

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 redcoats 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 Cetshwayo’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 Cetshwayo’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 Ziwedú (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, Ziwedu, 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 Ngcongwana, &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), Ziweddu, 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 reconnaissance 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 seemed 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 concerned 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 waited 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 relied 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 addressed 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 Ngeongwana 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 1833.

to the Governor. This they one and all entreated him to do, while the whole assembly earnestly reasserted 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 shuttlecocks 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 hillside, 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