If it be true that the Aba Qulusi have eaten up Msebe's tribe, I am unable to advise Hamu against the adoption of such measures as to him may appear necessary and within his power to uphold his authority, and prevent rebellion within his territory."

The Aba Qulusi had "eaten up" the cattle of five kraals of Msebe on September 25, but "did not kill any one when they made the seizures" [*ibid.*], and returned the cattle of three of them, whom they found to be friends [3182, p. 160]; and they did this in retaliation for the seizures made the day before by Hamu "from ten kraals of Kondhlo, headman of the Aba Qulusi" [3182, p. 119]. On Oct. 2, immediately (five days) after this reply of Mr. Osborn, there followed the massacre of the Aba Qulusi, when "a very large number [probably more than 1000 males] were killed, and scarcely any of the male portion escaped with their lives" [3182, p. 151]. Of course, I assumed that Mr. Osborn sent the above message by instructions from his superiors, and not of his own accord.

But I must not dilate further on such points as these. Suffice it to say that there is only one of the charges of any importance brought against me in this Blue Book which I could not rebut as easily as those above considered. That one accusation I fully admit to be true, being based, indeed, on a voluntary statement of my own, viz. that in conversation with the chiefs Ngcongwana and Posile, while waiting some weeks at Bishopstowe to be sent down to the Cape, as also with Zulus who came to see them from time to time, "I explained to them that it was of no use for the ex-King's brothers and his personal friends only to make application on his behalf; but, if it was really true, as they asserted, that 'all Zululand' wished for his restoration, *they should go to the Resident, and ask leave to come down to Maritzburg, and make their wishes known in a proper manner to the Government*" [p. 75]. And His Excellency complains, moreover, that I had "said that

I felt 'perfectly justified' in having given such advice under such circumstances, more especially after reading the recent utterance (London *Times*, April 18) of the Prime Minister in Parliament " [*ibid.*].

I can only say that I still feel "perfectly justified" in having given such advice—rather that I should have been ashamed of myself as an Englishman, and a preacher of the Gospel of peace, if I had not told them, when they came to me for advice in their troubles, that, instead of taking up arms to attack their foes, they should use the orderly and constitutional method, as above described, of presenting their prayer to the Governor. Your Lordship will perceive that I advised them to "go to the Resident and ask leave to come down to Maritzburg." And, but for past experience, I should certainly have expected that he would have given such leave at once, at all events, for the representatives of the three appointed chiefs, Seketwayo, Somkele, and Faku, who came down on this occasion, and perhaps for a few others to accompany them in the name of the rest. I should have expected this, because I knew that the Resident's instructions were [2482, p. 281]: "You shall not prevent any [appointed] chiefs from visiting the Governor or Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, should they wish to do so." Not receiving such permission, they waited twelve days in Zululand for the possibility of Mr. Osborn's return from Natal, and then crossed the Tugela, acting on the words spoken by Sir E. Wood to Ngcongwana [3182, p. 175]: "If you were refused a pass, I think you were justified in coming to me [i. e. to the Governor himself at Maritzburg] for one."

I must leave it to your Lordship to judge whether, under the above circumstances, I can be justly blamed for the fact of the Zulus having "taken up arms" in self-defence on their return from Natal, when they had been peremptorily rebuffed by His Excellency, and even the representatives of the three appointed chiefs received no recognition whatever, not even the usual scanty supplies of food. I am not, of course, now questioning the wisdom of this policy; though I should say that my advice was given when Sir Hercules Robinson was

High Commissioner, who was favourable, I understand, to the restoration of Cetshwayo, whereas Sir Henry Bulwer was "not in favour of it" [p. 92]. But the Zulus had no alternative, if they did not wish to be destroyed by their foes. On May 17, before they could have reached their homes, Mnyamana reported to the Resident [p. 37] that Hamu had expelled the people from two of his kraals and had taken possession of them; on June 17 he came to Mr. Osborn, with Ndabuko, Ziweddu, and Shingana, stating that "their men had collected for the purpose of protecting them" [p. 68]; and on June 23 he replies to a messenger sent from His Excellency [p. 89]:—

"I do not deny that I have had an armed force here with me; but it was not to disturb the country. It was to protect me and the people under me from Hamu, who had never ceased to trouble me and continues to do so. I have sat still all this time and continue to sit still, because I fear the Government. Four of my principal kraals—one being that of my induna—have been seized by Hamu, [and] the women and children driven out; and they are now occupied by Hamu's people, and many of my people have in consequence deserted their kraals. Who am I, that I should make war on any one? What I did was in self-defence."

I believe that my advice, at the time when it was given, helped to soothe embittered feelings in the hearts of the Zulus, by directing them to the exercise of peaceful and constitutional means for the attainment of their desire, and thus helped also to prevent a conflict which would assuredly have deluged the country with blood.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful and obedient servant,

J. W. NATAL.

To the Right Honourable
The EARL of DERBY.

(D.) *Letter to Lord Derby from one of the Bishop's Sons.*

NORWICH, May 27, 1883.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to make a request concerning the publication of my father's reply to Sir H. Bulwer's accusations against him that I believe your Lordship will admit that I am not without the right to prefer on his behalf.

It is notorious that when any matter is brought to the notice of the Colonial Office in any way affecting the credit of an official in the Colonial service, the statement conveying the information is not accepted for consideration without having been first referred to the person implicated, in order that it may be read by the light of his explanations. And this rule is a convenient and just one. But a very different course has been adopted with regard to the charges made by Sir H. Bulwer against my much venerated father, and while months have elapsed since Sir H. Bulwer's statements were put before the public, the Bishop's letter is still unpublished. I refer your Lordship to last week's for an instance of the advantage which is taken by his unscrupulous enemies of the discreditable fictions that Natal officials and the Natal correspondents of the London papers (well-known and rabid supporters of Sir Bartle Frere's policy) have industriously circulated about my father. Similar articles have appeared elsewhere, as in the, abounding in injurious innuendoes, and giving a totally false impression concerning the course of events in Zululand and the Bishop's attitude and doings.

It is monstrous that he, of all men, should be pursued by such malignant misrepresentation, and that no authoritative voice should be raised in his defence.

My respectful request is that your Lordship will see fit to publish the Bishop's letter as a separate Parliamentary Paper. The slight additional conspicuousness that would thus be given to it would at once be a little compensation for the disadvantages attending so late a defence, and would

be a tribute of respect by the paying of which the interests of the public service would benefit.

I have, &c.,

FRANCIS E. COLENZO.

[The reply to this was that Lord Derby regretted that he was unable to adopt Mr. Colenso's "suggestion," and that the Bishop's letter was included in a collection of papers about to be published. It appeared within five pages of the end of a Blue Book of 162 pages, published on the 9th of June, 1883.]

(E.) *The Conditions formulated by the Bishop of Natal in December 1880 for the Restoration of Cetshwayo.*

(Extract from the Bishop's Digest,* p. 786. *First Series.*)

The Bishop of Natal [he wrote in the third person] never maintained that the Zulu war was provoked "by the Colonists," though, no doubt, after Isandhlwana the great majority of them vehemently supported it. But the inception of the Zulu war was due entirely to the crafty machinations, the unscrupulous assertions, and the unjust actions of Sir Bartle Frere, as shown throughout this "Digest"—most probably with the view of bringing about more speedily and easily the South African Confederation. Otherwise the above statement [the Bishop is reviewing an article in a Natal paper] very correctly expresses the Bishop's views—except that, while believing in the ultimate triumph of the right and just, instead of mere policy and brute force, and maintaining the principle "*Fiat Justitia*," he would not be irrational and extravagant in the application of that principle, and would urge the restoration of Cetshwayo upon such conditions as—after what has already happened—may be laid down by the English Government, with a view to the peace, order, and advancement of Zululand, as well as the safety of Natal and the Transvaal. Such arrangements might be made without difficulty, would be readily acquiesced in by the Zulus as

* See account of this Digest, *supra*, p. 157.

well as by Cetshwayo, and would assuredly promote the above objects infinitely better than the present unmeaning and arbitrary state of anarchy.

For instance, conditions such as these might be laid down, on the assumption that the petty chiefs appointed by Sir Garnet Wolseley were not appointed *for their own aggrandisement*, and that modifications may and should be made in the present arrangement *with a view to the better government and welfare of the Zulu people, and their advancement in civilisation, and the greater security of the adjoining British Colonies*:—

1. Cetshwayo to be restored to his country as King, not to rule it as an independent sovereign, but to be guided in all important matters by the advice of the Natal Government, expressed through the Resident.

2. John Dunn and the other chiefs appointed by Sir Garnet Wolseley to be recognised by Cetshwayo. [N.B.]

3. If thirteen petty chiefs are good for the Zulu people, twenty, thirty, or forty would be better still; and the King may, with the approval of the Resident, appoint other petty chiefs, breaking up the present districts, as may seem desirable, into smaller portions, to be managed by them, as the magistracies in Natal are by the resident magistrates.

4. The Emahlabatini district, as the ancestral home of the Zulu Tribe, to be assigned to the King himself, with a petty chief under him.

5. Each recognised chief to administer justice in his own district, but an appeal to be allowed in all cases from the chief's judgment to that of the King, and from the King, if the chief is overruled, to the Resident, who shall in such cases consult the Natal Government, and whose decision shall then be final.

6. No sentence of death to be carried out without the consent of the Resident.

7. A hut-tax of 10s. to be levied, and paid into the Zulu Treasury, to be in charge of the Resident, and to be expended solely for the benefit of Zululand. Cattle, goats, &c., to be taken in payment at a fixed price, as formerly in Natal.

8. All payments for waggon-licenses, ferries, use of forests, fines, &c., to be paid into the Zulu Treasury.

9. From the Treasury are to be paid the Resident's expenses, an allowance for the King's private expenses, and one for the King's Civil List, which last should include an annual stipend (say of 300*l.*) for John Dunn and each of the petty chiefs, thus assimilating their position to that of magistrates in Natal.

10. The balance of revenue from all sources to be employed in building houses and offices for the King, Resident, and chiefs, schools, gaols, bridges, improving roads, &c.

11. The King to collect, through the chiefs, all firearms and ammunition, to be handed over to the Resident.

12. When this is done, the King to be allowed (say) 500 firearms with ammunition, for the use of his bodyguard and police, or in case of danger from the Swazis—the guns to be breechloaders of good quality (e.g. Martini-Henrys), so that all ammunition must be obtained in future through the Natal Government, instead of the Zulus making powder for themselves.

13. These guns, &c., to be kept at the King's place, except when in actual use.

14. Each petty chief to be allowed for his own use (say) 2 guns and ammunition in like manner, and other guns to be granted by the King and Resident, under license, as in Natal.

15. The military system to be discontinued, the army disbanded, and the military kraals destroyed, and all Zulus to be allowed to marry without restriction from the King.

16. The King to be allowed to have a standing force of (say) 1200 men, to be chosen by himself from volunteers in the first instance, or when vacancies occur through marriage, sickness, incapacity, or death, of whom 200 should serve two months at a time at the King's Kraal, as bodyguard or police, and to weed his crops, &c.

17. The Umkosi (Feast of Firstfruits) to be kept in presence of the King and Resident, the men, as of old, and as now in Natal, bringing no weapons, but only sticks and

shields, and no compulsion being used to force their attendance.

18. The petty chiefs to form a Council of Advice to the King and Resident, to be summoned and consulted as occasion may call for it, e.g. as to making new chiefs and districts, levying increased hut-tax or imposing other taxes, spending balance of revenue, fixing punishments for different classes of offences, &c.; but no decision of King and Council to be valid without the approval of the Resident.

19. The King's Civil List should pay for a certain number of police with each chief. But the chiefs are to support themselves and families out of their stipends, as magistrates do in Natal, and must not *force* labour out of their people. If they need men or women to weed their crops, &c., they must be hired and paid for by themselves, as free labourers.

(F.) *Remarks upon the above, and upon a recent Article in the 'Saturday Review.'*

It will be seen that the above was written by the Bishop before several of the chiefs had proved themselves unfit to rule. The events recorded in this volume necessitated in his opinion, it need hardly be said, important modifications in the conditions proposed by him. They are quoted, however, to meet the assertions of those who, in leading English periodicals, have endeavoured to weaken the force of the Bishop's testimony by representing him as carried away by "sentiment" and oblivious of the real needs of the Zulu people.

The following article has appeared in the *Saturday Review* (June 1884):—

"The coronation by the invaders of Zululand of Cetshwayo's son, Dinuzulu, furnishes a mortifying comment on the policy of the English Government. The new King is, of course, dependent on the adventurers to whom he owes his elevation, and it may be assumed that he has already recognised their title to the lands which they already occupy. The Boers who have exercised the highest

of sovereign rights are not an organised or independent community. The Governments both of the Transvaal and of the Orange Free State have in the first instance censured the aggression, which they may perhaps nevertheless regard with tolerant complacency."

The service which a small party of Boers has rendered the cause of peace in Zululand may be briefly epitomised as follows:—

(a) They have given the National party—commonly described in official language as the Usutus—the moral support which they so much needed.

(b) They have assisted the Zulus to get rid of the firebrand which has desolated Central Zululand—the European-led force, well trained and well supplied, which has operated with Zibebu's territory as a base. The existence and special organisation of this force is the key to the history of Zululand since the "restoration."

Zibebu was allowed to arm and prepare his men, under Sir H. Bulwer as High Commissioner, for ten months before the restoration, whereas Cetshwayo was forbidden to maintain a stronger force than "a few policemen to keep order." But over and above the advantages which Zibebu enjoyed in his firearms and horses, and in having "his men drilled and an organisation more or less complete" (*Natal Mercury*, June 24th, 1882), he was afforded aid by the presence with his force of a contingent of mounted whites. By the help of these Zibebu fell upon Cetshwayo's kraal and upon an unprepared assemblage of chiefs and people from all parts of the country, including the Reserve. After dealing death and destruction far and wide Zibebu has since kept Central Zululand in a state of agitation and unrest.

The chiefs of the National party, with the heroic Mnyamana at their head, and with Cetshwayo's son Dinuzulu under their protection, were awaiting an opportunity of asserting his rights. It seemed unlikely that they could, unassisted, make headway against the great advantages of their opponents. The frown of the Colonial Government had not by the King's death been removed from a people whose attitude bore witness to the falsehood of the official theory

about Cetshwayo. The Reserved Territory—in actual extent one half of Central Zululand, but bearing a much larger ratio to it when the uninhabitable swamps of Cetshwayo's territory are taken into account—had proved the means of severing many loyal Zulus from the National party. (A recent traveller in Zululand, Mr. W. Y. Campbell, after careful inquiries at innumerable kraals in November last, estimated the number of the Zulus well affected towards the King as forming seven-eighths of the whole population.) Moreover there appeared to be some difference of opinion among the chiefs as to the wisdom of placing so young a man as Dinuzulu at the head of affairs at this crisis; Mnyamana, whose loyalty has been exhibited by the self-sacrifice of years (see p. 52 *supra*), and whose sagacity has stood the test of many a temptation to take the field against Zibebu and Hamu, is said to have been in favour of a regency.

Under this state of things the Boers have stepped forward, and, after formally proclaiming Dinuzulu, have aided the National party in attacking Zibebu and his mischievous auxiliaries, and in recovering the cattle looted from Central Zululand. He is stated to have been totally defeated and great sympathy for his white freebooters has been attempted to be evoked by Mr. J. Robinson, of Durban, editor of the *Natal Mercury*, through the instrumentality of his organ, the *London Times*; his telegram running as follows:—“(July 4) Questions have been asked in the Natal Council regarding the fate of the nine British subjects [*sic*] who were with Usibebu before his defeat, but have not since been heard of, and the Government is making inquiries concerning them.”

It will be seen from the above remarks to what extent the National party are now “dependent” on Boer support.

“The district which has been occupied by the Boer invaders is exactly or nearly the same which was formerly the subject of dispute between Cetshwayo and the Boers of the Transvaal.”

A reference to the Blue Books will show that when the Zulu country was parcelled out by Sir G. Wolseley, the award of the Commissioners appointed by the Lieut.

Governor of Natal, Sir H. Bulwer, upon the Disputed Territory question *was practically reversed, nearly the whole of that territory being handed back to the Boers.* No change has been made in the "resettlement" of the country or in the arrangements made with the Boer Republic, and the only portion preserved to Zululand of the land decreed to be "of strict right belonging to the Zulus" is that which lies on the south of the Penvana, or Bevana, river, and so much of the strip on the east of the Blood river as lies within Hlubi's territory.

"The conflicting claims were, by consent of both parties, referred to the English High Commissioner, who ultimately gave an award in favour of the Zulus. It happened by a disastrous fatality that between the announcement and the execution of the award the Government of the Transvaal was induced to transfer the dominions of the Republic to the English Crown."

The astounding incorrectness of this account must be apparent to all. The Proclamation annexing the Transvaal was issued on the 12th of April, 1877. The Boundary Commissioners reported their judgment to Sir H. Bulwer on the 20th of June, 1878. On the 11th of November, 1878, Sir B. Frere wrote that he accepted the Commissioners' verdict. On the 11th of December the award was announced to the King's chiefs, coupled with the Ultimatum that preceded our invasion.

"Sir Bartle Frere, who, having soon afterwards succeeded to the office of High Commissioner, was now a party to the litigation, construed the award of his predecessor [*sic*] as applicable only to territorial sovereignty, and not to proprietary rights. The Boers who had taken possession of the debated lands were consequently confirmed in their occupancy; and if the patrons of Dinuzulu are the same persons, they may establish a plausible claim to their former property. The unexpected, and probably unintelligible, interpretation of the award was the main cause of Cetshwayo's alienation from the English interest."

It was the Ultimatum and consequent invasion which, naturally enough, alienated Cetshwayo.

“His formidable military force had been organised in the expectation of hostilities with the Transvaal, but he now found that his enemies had become English subjects, and that, at the same time, he was deprived of the fruits of a regular and legal judgment. Having converted a friendly potentate into an antagonist, Sir Bartle Frere thought it prudent to anticipate a not improbable attack. There is no doubt that he was cordially supported by the public opinion of South Africa; and after the victory at Ulundi his policy appeared to be justified by success.”

(a) The formidable military force received none but natural additions in Cetshwayo's reign. Of the twenty-one regiments named in ‘The Zulu Army,’ published by direction of Lord Chelmsford, only two had been raised by Cetshwayo.

(b) For the nature of the force organised at the time of Sir T. Shepstone's exploit in the Transvaal, see p. 59 *supra*.

(c) As to the real motives which led to the Zulu war, the Attorney-General of Natal, speaking in the Legislative Council in December 1880, and referring to the Ultimatum as the joint production of himself and Sir Bartle Frere, admitted that the war was waged—not for the trumpety causes put forward by Sir Bartle Frere as *casus belli*—but for the purpose of remodelling the Zulu nation with a view to confederation!

“If the English Government had then declared a protectorate in Zululand, the subsequent anarchy and bloodshed, with much loss and discredit, might have been averted.”

See the Bishop's Conditions, p. 358 *supra*. He favoured a protectorate, provided only that the outrageous fictions, upon the strength of which Cetshwayo and his powers of beneficially ruling his people were condemned to destruction, were exploded.

“The Zulus themselves appear to have regarded the previously reigning dynasty as the product and symbol of the military organisation which was shattered at Ulundi. Cetshwayo as a prisoner and an exile had, therefore, no hold on the loyalty of his

former subjects, and the chiefs who succeeded to fractions of his power would lose nothing by acknowledged allegiance to England."

This is as gross a misstatement as that referred to above. See the abundant evidence to the contrary in this volume, in particular consider the note appended to p. 174 *supra*. Consider, in fact, almost any evidence other than the *dicta* of discredited officials.

"The modern prejudice against the extension of Imperial responsibility deterred the Government from assenting to the more or less direct annexation which was recommended by Sir Bartle Frere and by almost all competent authorities. The division of the country into thirteen provinces, under as many petty chiefs, was perhaps the best alternative for simple annexation. The Zulus, being naturally intelligent, doubted the sincerity of self-denying professions, and took it for granted that the provincial chiefs would be controlled and protected by the power which had brought them into existence. If their reasonable expectations had not been disappointed, the petty quarrels among some of the chiefs would have been from time to time adjusted without resort to arms."

See what is related in this volume of the massacre of the 1200 Aba Qulusi, and of the grounds for the "petty quarrels" in the country. See, for the influence of the Resident, the Sitimela slaughter.

"Repeated experience has proved that it is cheaper and more convenient to manage warlike barbarians as subjects than as nominally independent neighbours. The rough-and-ready arrangement which was effected by Sir Garnet Wolseley might have been tolerable, and, if not permanent, at least moderately durable, but for a sentimental agitation which was directed to the restoration of Cetshwayo."

Granted that a feeling directed exclusively to the performance of an act of abstract justice to an individual may be stigmatised as "sentimental." But compare the "sentiments" which actuated the Bishop in espousing the

cause of Cetshwayo (e. g. those expressed by him in the words prefaced to the above conditions) with the "sentiment" known in popular language as Jingoism, which can ignore the most patent facts and invent or recklessly adopt the most extravagant fictions for the sake of justifying the conduct of distinguished officers of the Empire, and discrediting the life-work of an unpopular prophet.

"He had been harshly treated, and the gallant defence of his kingdom could not be punished or resented as a crime; but the interests of the Zulus had become irreconcilable with his own."

It was because the contrary of this last proposition had been established by the most overwhelming evidence that the Bishop so strongly advocated the ex-King's restoration. And his view was taken by numbers of persons on the spot, e. g. the Boer Colonists of Natal and the administrators of the Government of the Transvaal, none of whom could be suspected of false sentiment about a Zulu. The persons who in various parts of Natal pronounced by means of petitions against the Bishop's view on this point, constituted, according to population returns not quite one-fortieth of the whole European population, making no allowance for the undoubted fact that names were in not a few cases counted more than once because affixed to different petitions. It will be seen that the reviewer changes his ground from "cheaper and more convenient" to "irreconcilable with Zulu interests." But regard for Zulu interests was "sentiment in the Bishop."

"No politician could have anticipated that an English minister would be found to receive a dethroned potentate as an interesting pretender, and then, with romantic sympathy, to restore him to his throne. Sir Henry Bulwer, the experienced and judicious Governor of Natal, urged upon his superiors the expediency of securing a retreat for the chiefs who were to be capriciously dispossessed in a territory to be reserved for the purpose. Lord Kimberley, apparently for the purpose of thwarting a too zealous subordinate, drew his pen through the middle (*sic*) of the district which Sir Henry Bulwer had marked for the proposed Reserve on the map. It is in this diminished space that John Dunn and other

[dis]loyal chiefs have taken refuge under the protection of an English Resident. But for Lord Kimberley's arbitrary interference nearly half of Zululand would now enjoy the benefits which might well have been extended to the whole."

Among the false premises that admit of being most readily disproved is this fiction respecting the necessity of providing a reserve for Zulus unwilling to be under the King's rule. As far as the disposition of the people is concerned it has been most plainly shown that in the reduced reserve an overwhelming majority of the people were strongly attached to the King and anxious that his rule should be extended over them. Great efforts have been made by the Natal officials to conceal this fact. No efforts at all have ever been made by the Home Government to obtain testimony on the subject from persons not pledged to sustain the official view. J. Dunn and Hlubi the Basuto no doubt voted against the National party for obvious reasons hardly entitling them to be called "loyal." With regard to the extension of the British Protectorate to the whole of Zululand, this is what Cetshwayo desired and what he could not get.

"The Boer adventurers have not hesitated to appropriate supreme authority, as it has dropped from the nerveless hands which now administer a once vigorous Empire. It seems that they have effected at least a temporary reconciliation among the native belligerents."

This was written in dependence upon Mr. J. Robinson's telegrams to the *Times* and before the news of Zibebu's defeat reached us.

"But Usibebu and Oham [Uhamu] were represented at the ceremony which accompanied the re-establishment of the dynasty of Pandu in a mutilated and dependent kingdom. Many years ago an English agent exercised at the coronation of Cetshwayo the right of investiture which is now assumed without dispute by a voluntary gathering of settlers from the Transvaal. The new King, or those who control his policy, may probably think it prudent to discontinue the menaces and occasional incursions

which have placed the English Resident on the defensive in the Reserve."

We have yet to learn the full truth concerning the fighting in the Reserve. What has transpired only serves to show the hollowness of the official view already commented on. Many of the Zulus whom Mr. Osborn attacked were residents in the Reserve, and refusal to pay taxes is alleged in telegrams as a cause of the hostilities.

"Although the rule of hereditary succession is but capriciously observed among the natives of South Africa [?], there is no reason for objecting to the elevation of Cetshwayo's son, except that he derives his title from the choice of lawless usurpers. If he keeps the peace, he will probably be recognised, after a reasonable delay, by the Imperial and local authorities. In the probable contingency of a revival of the struggle with the King's uncle Oham and with his rival Usibepu, the Boers will probably find an opportunity of occupying additional territory as a reward of intervention on one side or the other. According to their own convenience, the new settlers will either retain their political connection with the Transvaal or set up a little Republic of their own, in accordance with the Stellaland precedent. Any attempt on the part of Dinuzulu to restore the warlike organisation which made his ancestors formidable will be summarily and sternly repressed by his new patrons; nor would such an experiment be regarded with favour by the English colonists. It is true that Cetshwayo during the height of his power always maintained friendly relations with the Government of Natal; but it is possible that his successor might rather incline to alliance with the Boers. Within a few years the military and political reputation of England in South Africa has been gravely impaired, and it is possible that native chiefs may exaggerate the decadence which better-informed politicians attribute to Cabinets at home, and not to provincial administrators.

"The report that one of the ablest and most loyal officers of the Crown has tendered his resignation may possibly not be confirmed; but Sir Henry Bulwer has by a long course of public service fairly earned promotion. As Lieutenant-Governor of Natal he steadily protested against Sir Bartle Frere's warlike policy; but he is not one of the pedants who regulate their conduct after the close of

a war with exclusive reference to the original merits of the quarrel."

Compare these words with page 174 *supra*, and with the Bishop's language. Sir H. Bulwer's policy has proceeded entirely upon a false view of Cetshwayo's character, and, without reference to the "original merits of the *quarrel*," it is clear that it was very material not to lose sight of the fact that the Home Government had been grossly deceived on this subject.

"When the Zulu dynasty was overthrown, Sir Henry Bulwer seems to have agreed with Sir Bartle Frere in the opinion that some kind of English protectorate should be substituted for the despotism of Cetshwayo."

Compare Cetshwayo's words on p. 283 : "There has been more bloodshed since I have been a prisoner than during the whole of my reign. The bloodshed in my reign was to the bloodshed since as an ant in a pond of water."

"The determination of the Home Government to reverse Sir Bartle Frere's policy at all points must since have caused incessant trouble and anxiety to its unwilling agent. It would have been equitable, and perhaps it might have been safe, to avoid a collision with the Zulu King; but neither expediency nor justice required that no advantage should be taken of his fall."

Compare the Bishop's language on p. 358 *supra*.

"Soon after the end of the war Sir Henry Bulwer called the attention of the Colonial Office to the intrigues of officious philanthropists for the restoration of Cetshwayo. He must afterwards have been greatly surprised at the conversion of Downing Street to the sentimental theories of Bishopstowe."

The "intrigues" and "sentimental theories of Bishopstowe" are fully set forth in the Bishop's own language in the letters referred to under his name in the index.

"But he had perhaps become habituated to the rejection of his advice, when his proposed frontier line was capriciously shifted to

the south. In the midst of danger and dishonour, arising from blind timidity, there is some consolation in the fact that English civilians and soldiers, removed from the influence of constituencies and caucuses, are not inferior in capacity or courage to their predecessors. It was against the advice of the commander of the forces that Mr. Gladstone capitulated to the insurgent Boers. The restoration of Cetshwayo was not recommended by a single competent and responsible adviser on the spot."

This is true if it means that the officials of the Natal Native Department and those accepting their version of facts did not advise the restoration. If the words "and responsible" (in the sense animadverted upon on p. 2 *supra*) be struck out, the statement is false.

"It may also be observed that colonists who are exposed to the aggressions of savage tribes or of civilised neighbours seldom fail to urge on the Imperial Government an active and vigilant policy. The Australian Governments and Legislatures almost openly advocate the establishment of a Monroe doctrine in the South Pacific. The English inhabitants of South Africa for the most part approved of the Zulu war, notwithstanding the trivial nature of the alleged provocation. All the colonies from the Cape to Natal publicly express their regret for the death of Sir Bartle Frere, who was studiously neglected and disparaged by the dominant party in England. He may have made mistakes; but he was right in his fundamental conviction that the Empire would be best maintained by the bold and energetic policy to which it owes its existence. It is easy to sneer at a supposed devotion to 'gunpowder and glory.' If gunpowder means force and readiness to use it, the effect which it produces is with few exceptions pacific. 'Glory' is not an ordinary English motive, and it assuredly had no influence on such a career as that of Sir Bartle Frere. Inglorious avoidance of responsibility is almost always dangerous."

In a letter to the Secretary of State dated 4th of April, 1880, Sir H. Bulwer wrote, "The view of his Excellency the Lieut.-General, and also of his Excellency the High Commissioner, were both based on the assumption of an invasion of Natal by the Zulus—a contingency which, though it was of course a *possibility*, as it had been a possibility for the last

thirty years, was, in the opinion of this Government, in the highest degree improbable, unless indeed it should be brought about by compromising action on our part." And again, in another despatch, "Now I venture to say that up to that time we, in this colony, had not so much as heard the word of war . . . the idea of a Zulu war had not yet occurred to any one. The idea was an imported idea. It was imported at the time of the arrival of the troops and the head-quarters staff from the Cape Colony. Once introduced under such circumstances the idea spread fast enough."

The above article closes with some essentially unchristian sentiments. Many more obvious comments might be made on it. It is produced here for comparison with the Bishop's own words, because it is a fair sample of the matter which has appeared over and over again in the journal from which it is taken—a journal the influence of which was probably well characterised by a University professor who wrote recently of "the Sadducees of the *Saturday Review*, that Philistine print that has done so much to vulgarise its University readers and writers." And it may be added that one may look in vain through the columns of such journals for a recognition of the supreme importance of the "sentiment," never absent from the Bishop's mind, which he expressed in the words that close the passage printed in this volume beneath his portrait.

I N D E X.

ABORIGINES' Protection Society, 67, 72
"Agitation" in Zululand, causes of, 178.

Ancestral spirits of Zulus, 173.

Appointed chiefs, 17; Gaozi, death-bed utterance of, 27; three represented in second deputation, 31; Seketwayo's letters patent, 31, 83, 84; seven in favour of Cetshwayo, 31; eight support prayer for his restoration, 36, 239; three actively hostile (*viz.* Zibebu, Mfanawendh-lela, and Dunn, 75; conditions of their appointment, 131; broken, 156; representatives of three on Great Deputation, 166, 189, *ib. in notis*; their message to Government, 225; conditions laid down as to their communication with Governor, 189 *in notis*, 192.

Arbitration (between Boers and Zulus), the Bishop advises and Sir H. Bulwer proposes, 179.

Basutos, a tribe of, located by Sir Garnet Wolseley in Zululand, 7.

Bishop of Natal, sole mouthpiece of Zulu nation, 11; is asked by great chiefs to explain Cetshwayo's offences, 17, 24; his answer, 22; his advice to emissaries of great chiefs, 26; criticises Sir H. Bulwer's version of the Sitimela slaughter, 42; visits Cetshwayo at Capetown, 55; his letter to Sir

George Colley, requesting inquiry into Mr. Osborn's facts, 68-70; reports oppression of Zulus (1880) for petitioning for Cetshwayo, 71; fears ill results, 71; receives report from Mnyamana of attempts to corrupt him, 79; reproached by the Zulus for not interfering to help them, 80; these reproaches compared with false accusations of ignorant Colonists and Government, 81 *in notis*; his letter to papers *re* deputations, 83; reports arrival of three chiefs summoned for Cetshwayo, 87; invites free expression of Zulu feeling, 110; requests leave of the Government to shelter the three chiefs at Bishopstowe, 120; is told to refer them to Secretary for Native Affairs, 121; letter to Sir E. Wood, 138; second letter as to use of word "rascal," 140; his Digest, 157-8; Sir H. Bulwer's notions as to his influence, 163; his disclaimers, 171; conditions suggested by him for restoration of King, 174 *in notis* (and see Appendix); informed against by Government spies, 175; occasions of his advice, 179-84, 243; letter to Lord Derby as to Sir H. Bulwer's accusations, 184, 212, 285; confidence in and affection for, of Zulus, 185; Zulu expressions of feeling attributed to

- his advice, 210; letter to Sir H. Bulwer, 212; is given no opportunity of refuting worthless tales sent home to Downing-street, 227; his sound knowledge of the Zulu tongue, 230; his son's testimony to this, 232; list of his Zulu books, 232 (and see 230 *in notis*); logical result of theory respecting his alleged influence in exciting deputations, 240, 285; this letters of June 1882 as to this supposed influence, 241, 246; accusations as to alleged messages to Zululand, 284, *ib. in notis*.
- Bishopstowe, 87; chiefs reproved for going to, 91; leave given them to stay at, 126; first news of Great Deputation reaches, 162; sick Zulu girl taken to, from Capetown: Sir H. Bulwer's suspicions aroused, 170; Bishopstowe and the Zulus, 185.
- Boers, failure by, to establish rights to Disputed Territory, 4; their war with Sikukuni, 59 (*in notis*); visits of, to Zululand, 151; their treatment by England pleaded by Cetshwayo, 254-5.
- Bower, Mr. G., describes Cetshwayo's distress at announcement of postponement of his visit to England, 282.
- Boundary Question between Boers and Zulus, 4, 179.
- Bulwer, Sir H., employs Zulu criminal as messenger to Cetshwayo, 33; recommends rule of kinglets, 40; adopts J. Dunn's version of Sitimela slaughter, 42; interview of chiefs with, in October 1881, 88; his opportunity for ascertaining feeling in Zululand, 169; his suspicions, 170; his blindness, 173, 183; accuses the Bishop, 171; his informers, 175, 211; his hopeless prejudice, 177; the Bishop refers Cetshwayo to, when applied to for advice, 179; representation by, as to the Bishop's advice, 180; his despatch respecting same, 182; neglects all opportunities of availing himself of the Bishop's experience and knowledge, 183-4; comments severely on language of Great Deputation to Mr. Osborn, 194; determines not to see deputation, 195; his decision and advice to Zulus respecting J. Dunn, 207; his despatch upon this interview, 213; a comparison between official account and that taken down by the Bishop, 213; his method of catechising Zulus, 217; instances of his exclusion of a forbidden topic (Cetshwayo), 218; his comment as to J. Dunn's taxes, 219; ignores the danger feared by the unarmed 2000 Zulus, 221; letter to the Bishop as to his "intervention," 244; the same criticised, 245; refutation of his charges, 246; abandons his trip to Zululand, 250; hard-heartedness towards Cetshwayo, 264; cruelly delays Cetshwayo's visit to England, 279; his disastrous hobby, 285; misled as to Zulu feeling, 287; his intentions against Cetshwayo, 289.
- Campbell, Mr. W. Y., corroborates the Bishop's evidence, 27 *in notis*.
- Capetown, proposed visit of chiefs to, discussed with Governor, 90; the Bishop's visit to, 55.
- Carnarvon, Lord, approves the Bishop's advice to Cetshwayo, 180.
- "Categorical Denials," 83, 133, 190 *in notis*; how obtained, 233.
- Cattle, collection of King's, 149, 220.
- Cetshwayo, his retreat concealed by Mbopa in spite of torture, 30; his family degraded: their treatment at Zibebu's hands, 8, 30; his book, 17, 65; his brothers, 17-28, 31; they are "given" to J. Dunn, 51;

his son, 18; deathbed tribute to his worth, 27; his "City of Refuge," 25-31; the solitary (alleged) insolent message from, 32; his justice to Dunn, 42; his captivity, 55; news of his home, 57; names his new baby, 57; denied by Natal Government the most trifling moral support, 58 *in notis*; writes to J. Dunn, 59; his wives, 60-1; official report on, 262; his distress at thought of their position, 283; affection of, for his family, 284; petitions for freedom, 60; his prayer refused, 61; corroborates his chiefs' testimony, 62-3; learns to sign his name, 64; his visitors, 65; his best friends excluded and bitterest foes admitted, 65; his amusements, 65; his close confinement, 66; proposed location of, with Langalibalele, 66-7; is ready to go to England, 67; his millet, 99; stigmatised as "scoundrel" by Sir E. Wood's interpreter, 136; officials labour to maintain fiction as to his character, 235; official estimate of, in England, 266; begs to be allowed to go to England, 252; his touching letters to Mr. Gladstone and Lord Kimberley, 253; his request entertained, 255; repeated letters from, 257, 286; supplicates Government on behalf of his family, 258-9; his petition neglected in Natal, 259; his visit delayed: legal difficulties, 264-9; the King's word taken, 270; fresh difficulties: custodian discredited, 271; choice of custodian, 272; the King's excellent conduct and letter respecting, 274-5; desires separate interpreter, 275; is robbed of a devoted friend, 276; is cruelly disappointed by Sir H. Bulwer, 279; shock to Cetshwayo, and first symptoms of heart disease, 282;

compares bloodshed in Zululand since his reign with that before, 283; his letters, 286; misrepresentations concerning him continue unchecked, 291; leading to his ruin and death, 292.

City of Refuge established by Cetshwayo, 31.

Clifford, General, his courtesy and kindness to Cetshwayo, 55-6, 65-6.

Colenbrander, J., kills Maduna's cousin, 97; joins J. Dunn in Sitimela butchery, 146.

Colenso, Dr. R., refused access to Cetshwayo by Sir B. Frere, 65.

Colenso, Miss, accused by Sir H. Bulwer of giving advice to Zulus, 177, 183.

Colenso, Mr. F. E., refused access to Cetshwayo by Sir B. Frere, 62; letter to Lord Derby, 176 *in notis*; appointed political agent by Cetshwayo, 180; Colonel Durnford's comments on appointment, 181; testimony of, as to the Bishop's knowledge of Zulu, 232.

Colley, Colonel (Sir G. P.), 1; requested to institute inquiry into circumstances of deputation, 113; delays to do so on account of unsettled state of Zulu mind, 114, 151; his declaration forbidding mention of Cetshwayo's name, 160.

Colonial newspapers, unfounded assertions in, corrected by the Bishop, 237.

Dabulamazi, 57; and J. Dunn, 201; appeals for Cetshwayo, rejecting Dunn and his taxes, 205.

Deputations from Zululand, 12, 13; difficulties surmounted by first emissaries, 17; official reply to same, 20; they defend Cetshwayo against Sir B. Frere's charges, 23-32; a second gets a pass from Resident,

- 28; and is referred back to him, 30; a third applies in vain for one, and goes down without one, 35; alleged repudiation of, 48, 73, 233; no report of first sent to England, 106; fifth or Great Deputation, 159, 161; recapitulation, *ib.*; representative character of, admitted, 162; its object misrepresented, 163; constitution of, 166; enters Natal unarmed, 167; applies to Resident at Pietermaritzburg, 168, 224; communicates with Bishopstowe, 185; approaches the city, 186; treatment and blameless conduct of deputation, 187; earnest appeal by, for a hearing, 193, 199; reproved for bringing down a large party, 195; referred back to Zululand, 196; peril incurred by the 2000 Zulus, 197; the deputation defends its language, 198; interviews Resident again, 199; is finally rebuffed by Governor, 200; prepares for departure, 200; but defers it on arrival of J. Dunn, 201, 222; turns homeward in danger of destruction, 220; its "purposes" suspected by the Governor, 222; duly reports itself, 224; strict attention by Zulus to form of no avail, 226-7; arrival of "party of demonstration" represented by Sir H. Bulwer as ground for abandoning trip to Zululand, 250; and for delaying Cetshwayo's visit to England, 280; the 2000 Zulus gain nothing by perfect behaviour and laying aside of arms, 251; magnitude of deputation altogether understated by Sir H. Bulwer, 346.
- Dinuzulu, Cetshwayo's son, is presented with horse, 57.
- Disputed territory, decreed to be of "strict right belonging to Zulus," 4-5; handed over to Boers, *ib.*;
- arbitration respecting, 179; award respecting, 272 *in notis*.
- Dunn, chief J., is rewarded for treachery to Zulus, 6; his people armed, 19; Seizes cattle, *ib.*; his slaughter of Sitimela's people, 41 *et seq.*, 142, 197, 206; his own account of his doings, 145; misstatement by, as to deputations, 83; arrives at Pietermaritzburg, 200; is summoned with his people to interview with Governor, 201; his tyranny, 202; is confronted with the chiefs at Government House, 203; his taxes objected to out of loyalty to King, 204; his remedy against disaffection, 208; statement in papers as to his people's aversion to Cetshwayo's return produced to him, 209; his yoke intolerable, *ib.*; treasure acquired by, from Zulus, 216 *in notis*; connection between him and English Government in eyes of Zulus, 220.
- Durnford, R.E., Col. A. W., letter as to the two political agents, 181; letter from, as to Sir Theo. Shepstone's and the Bishop's visits to England, 184 *in notis*; his Boundary Award, 272.
- "English falsehood," 12, 84, 261.
- Figurative expressions of Zulus, 7.
- Fokoti, Zibebu's brother, 141.
- Frere, Sir B., refuses the Bishop's sons and daughter access to the King, 55; favourably impresses Cetshwayo at personal interview, 59; urges him to practice resignation, 61.
- Gifford, Lord, his party tortures Mbopa, 30.
- Gladstone, Mr., promises greater liberty to Cetshwayo, 46; speech of, as to Zulu national feeling, 160; Sir H. Bulwer does not share in his views, 245.


- Grandier taken prisoner by Zulus and hospitably treated by Cetshwayo, 63.
- Hamu (Oham) appointed a kinglet, 8; massacres the Aba Qulusi, 41, 151-5; Cetshwayo's half-brother, in the first instance well affected towards the King, 57, 142; his white man's apology for, 148; his character, 151; Government under pledges to, *ib.*
- Hlubi (a Basuto chief) appointed a kinglet, 7; merits and demerits of appointment considered, 7.
- Inhlazatshe meeting (with Sir E. Wood), 75, 89.
- Kimberley, Lord, interests himself to ameliorate conditions of Cetshwayo's captivity, 256; writes respecting Sir H. Bulwer's delaying Cetshwayo's visit to England, 289; recapitulates telegrams concerning, 290; and decides upon the King's starting, 291.
- Langalibalele, 67; his miserable prison, 67, 68, 278 *in notis*; his audacious plea, 194 *in notis*.
- Legislative Council of Natal, misleading reply in, 133; Dunn's conduct commended in, 144.
- Letters patent, Seketwayo's, 31, 83; their probative force, 84.
- Lloyd, Archdeacon, 65.
- Maduna, Cetshwayo's brother (*see* Ndaduko).
- Malimati (*see* Mr. Osborn).
- Mavumengwana objects to paying J. Dunn taxes which are pointed to as evidence of disloyalty to Cetshwayo, 204.
- Matshana, treacherous attempt to arrest, 1-2.
- Message from Cetshwayo to Sir H. Bulwer in 1876, the formidable but fictitious, 62.
- Mbopa refuses under torture to betray Cetshwayo, 30.
- Mfunzi and Sindindi, well-known old King's messengers, 110, 133; the former punished for representing his chief in Natal, 74, 85; calls thank-offerings to witness, 86.
- Mitchell, Col. (Col. Secretary), discredits deputations, 48, 73.
- Mkosana, return of, from Capetown causes excitement, 149, 173.
- Mnyamana, 38, 52, 57; inquires grounds of Cetshwayo's deposition, 17; prepares to join embassy, 31; silenced at Sir E. Wood's meeting, 52; is advised to repudiate his messengers, 79; devotion to Cetshwayo's family, 79-80; houses the Princes, royal women, and children, 101; called to account by Osborn, whom he withstands, 101; reports massacre of Aba Qulusi, 151.
- Morning Post*, letter in, as to Cetshwayo's custodian, 273.
- Mpande (Panda), his grave desecrated, 30.
- Natal Witness*, accusations against the Bishop by, 171; his letters to, 171.
- Natal Mercury*, admission in, as to bad effect of Sir E. Wood's visit, 53, 92; ditto as to support Maduna would find throughout Zululand, 54; report in, as to Zibebu's willingness to submit to Cetshwayo, 58 *in notis*.
- Native Affairs Office in Natal, its influence, 2; relations of, with Bishopstowe, 121-3; neglect of Cetshwayo's petition as to his family, 264.
- Ncongwana, Ngobozana, and Posile (the three chiefs deputed to join the King), punishment of, for petitioning for Cetshwayo, 74-6; interview of first with Resident, 76; is insulted, 77; their second attempt to get a hearing at Pietermaritzburg,

- 87; their interview with Sir H. Bulwer, and steadfast waiting at Bishopstowe, 116; interview at Government House, 117; are plunged into despair by telegraphic message, 117-8; the real telegram, 120; pleasant prospects, 127; interview with Mr. H. Shepstone, 127; the Resident gracious, 129; embarkation of, 132; Sir E. Wood's confused and misleading telegrams as to the Bishop's instrumentality in summoning them, 238.
- Ndabuko (Maduna), Cetshwayo's brother, joins second deputation, 31; silenced at Sir E. Wood's meeting, 52; admission in *Natal Mercury* as to support he would find throughout Zululand, 54; gives his nephew Dinuzulu a horse, 57; reports Zibebu's raid to Resident, 95; his young men retaliate, 96; are sent by their chief prisoners to the Resident, 97; his restraining hand, 96; his cousin murdered by Zibebu's white man, 97; addresses assembled Zulus on Great Deputation, 167; slandered to Government, 203; his character misrepresented, 229, 326 *in notis*.
- Niggers and Yokels, 124.
- Nozaza brings down letters patent of appointed chief, 83; carries them to Secretary for Native Affairs Office, 110 *in notis*.
- Ntshingwayo, appointed chief, 57
- Nunn (Hamu's white man), apology by, for Hamu's misdeeds, 148; reports message to Hamu, purporting to be Resident's license for "eating up," 151.
- "Ofi" (*see* Shepstone, Theo., jun.).
- Official fictions, 14-16.
- Official views, influence of, in Zululand, 105.
- Official justifications for Sir H. Bulwer's neglect of Great Deputation' 223.
- Official jealousy of the Bishop, 226-7.
- Official method of learning the truth, 234.
- Osborn, Mr. (Malimati), Zulu Resident, Zulus referred to, 24; Zulus apply to, and are refused hearing, 28; refuses passes, 34, 78-9, 165; instructed to hear Zulus, but inaccessible to them, 34; his attitude towards loyal chiefs, 77; how far responsible for oppression in Zululand, 130-1, 332; interview with Hamu as to massacre of Aba Qulusi, 154; his *induna* denies Zulus access to him, 165; the Governor's reliance upon his accuracy, 183, 195; reception by, of messengers announcing Great Deputation, 169; further interview with, 186, 190; upbraids them for want of passes, but is silenced by their facts, 189; evidence of stifling of Zulu petitions, 112, 191; accused to his face by members of Great Deputation, 193; again meets the Zulus, 199; his version of Zulu speeches compared with that of the Bishop, 228-9, 301.
- Passes, futile applications for, 34, 164, 189; indispensable, 38, 188; censures of Zulus for not procuring, 91, 189.
- Pine, Sir B., recalled for Langalibalele affair, 184.
- Poole, Major, and Cetshwayo, 64, 66.
- Posile, punishment of, for carrying his chief's message about Cetshwayo, 86.
- Princes, the Zulu, their status and property after war, 18, 19; ordered under J. Dunn, 100, 141; insulted by Zibebu, 18; destitute of all power save moral influence, 215 *in notis*; the genuineness of their

- excuse for delaying return of Great Deputation, 221.
- Punishments of Zulu messengers, 84.
- Qulusi, Aba, massacre of, 141, 152, 154, 178.
- Robinson, Sir Hercules, 87; his comprehension of Cetshwayo's needs, 256; tries to save King from disappointment of postponement of visit to England, 281.
- Robinson, J., editor of *Natal Mercury*, and correspondent of *London Times*, 65, 143, 363
- Royal house, attempt to degrade, 9.
- Royal women wait on Resident, 102; are insulted in his presence, 103; are housed by loyal chiefs, 104.
- Rudolph, Mr., 136, 138, 141.
- Samuelson, Mr. R., his affection for Cetshwayo and desire to help him, 276; is dismissed for inattention to formalities in posting letters to England for him, 277; his pity for the captive and characterisation of his place of bondage, 278 *in notis*.
- Schreuder, Bishop, 18, 65.
- Seketwayo (an appointed chief), he and his brothers staunch, 82; his letters patent, 31, 83; his representatives on Great Deputation, 191.
- Shepstone, Mr. J., is censured by Lord Carnarvon, 1; interviews third deputation, 38; interview of Zulus with Governor in Oct. 1881, 88; his report on deputation, criticised and condemned, 106-10; directs Zulus to report themselves if pass refused, 163; his spies, 175; the Matshana inquiry, 183; deputed to hear emissaries, 195; a dissentient from Filmer's doctrine, 210; fails to report preliminary announcement from Great Deputation, 225-6; his nephew appointed Cetshwayo's custodian in England, 273; and chooses interpreter, 279.
- Shepstone, Henriquez, England ahead, 127; appointed Cetshwayo's custodian in England, 273, and chooses interpreter, 279.
- Shepstone, Sir Theo., 17; message to Cetshwayo as to annexation of Transvaal, 59; visits England to answer for outrages upon Langalibalele's and Putini's tribes, 184.
- Shepstone, Theo., jun., 77 *in notis*.
- Shingana (Cetshwayo's brother) joins second deputation, 31.
- Sitimela, 41; butchery of Mtetwas, 143; account of his disastrous visit to Zululand, 144.
- Siwunguza (an appointed chief) catechised as to his deputation to Natal, 73; recommended to punish his messengers, 74; punishes them, but expresses his sympathy, 85; detains his brother, 87.
- Smith, Dr. J. W., appointed political agent by Cetshwayo, 180.
- Sobantu (= "Father of the people." Bishop Colenso's name among Zulus), 12.
- Sitshaluza, 57.
- Sotondose (Resident's attendant) advises chiefs to repudiate their messengers, 79, 80, 261.
- Strahan, Sir G., 59, 66.
- Swazis, British allies, 60.
- Taxes, J. Dunn's, 216; payment of these of moment to Zulus chiefly as affecting Cetshwayo's return, 217.
- Thank-offerings, 86.
- Tom, 175, 308.
- Transvaal, annexation of, 59 *in notis*.
- Transvaal boundary question, 179.
- Umkungo (Cetshwayo's brother), 63.
- Wolseley, Sir Garnet, his settlement of Zululand, 3; general condemna-

- tion of arrangements, *ib.*; reverses Boundary Award, 4; promises to leave Zululand to the Zulus, 5; grants portion thereof to Boers, 5; and portion to Basutos, 7; his policy towards royal house, 8; his discourtesy towards Cetshwayo, 9.
- Zibebu is appointed a kinglet, 6; his character, 6; breaks truce, *ib.*; oppression by, 39; raid by, 53; would have submitted to Cetshwayo had he been encouraged, 58 *in notis*; raids by, after Inhlazat-she meeting, 93, 141; his *impi* kills women, 95; wanton attack by, on Gebuza and party, 98; further raid by, and killing of women, 98; his visit to Governor turned to account, 108; possible reconciliation with Cetshwayo prevented by whites, 109, 142-3; and by officials, *ib.*; Cetshwayo brings his conduct to notice of Government, 259.
- Ziwedu (Cetshwayo's brother) prepares to join embassy, 31; silenced at Sir E. Wood's meeting, 52.
- Zulu boundary award, 4.
- Zulu nation is not consulted, 10; its voice stifled, 11; proclamations of British goodwill towards, 10; its first attempts to petition for Cetshwayo's return, 11; its emissaries abandon figurative language, 12; extent of representation of, by Great Deputation, 243.
- Zululand, area of, 243 *in notis*.
- Zulus, their devotion to Cetshwayo, 12; special evidence of, 30, 156, 167-8; their faith in Sobantu, 12; their repeated and futile efforts to see Resident, 34; their expression of loyalty towards Cetshwayo "taken for granted" and ignored by Sir H. Bulwer, 214; helpless position of loyal Zulus under disfavour of Colonial Government, 236.

END OF VOL. I.





DT878 .Z9C6 v.1

The ruin of Zululand: an account of

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00023 9485