

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 ? ”

Dabulamanzani 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 Dabulamanzhi 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 Dabulamanzhi *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 assegais 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 Capetown, 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 (Ngeongewana 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.