

It was only when a (supposed) fault was to be accounted for that Cetshwayo's brother was put in the foreground thus by the Natal Government. But it must also be observed that, although during this particular interview the question of *why arms had been taken up by those who had assembled to protect the Princes* was not apparently raised at all, Sir Henry Bulwer already knew, from Mr. Osborn's report of the previous conference, that of June 17th, precisely why they had done so. The chiefs then present had distinctly asserted—so writes Mr. Osborn [3466, p. 67]—that “the men forming it (the *impi*) had come together of their own accord to protect the chiefs, especially Undabuko and other sons of Mpande as they had heard that there were those who meant to attack and kill them.” And Kilane, a trusted messenger from the Government to Zululand, had reported to the S.N.A. on July 11th, ten days before Sir Henry Bulwer wrote as above, that it was a mistake to suppose that Ndabuko had attacked Zibebu; and when on hearing this, Mr. Shepstone appealed to Siziba (another Zulu messenger), the latter told him how Zibebu had made the first attack, and how “on this the Zulu people rose, saying ‘Who will refuse to give his life to-day? The sons of Mpande are attacked again! Let us go and fight for them!’ But Mnyamana and Ndabuko prevented them, saying ‘Do not let us attack!’” The S.N.A. replied, “It is well. I now understand, though I had heard another tale; Mnyamana is an *indoda* (manly, fine fellow) in that he has not

fought.” And he promised to report their words to the Governor.*

After careful consideration of all the evidence offered upon the subject, and cross examination of several Zulus, no unprejudiced mind could entertain a doubt as to the substantial truth of the stories of Umsutshwana and Ngamule.

But my readers will hardly have accompanied me so far without learning to be prepared for a determination on the part of the Government officials to give credence to *any* tale, however improbable, which they might receive from Zibebu, rather than to the sorrowful story of the sufferers from his tyranny.

Nor will they be disappointed. On July 27th, 1882, Sir H. Bulwer writes [3466, p. 116] to the Earl of Kimberley as follows:—

“Everything serves to show that Undabuko has been the prime mover in these disturbances. When he returned from Natal he evidently did so with a deliberately formed design to carry the agitation to the extreme measure of taking up arms, not, it is to be observed, in defence, but for aggressive purposes.”

This is truly an amazing statement, after which one begins to wonder how far the writer can be altogether responsible for his own words and actions. There is something hardly sane in this persistent

* The above does not appear in the Blue Book, which in fact gives a most meagre account of Kilane's report, although he was sent up especially by the Government, and it might have been imagined that they would have taken the opportunity of gaining all the information possible. Perhaps they did, but, if so, they kept it to themselves.

rejection of the most palpable truths by a man who, five years earlier * had shown so much ability and sense of justice as had Sir Henry Bulwer. What he means by "everything shows, &c.," and "it is to be observed" is simply and solely that Zibebu, in excuse for his own violent action, *asserted* it. He asks Lord Kimberley's "particular attention" to the statement of Sikota—i. e. Zibebu's statement made through his induna Sikota—and encloses the Resident's report on the whole subject. This is, of course, in precisely the same tone. It appears to him, he says [3466, p. 116], that Umsutshwana and the other chiefs—

"Voluntarily vacated their kraals, and removed their families into Somkeli's territory (i. e. into an almost uninhabitable desert, included in Somkeli's district) for safety in view of the open conflict then pending.† . . . Umsutshwana and the other headmen

* In his despatches before the Zulu war, in which he exposed the fictions by which his fellows were bringing about that war with a firm hand. Owing to his attitude on this occasion many felt a confidence in him on his return to Natal, which was not justified by his subsequent actions.

† Sir H. Bulwer explains this "open conflict then pending" by asserting (on Zibebu's authority) that a message was sent to Umsutshwana by Undabuko after the latter's return with the Great Deputation, bidding Umsutshwana to take up arms, as he had received authority to do this from the "Amakosi" at Pietermaritzburg [*ibid.*, p. 223]. In a later despatch, on still more worthless authority—viz. that of two men, one of them a petty official under Government, who living on Bishopstowe lands, acted as a spy, reporting to the S.N.A. Office all he could learn or invent of the Bishop's doings, and the other an induna of that office, but of whom the Governor speaks as "two trustworthy natives," which neither of them were—he asserts that by "Amakosi," Ndabuko must have meant his friends at Bishopstowe—not the Bishop himself, but his daughter (the present writer's sister) Miss Colenso!

of his party are very anxious that they and their people should be allowed to return to their homesteads. This Zibebu refuses to permit for the reasons given by his indunas."

Undabuko never made the statements attributed to him; he never did take up arms (except in self-defence), and certainly Miss Colonso never gave him any such advice, nor could the expression "Amakosi" have signified any one except the Government. Later on a Zulu messenger, Makeu, committed a fault which gave some retrospective colouring to Sir Henry Bulwer's suspicion, although the case was such a different one in some respects, as to leave it still improbable that any of the Zulus ever used the term "Amakosi" for the Bishop and his family. On this later occasion, after Cetshwayo's "restoration," Makeu had a message to carry from the Bishop to the King, requesting the latter to send down certain witnesses required upon a case on trial in Maritzburg, and in his anxiety to succeed in his mission, the messenger forgot, what he, like all others, had constantly been taught at Bishopstowe, that the simple truth, and that only, would ever serve a right purpose, and, to expedite matters, as he thought, he told Mr. Fynn, the Government official Resident with the King, that it was *the Governor* who had sent him. But on being pressed by Mr. Fynn, who had excellent reasons for doubting the fact, he acknowledged that it was *Sobantu* (the Bishop) of whom he had spoken as *Hulumendi* (Governor or Government). Sir Henry Bulwer spoke of this as "a remarkable instance of the way in which some of the members of the extreme Usutu party have come to look upon the Bishop of Natal, from the part which he has taken on their side in the political affairs of the Zulu country" [3705, p. 69]; but, as a matter of fact, it was nothing of the kind. It was a proof that Makeu had discovered from themselves, how jealous were the Government officials of what they chose to call "interference" on the Bishop's part, and that he knew very well that, far from the name carrying authority, Cetshwayo would be less likely to be allowed by his white tyrants to pay any attention to a request from *Sobantu*, than from any other white man in Natal [*ibid.*, p. 60]. Makeu was to blame for his untruth, and Cetshwayo reproved him for it, but it is less remarkable that *one* amongst the brow-beaten "King's-men," should have failed in strict truth, than that many should have adhered to it so accurately and unflinchingly, that none of the facts collected and published by the Bishop have ever been answered, except by mere contradictions

These reasons are recorded thus [*ibid.*, p. 119]:—

“They are his open enemies, and he would be bringing them back into the midst of his loyal people. They would rise against him and kill him if he allowed this. The heads of the Usutu party to whom they belong have already threatened to take forcible possession of part of his territory during next moon.”

Their being “open enemies” meant, as usual, that they had expressed their wish for the King’s return, and of the rest of the “reasons” there is not the smallest proof, except Zibebu’s own word, while it must be remembered that the “part of his territory which the Princes had—not “threatened to take forcible possession of”—but appealed to the Natal Government and Mr. Osborn to restore to them—meant their own kraals and land, from which they had been expelled by Zibebu, for no other fault than that of “praying for Cetshwayo.”

Now, it was well known before the Great Deputation left Maritzburg that the members of it expected to be attacked upon their return without having been received by the Governor, by the three unfriendly chiefs. Zibebu and Hamu, it will be remembered,

without proof, neither subsequent admissions from the men themselves—except in this single case—nor after events, having ever risen against them. This fact is, of course, partly due to the Bishop’s extreme care in sifting any information he received before accepting it, and to the Zulus being well aware that the truth only would serve them with him. Also, to much of his information coming direct from the Princes, men of natural sincerity and unimpeachable honesty.

Of the trial alluded to, and how right Mr. Fynn was in supposing that Government did not want witnesses to be sent from Zululand, a full account will be given in its proper place.

had threatened beforehand, "if you are rejected [at Maritzburg], and come back without what you are asking for, we shall wipe you out;" and they made their first attack upon the Princes, &c., within six days of their arrival, and without the smallest provocation; while Dunn, who had exclaimed in the streets of Maritzburg to some of the men from this district, "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;" * sent them a message as soon as they returned, "Prepare your weapons! Sharpen your assegais! Look out for a place of refuge, for I am coming."

Umsutshwana was privately warned by one of Zibebu's brothers that the threatened vengeance was about to fall upon him and his tribe, whereupon they escaped into the desert, and this is what Mr. Osborn calls "voluntarily" vacating their kraals!

Zibebu's story, which is simply a mass of false excuses, mere "reports," and plausible inventions,†

* This speech was afterwards put into the mouth of the favourite scape-goat, Undabuko, but it was never spoken by him, and the men to whom Dunn used the threat repeated it *at the time*, i. e. the same or the following day, with all the surrounding circumstances, to the present writer's family.

† Mr. Osborn writes to Sir Henry Bulwer on this occasion [3466, p. 117]: "Zibebu's statement, as made through his indunas, is more entitled to credence than that of Undabuko, and the other Usutu headmen. I have always found Zibebu straightforward and truthful in any transactions I have had with him." This is no more than the Resident's own opinion, and that opinion appears to be grounded solely on his personal inclination to *believe* Zibebu's assertions, which to the minds of impartial observers are by no means borne out by acknowledged facts. On the other

may be shortly summed up from the accounts of his own messengers, as follows:—

When Undabuko returned from Maritzburg, he called upon the people to arm against the kinglets unfriendly to Cetshwayo, as the King was coming back at once;* thereupon the whole tribe, living over a very considerable extent of country, left their homes, and taking with them their cattle and grain, went away into the bush country, in the middle of winter, leaving their huts behind them, and doing this to show defiance to Zibebu, and to gain favour with the returning King. Zibebu neither threatened them beforehand, nor molested their deserted homesteads; he merely refused to allow such rebellious subjects to return and set up a head-quarters of disturbance within his territory, especially as the tribe, not content with carrying off cattle and grain from the kraals of Zibebu's loyal people, on their first departure, made repeated raids from the bush country upon the quiet and inoffensive people within their reach. All this is a very pretty tale from Zibebu's point of view, and it is backed up by the reports of Mr. Osborn's messengers, sent to see, on

hand both Undabuko and Umnyamana bear high characters for truthfulness, not only amongst the Zulus, but amongst the Europeans who are personally acquainted with them.

* Ndabuko did nothing of the sort. He certainly urged the people to be firm in their peaceable petitions for the King, and they called upon each other to arm in his defence and that of the other Princes, as well as in their own, when threatened by the three kinglets. But this, under the vision of the official mind, always took the above form, on, apparently, Zibebu's original authority.

the Resident's account, what the state of things really was in the deserted homes of Umsutshwana's people. They "did not see any kraals of Umsutshwana's, of Umgamele, or of their people which had been burnt" [3466, p. 120]; but this may readily be accounted for by the fact that they went "in company with a man of Zibebu's to inspect the kraals" [*ibid.*, pp. 119 and 120], after first visiting Zibebu himself, and being directed by him to a man * who would "*be able to give us information,*" and that they "did not visit the whole district [a very large one]." Two further messengers were sent next by the Resident [3466, p. 116] "to make a thorough inspection," and these were accompanied by a couple of Umsutshwana's indunas; but no mention one way or the other of the destruction of any of the kraals appears in their report [*ibid.*, p. 180], forwarded by Mr. Osborn. They describe the deserted huts and emptied grain-pits, but repeat various tales gathered from one and another, accounting for the absence of grain in other ways than by Zibebu's act, or that of his *impis*. The various stories told on both sides here, and afterwards, to the Resident, would require much sifting and some personal knowledge of the speakers' characters to get to the bottom of them, but without entering into such wearisome details, it will be sufficient to put forward one acknowledged and undeniable fact to show that some portions of Zibebu's tales are in the highest

* A brother of Umgamule's, but one who had kept on good terms with Zibebu.

degree improbable, and that others are simply impossible.

Umsutshwana's tribe, and the others with them, were dying of want in the wilderness. The chiefs themselves report [*ibid.*, pp. 156, 182] the fact to Mr. Osborn repeatedly, and their two indunas, who accompanied Mr. Osborn's second messengers on their round of inspection, reported [3466, p. 182]:—

“On reaching the people we found them in dire distress and dying from want; they are all reduced almost to skeletons, and in addition to the hardships of hunger and exposure, they are suffering from disease in the shape of diarrhoea, caused by drinking the unwholesome water where they are encamped. The people told us to tell Umsutshwana that they were dying, and to ask him to come and see them; that they wished to see him before they died.”

And Mr. Osborn's own messengers confirm this account by the few words reported as their statement [*ibid.*, p. 181]:—“We saw that the people were suffering from want; they seemed to have but little food . . .”

It was a highly improbable thing that this tribe, on the vague report* of Cetshwayo's return, and for

* The messages and assertions attributed to Ndabuko are entirely imaginary, and the Zulus were not at all likely to act prematurely on such rumours as reached them. They are not prone to accept such readily as truth, which was sufficiently proved by what happened at the (so-called) restoration of Cetshwayo. The Government officials having omitted to give notice to the people of his actual approach, the greater part of them totally disbelieved it, and did not, therefore, at first go to meet him, those who did appear during the first few days being chiefly small bodies sent to see if there *possibly could* be any truth in the report. This fact was, of course, taken up at once by Cetshwayo's enemies to show that the people were not rejoiced at his return, although circumstances soon proved the contrary.

the distant hope of pleasing him, should have gone off in this hasty fashion into the wilderness to show their contempt for Zibebu. Nothing but an expected attack could have caused them to go off, leaving their huts behind, to expose themselves and their families to the inclemency of the season.

But had they, as is stated on Zibebu's behalf, carried off with them not only all their own herds and grain (except some of the latter which they are represented as coming back to fetch),* but cattle and stores plundered from their neighbours, besides making subsequent raids for the same purpose on peaceful kraals in their vicinity, it would have been quite impossible for them to have been so soon reduced to the condition above described. As to the kindred subject of Hamu and his complaints of raids upon him on the part of the Aba Qulusi, which occupy many pages of this Blue Book, it may be dismissed in a few words. In 1881 Hamu had attacked this tribe (for the old offence of loyalty to Cetshwayo), and falling upon them unprepared, had massacred "the greater number of them."† The remainder escaped over the border into Transvaal territory, and the "raids" complained of by Hamu in 1882 were simply reprisals on the part of the scattered remnant of the tribe, and attempts to recover not only some of the cattle of which they had been robbed, but women and children whom

* Their attempts to recover their own stores are always spoken of, officially, as raids, attacks, &c.

† See vol. i.

they had lost during the rout. The facts of this massacre by Hamu in 1881 are not denied by the officials, and Sir Henry Bulwer goes so far as to say [3466, p. 155] that "after Hamu's severe (*sic*) treatment of the Aba Qulusi last year, we cannot be surprised that that people should have taken the opportunity of the first encouragement given to them in order to retaliate upon Hamu's people."*

* Hamu certainly appears to have shown himself throughout to be the most worthless of the Zulus, and conspicuously lacked the fine qualities which distinguished his half-brothers, Cetshwayo and Ndabuko. His desertion to us during the Zulu war might be excused as weakness rather than wickedness, but his atrocious slaughter of 1200 of the Aba Qulusi, a crime with which his subsequent actions have been quite in keeping, exhibited him in an unmistakable light. There is something almost absurd in his assertion that "he has done nothing to cause all this action against him" [3466, p. 159], and in the confidence with which he requests the Resident to obtain for him the return of cattle "raided from him by the Aba Qulusi a little time ago," and of which the Boers (into whose territory, or that which they claim as theirs, the Aba Qulusi had retired) had taken possession [*ibid.*, p. 121]. Seeing that Hamu had driven out such of the Aba Qulusi as he had not murdered (for the slaughter of 1200 on one side with only 8 killed and 13 wounded on the other, can be called nothing less than murder), and had taken possession of all their worldly wealth, it may readily be imagined that any flocks and herds afterwards carried off by the remainder of the tribe, were, even if not their own identical beasts, a very reasonable substitute. Yet the Resident's reply to his request is not based upon any such question of equity, but simply on the fact of "the Boers being outside Zululand." How far even *that* can be truly said, seeing that they occupied a large portion of the country which British Commissioners had decided in 1878 to be "of strict right belonging to the Zulus" is a matter open to dispute. But here, as ever, the Boers come in to take advantage of the mistakes made by England through the folly or dishonesty of her representatives, and to reap the advantage bought by the sacrifice of her honour, and of the

This *way of putting it* is adopted in order to bring Ndabuko's name in again as the mischief-maker. "These acts of violence [raids by the Aba Qulusi] were committed in concert with, and as part of the movement of Undabuko in taking up arms after his return from Natal in May last [*ibid.*]," writes Sir Henry on August 30th, and Mr. Osborn, in reporting Hamu's complaints, remarks [*ibid.*], "Both the Aba Qulusi and the Pangesweni men belong to the Sutu party." Again the Resident had complained [*ibid.*, p. 117] on July 12th that—

"Notwithstanding the promise made by Undabuko and Umnyamana, as the principal heads of the Usutu, that all their people assembled under arms would on the appointed day disperse to their homes, and remain quiet, they have failed to carry out their

blood of her noble sons, while she herself gains nothing but the distrust of the savage tribes which once believed in her word as in a religion, and the disapproval or the ridicule of other European States. This small matter of Hamu was a trifling point—but has it not been ever so? Who profited by the Zulu war of 1879? Not England, who lost a thousand men, besides honour and treasure. Not the Zulus, surely. But the Boers? Yes, they got nearly all they wanted—released from England's rule, against which they had not dared to stir while the Zulu power existed and that portion of Zululand, long known as the "Disputed Territory," which British justice, for once rightly personified in Colonel Durnford, R.E. (see note to p. xiv. of Introduction to vol. i., and *supra*, p. 14, *ad fin.*), had assigned to the Zulus, but which Sir Garnet Wolseley, in a mood of "expediency," gave back to the Transvaal. Yet they were not satisfied. They wanted *more* land, and first of all that bit of the "Disputed Territory" which had *not* been given them by Sir Garnet Wolseley. All through those troublous times in Zululand which succeeded our invasion, the cautious advances of the Boers may be traced, and again, after Cetshwayo's death, they appear, taking advantage once more of England's mistakes. This, however, is trenching on what properly belongs to a future part of our story.

promise in two directions. viz. in the north, where the Aba Qulusi up to scarcely a week ago remained as an *impi* encamped in the rocks at the Hlobane, from whence they repeatedly raided Hamu's territory, . . . ;" and, in the south, where the people of Umsutshwana encamped in the bush, and "carried on similar acts of violence in Zibebu's territory, and are still doing so."*

"I am strongly of opinion," continues Mr. Osborn, "that these acts of violence were continued by Undabuko and Umnyamana in order to keep up the war-spirit in their party, and to provoke retaliation by the appointed chiefs, and thus obtain an excuse to reassemble their *impis*."

This is a most wanton assertion for which there are not the smallest grounds except to the prejudiced mind of the writer. He says, "Both the chiefs Hamu and Zibebu faithfully discharged their *impis* on the appointed day," and makes the above statement to show that the Princes did *not*. Yet he himself on June 23rd reported [3466, p. 69] their having done so, and he must have been perfectly well aware that they could not be responsible either for the armed parties of Umsutshwana's people who issued from time to time from the bush to procure food for their starving families, nor yet for the forays of the broken clan of the Aba Qulusi in the north, with which Ndabuko and the other Princes had nothing whatever to do. To forbid the Princes to raise hand or foot in their own defence, or to assert their own authority, to do all that was possible to lessen that authority, and to countract their influence, and yet to make them—especially Ndabuko—responsible for every wrong act of which any of the wide-spread royalists were accused—this was the manner in

* See note to p 159.

which Sir Henry Bulwer, and those who worked under and with him, elected to carry out the wishes of the Home Government for the supply of full information as to the sentiments of the Zulu people; this was the treatment accorded to Cetshwayo's faithful brothers and loyal subjects; and this—in an even more cruel degree, and with far worse consequences—was how the King himself was crushed some twelve months later.

Before closing this part of our narrative, and taking leave of the events which preceded the "restoration" of Cetshwayo, it is necessary to draw special attention to one portion of the subject—one to which allusion has been made from time to time, throughout this work, namely, Sir Henry Bulwer's determined prejudice touching the influence of the Bishop of Natal and perpetual misrepresentations of all he did and said on the Zulu question. It was a prejudice kindred to, though not solely arising out of his other prejudice against Cetshwayo, for, under any circumstances, Sir Henry Bulwer would have objected to what he considered "unofficial interference," or the smallest infringement of his prerogatives, his arbitrary power as supreme chief, &c., &c. He would have resented the most effectual assistance in his most cherished schemes, were it given by an "unofficial" person, unless by his own especial command, and under his own unquestioned directions.

His first complaint against the Bishop, in 1878, is a perfect illustration of the above. Writing on the subject in 1882, he says [3466, p. 71]—

“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 Cetshwayo, had given me a great deal of trouble at the time when, matters being very imminent between the Zulus and the Transvaal Government, I had, with the object of maintaining peace, made a proposal that the dispute between the two parties, which concerned certain territory, should be the subject of an inquiry by a commission, afterwards well known as the “Rorke’s Drift Commission.”

The fact is that the Bishop’s only communication with Cetshwayo at that time, or, indeed, since 1874, was—in reply to messages asking for counsel—to advise him to do the very thing which Sir Henry Bulwer was just about (unknown to the Bishop) to suggest to him, i.e. to submit his case against the Transvaal to British arbitration. The effect of his advice must have been—not to give the Governor “a great deal of trouble,” as he says, but—to make Cetshwayo all the more ready and anxious to fall in with the Governor’s proposals. But, apparently, Sir Henry Bulwer would rather fail in his purpose than be indebted for its success to anything but his own position and authority.

The words “and some of the members of his family,” can only refer to the appointment of Mr. F. E. Colenso as one of the two Diplomatic Agents to Cetshwayo.* But, not to dwell upon the fact that their efforts, had Sir Henry Bulwer tolerated their appointment, would certainly have been in the same direction as his own, the Governor, when he wrote this despatch, knew that the Bishop had

* See vol. i. for account of this, and *supra*, pp. 50-1.

nothing to do with the appointment in question, and that he did not even know of it until after it was made. When he did know of it, he almost regretted it, for, having some comprehension of Sir Henry Bulwer's extreme jealousy for his own rights in native matters, he foresaw that the Governor might object, precisely as he afterwards did; and as the Bishop had, at that time, great hopes that Sir Henry Bulwer was doing his utmost to prevent the invasion of Zululand, he did not approve of anything that might put the Governor out. In a published letter of March 1879, addressed to Sir Bartle Frere, he speaks of the appointment as "a genuine effort [on Cetshwayo's part] in the interests of peace, though overruled and set aside by the English authorities [Natal Government, rather]. I had nothing, however, to do with this transaction," he adds, "though I did urgently advise him [Cetshwayo] to trust to the uttermost in the good faith of the English Government." Colonel Durnford, R.E., also looked upon the appointment (while he took for granted that Sir Henry Bulwer would recognise it) as the wisest step Cetshwayo could have taken, and more likely than anything else to prevent a collision between us, as rulers of the Transvaal, and the Zulus.

Let it fully be understood then, that the "communication" between the Bishop and Cetshwayo "before the Zulu war," i. e. for several years before the war, of which Sir Henry Bulwer speaks so resentfully as "tending to prejudice the relations between this Government and Cetshwayo," and

giving himself "a great deal of trouble," amounted to nothing more nor less than this—that the Zulu King had sent several earnest messages to the Bishop of Natal, asking how he could best avoid offending his friends (?) the English, and prevent the threatened invasion of his country, and that the Bishop had advised him, in return, to "trust to the uttermost in the good faith of the English Government," and to submit his case against the Transvaal to the decision of the Natal Government, i. e. that he should do precisely what Sir Henry Bulwer wanted him to do.*

The Governor continues [*ibid.*]:—

"But, putting this aside, communications, as I have said, existed between the Bishop and Cetshwayo before the Zulu war, and it was possibly owing to this circumstance that when Undabuko and Shingana came into Natal in May 1880, professedly to pay their respects to the Governor, they went straight to Bishopstowe."

"Putting this aside," there had been no communications *at all* since 1874, but if Sir Henry Bulwer refers to that period, he is, no doubt, right as to the origin of Zulu trust in the Bishop's justice and humanity; but it is not easy to understand how a servant of the Home Government could regard the Bishop's action on the occasion in question with anything but approval and respect, since the latter

* It is difficult to understand how, as a Christian man, and a preacher of the Gospel, the Bishop could have refused to give the advice for which, in the interests of peace, Cetshwayo asked, or how he could possibly have given any more fortunately in keeping with Sir Henry Bulwer's wishes.

rendered that Government a palpable service, and his action was entirely justified by the Secretary of State's final decision. It may be as well to recall the facts, which have probably faded from the minds of those English readers who ever heard them, but which are not without an important bearing upon the subject of the present volumes.

In 1873 the Natal Government undertook a military expedition against the chief Langalibalele and his tribe, residing within the colony, and who were suspected, though, as it afterwards appeared, without good reason, of rebellious tendencies. The expedition, hastily undertaken on insufficient grounds, proved a disastrous one. The tribe, on hearing that the troops were advancing against them, left the colony, without committing any act of violence, or even of theft upon the scattered white population of the district from which they fled. Unfortunately, a party of them on their way through a frontier pass, came into collision with a small body of colonial troops under the late Colonel Durnford, R.E. The pass in which they met could easily have been held by the number of men under Colonel Durnford's command had they been trained soldiers, and resolute men like their leader. But, unhappily, they were but raw colonial recruits. The Colonel was too good an officer and soldier to fall back and allow the enemy to escape through the pass which he had been sent to hold, but the men with him had not courage, or perhaps it should be more fairly said, discipline enough, to stand the test of danger. They fled,

leaving their commander behind,* and, in consequence of their retreat, the natives opened fire upon them, killing the last three of their number. This unhappy incident caused a violent, and altogether unreasonable hatred against the absent chief Langalibalele, amongst the colonists, and when he was captured beyond the borders, and sent back in fetters to Maritzburg, public feeling demanded his destruction in revenge for the death of the three carbineers, with which the chief had nothing whatever to do. A farce of a trial followed in which the only fault proved against him was that he had *run away*. Nevertheless, he was condemned to death as a rebel, the sentence being commuted to banishment and imprisonment for life. Throughout the trial (at which he was allowed no advocate), it was repeatedly pleaded on his behalf that he had shown doubt of the good intention of the Government when summoned to Pietermaritzburg, *because he was afraid, remembering what had happened to Matshana on a like occasion some years previously*. But the plea was treated with contempt, as an aggravation of his fault, in that he had dared to distrust the good faith of the Government.

The Bishop of Natal, observing, in the daily published accounts of the trial, that this plea—again and again repeated—was always ignored, inquired

* After the whole of his white force had left him, Colonel Durnford was carried off the field, severely wounded and exhausted, by his faithful Basuto followers. For full account see 'A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa.' A Memoir of Colonel A. W. Durnford, by Lieut.-Colonel E. Durnford.

into the meaning of it, and discovered the following facts. About fifteen years before, a native chief, by name Matshana, had been summoned in the name of the Government to a friendly meeting by Mr. John Shepstone who, after inducing him to come to him with his followers, unarmed, made a treacherous attempt to seize his person, in which many of Matshana's followers were slain, though he himself escaped. Now, this very Mr. John Shepstone was Crown Prosecutor in the case of Langalibalele, and his brother, Mr. (now Sir T.) Shepstone, who, as Secretary for Native Affairs, was responsible for, and cognisant of the whole affair at the time, was one of the judges. It is not, therefore, surprising that the Court treated Langalibalele's plea as only an additional offence, and did not inquire into its meaning. The Bishop, however, feeling that it was a crying injustice to the condemned man that his plea should be ignored simply because it was inconvenient to some of the Government officials to have it brought forward, sent a statement of it home to England. The result was that an official inquiry was held, in which the plea of the chief, brought to the notice of the Home Government by the Bishop, was fully justified; and the Secretary of State administered a severe reproof to the officials concerned.*

* "The question at issue was, not whether or no a certain shot was fired, but whether on a certain occasion a Government official had acted in a treacherous manner towards a native chief, thereby giving reason for the excuse of fear on the part of Langalibalele, treated as a false pretence by the Court, some members of which

It was but natural that the Bishop's action on behalf of the native chief, against whom the transient fury of the white population was aroused, should be very unpopular amongst the latter, as well as with those officials (Sir T. and Mr. J. Shepstone) whose action received censure in consequence; but it is difficult to understand why subsequent Governors should have owed a grudge to one who had exposed a disgraceful proceeding, with which surely no Englishman could feel the smallest sympathy, and who had done the Home Government a real service

were fully aware of the facts, and the prosecutor himself, the official concerned. And, further, whether the said facts had been concealed by high Government officers, and denied by them repeatedly to their superiors in England."—'History of the Zulu War,' Colenso and Durnford.

The finding was that Matshana *was* enticed to the interview on false pretences, that he was induced to come unarmed, and that he did so in good faith, that there was no truth in Mr. Shepstone's statements of a counter-plot on the chief's side, and that Mr. Shepstone *did* make a treacherous attempt to seize the chief, but that he did not attempt to shoot the chief, the shot being merely fired into the air. Yet the *Natal Mercury* of November 2nd, 1873, expressed colonial feeling thus: "It is still understood that Mr. Shepstone, in the minds of impartial judges, stands more than exonerated from the Bishop's charges." Nor can it excite surprise that the colonists took such a view since Mr. Shepstone was retained in his responsible position, and received further promotion. Surely no righteous government can be possible while the chief authorities consider that a serious offence committed by one of high position must be covered and concealed at all costs rather than that the offender should be cast out, and the evil thing removed from their midst. The adoption of the former policy with regard to the Government officials of Natal has cost England much in blood, in honour, and in treasure, and Zululand almost its very existence during the last ten years.

in showing who, amongst their servants in Natal, could not be trusted with the management of native affairs. Yet Sir Garnet Wolseley avowedly did so. During his rule in 1875, a friend, writing from Government House, explained to the Bishop that it was a necessary part of Sir Garnet Wolseley's conciliatory purpose (to the colonists) to show a certain amount of cold shoulder to those persons who had "achieved a striking victory over the legitimate authorities," and that such persons must make up their minds "not to be looked on afterwards with special favour."

And Sir Garnet Wolseley himself went so far as to reproach the late Colonel Durnford, because he had fought a like battle at the same time against official injustice on behalf of the Putini tribe,* and because, as the Colonel writes himself, "I went to Durban to meet my friend the Bishop when he returned from England,† thereby plainly showing my sympathy. . . . As a Government officer, I am told, *I should not have gone near him!*" ‡

There can be little doubt that Sir Henry Bulwer resented the Bishop's victory over officialism as much

* In this Colonel Durnford to some extent succeeded, partly because the case was a more glaring one, partly because he was—although an honest man—within the magic official circle, and could therefore partially *force* justice to the people in question; yet they have never received even the meagre sum ordered to be refunded them by the Home Government, and which has now been held for ten years.

† Whither he went to plead the cause of Langalibalele in person.

‡ See 'A Soldier's Life and Work in South Africa.' A Memoir of the late Colonel A. W. Durnford. (Sampson Low and Co.)

as, or even more than, did Sir Garnet Wolseley. It showed that the official character would not protect any one from the Bishop's sense of justice, and that, with him, even a Governor must stand or fall according to the righteousness of his actions and the sincerity of his speech. That any one beyond the official circle should presume to have, or at least to express, an opinion against an official action was intolerable to his official mind.* Yet that the Bishop was not given to interference in politics may be gathered from his having lived for eighteen years in Natal without taking part in them at all until this glaring piece of injustice was forced upon his notice in 1873.

The Bishop had had occasion to send to Zululand, i. e. to Cetshwayo, for some of the witnesses he required on this trial, and, as this was the only communication he had ever had with the King since his visit to Umpande in 1859, when he saw Cetshwayo, then a young prince, Sir Henry Bulwer can refer to nothing else when he writes, "But, putting this aside, communications existed between the Bishop and Cetshwayo before the Zulu war." Without doubt he is right in supposing that the events of 1874 encouraged the Zulus to go to the Bishop of Natal for justice and kindness in 1880. The fate of Langalibalele had created a profound

* Both Sir Garnet Wolseley and Sir Henry Bulwer seem to have considered themselves and other officials bound solely—right or wrong—to the Colonial Government of Natal, and to have lost sight of their far greater duty to the Home Government, from which alone that of Natal receives its importance.

interest in Zululand, and Cetshwayo had begged that the victim might be allowed to come to him, promising to be answerable for his good conduct. The offer was rejected, and those Zulus who understood the matter could not but wonder at the harsh and unjust action of the officials in Natal, and preserve a feeling of grateful affection towards the Bishop who had fought, almost single-handed, for humanity and justice to the black man.

He won the battle in the sense that the truth of his assertions was acknowledged by the authorities, but these latter contrived to make the victory of no avail, for the time at least. Langalibalele *still* languishes a prisoner, after eleven years' cruel banishment, and repeated delusive hopes held out to him by official persons that he would soon be released; and the Shepstone brothers, although one had been convicted of what the Secretary of State spoke of as "underhand manœuvres opposed to the morality of a civilised administration," and the other had helped to deceive the Home Government in the matter for years—these men have been advanced from honour to honour, and have had more to do with bringing about the "ruin of Zululand" than even Sir Henry Bulwer himself.

The Zulus, then, went to Bishopstowe—*on their way, not instead of*, to the Government—primarily because they had faith in the Bishop. But there were abundant lesser reasons which, granting the certainty of a kind reception there, would naturally lead them to choose the place as their last halting-

place within an easy distance of town. Sir Henry Bulwer persistently harps upon the Zulus going first to Bishopstowe. He makes it out a mark of great disrespect to the Government, and Mr. J. Shepstone, as Secretary for Native Affairs, supports the idea thus [3466, p 230]:—

“It is the custom among natives for any deputation sent by one chief to another to proceed direct to their destination, report themselves, and have their lodgings pointed out to them, where they would also be fed;*” but since the Zulu war, and since the Bishop of Natal interested himself in Zulu matters, I cannot remember an instance of a party of Zulus coming direct to the office of the Secretary for Native affairs as had been the custom for over thirty years, but on the contrary have gone direct to Bishopstowe, where they lodged, and where I must conclude was their destination.”†

One might imagine from the above that Zulus had been coming in this manner to Bishopstowe every few months since the Zulu war, whereas, as a matter

* Receiving the miserable amount of beef (or rather bone), and *sometimes* a little meal, with which the Natal Government habitually entertains even its most distinguished native visitors. The system, which is no credit to the British name, could never have been carried on so long, but for the universal hospitality of the natives themselves, those at whose kraals the visitors are located, making up the deficiency at their own expense.

† There is hardly a statement in the whole of this short “Report” of Mr. J. Shepstone’s which cannot be proved to be absolutely incorrect. It contains twelve distinct assertions, every one of which is directly contrary to the fact, besides incorrect inferences and insinuations. But what else could be expected when Government continues to employ a man not only convicted of having acted in a treacherous manner while officially employed in 1858, but also of having quite recently borne false witness before the Court of Inquiry presided over by Colonel (Sir G. P.) Colley, and having made statements which were, to use the words of that officer, “entirely without foundation.”

It has been argued and on high authority, that Mr. Shepstone

of fact, but two parties in all had been there during the three years which had elapsed when Mr. Shepstone wrote this report. But what can the writer mean by "coming direct to the office, &c."? Surely not that messengers from Zululand are bound to travel, or have ever travelled, for four or five days, from the

in trying to seize Matshana at a friendly interview to which the chief had been invited on false pretences, was acting as a constable, and could not rightly be blamed for using means to "execute a lawful warrant," such as are made use of every day without reprehension for such purposes in all countries in Europe. It might be argued that there are marked differences between dealing with an "outlawed" native tribe, and with individual criminals in civilised countries, and Lord Carnarvon plainly took that view, for he wrote ". . . I must, even after the lapse of so many years, record my disapprobation of the artifices by which it is admitted Matshana was entrapped into the meeting, with a view to his forcible arrest. Such underhand manoeuvres are opposed to the morality of a civilised administration; they lower English rule in the eyes of the natives." At the same time Mr. Shepstone was less to blame for the original action than were his superiors by whose orders he committed it, and the Bishop's position in the matter may best be given in his own words addressed to a friend who had made some of the above representations to him. "I never said that his [Mr. J. Shepstone's] act of 'murderous treachery' [the words were not the Bishop's own, but were used by Mr. (Sir Theo.) Shepstone in denying the act shortly after proved (as to the treachery) against Mr. J. Shepstone] disqualified him from public employment. But I said that his dishonest concealment of that act (if it really occurred), in his official report, but still more his suppression of the truth when he acted as public prosecutor against Langalibalele, and most of all his daring denial of it in the face of Lord Carnarvon, and of the whole world, flinging upon me the charge of a 'libellous and malicious falsehood'—if the act really occurred substantially as described in my story—unfitted him to sit on the bench as the distributor of justice in the name of England, not to speak of his acting as Secretary for Native Affairs in his brother's absence."

border to the city, without halting for the night anywhere under shelter? Or is it that he "must conclude" that the native kraals at which they slept upon the way were, therefore, "their destination"? The whole accusation is absurd. The Zulus chose Bishopstowe as their last halting-place simply as the house of a private friend who, they knew, would give them shelter while awaiting the well-known dilatory proceedings of the S.N.A. Office. Had they waited to find lodgings for the night till they were pointed out to them by its officials they might have slept in the open for some time.*

Sir Henry Bulwer's despatch alluding to his old imaginary grievances against the Bishop of Natal was written on June 30th, 1882 [3466, No. 42], but it was by no means the first of its kind.

About three months before he had reported to Lord Kimberley, on the authority of the British Resident in Zululand—

"the arrival there of a messenger from the Bishop of Natal to Umnyamana, with a message to the latter from the ex-King Cetshwayo. The message claimed to be of an authoritative character, giving instructions on the part of the ex-King to Umnyamana," who "was directed to send a certain message on the part of the ex-King to . . . four of the appointed chiefs . . . who were further [3247, p. 43] to be called upon to go to Umnyamana, Undabuko, and Uziwedu, and to explain to these three their conduct. Umnyamana was also to send to the parents of the girls who formerly belonged to the ex-King's establishment, and warn them that the girls, who, it may be mentioned, were after the ex-King's deposition

* As Dabulamanzi's party were told by the induna of the S.N.A., "go and sleep there [wherever you can], and come here again to-morrow."

restored to their families and allowed to marry, still belonged to him (Cetshwayo) and that they must not be allowed to marry. They must not think, the ex-King says, that he will not return; 'he is only away on a visit to his friends.' Fortunately, says the Governor, Umnyamana and the Princes were evidently sensible of the very grave importance of the course they were told to take and of the risk they would run in thus openly putting at defiance the four appointed chiefs . . . and in thus boldly asserting their authority, in the name of the ex-King, over the duly established authorities of the country. They therefore hesitated before committing themselves to so rash a proceeding, and laid the matter before the Resident."

And even after the Bishop's satisfactory explanation [3247, p. 48] he writes to him again [*ibid.*, p. 49], saying in effect, "I am glad to hear that you did not do it, but hope you will not do it again."* In fact he desires the Bishop to forward *no* messages at all from the ex-King to any one in Zululand, and the Bishop thought it wise for the King's sake at the time to comply with the request, while Sir Henry

* Sir Henry Bulwer did indeed, upon this occasion write to the Bishop demanding an explanation, but he did not wait for an answer before making the accusation to the Home authorities, and using the words "I have not as yet, I am sorry to say, received any reply from the Bishop." Yet his letter to the Bishop was dated March 30th, and received March 31st. The Bishop's reply is dated April 1st, and (the 2nd being a Sunday) was received April 3rd. This, however, according to Sir Henry Bulwer's style of calculation (see p. 137) would be a delay of five days on the Bishop's part.

The late Sir David Wedderburn, commenting with indignation upon the Governor's behaviour to the Bishop, writes to the *Daily News*, "To acquire the confidence of native races, to understand their wishes, and fearlessly to proclaim them when ignored by men in power, will always be offences in the eyes of certain officials, but Bishop Colenso is not likely to be deterred from committing such offences even by the arrogant letter which he has recently received [from Sir Henry Bulwer, June 16th, 1882].

Bulwer still writes to Lord Kimberley on April 10th [*ibid.*, p. 47]:—

“From what I am told, I am led to fear that a great deal of harm has already been done by messages which have made their way into the Zulu country from Bishopstowe, and the effect of which has been to unsettle and disturb the minds of the people.”

This, in the Governor's mouth, always means leading them to wish or hope for Cetshwayo's return. To Sir H. Bulwer's mind Hamu's slaughter of over a thousand of the Aba Qulusi, and Dunn's of hundreds of Sitimela's people, were, it would seem, trifling disturbances compared with the most peaceful and orderly petition for Cetshwayo's restoration. But that the Bishop had done anything to “unsettle the minds of the people,” even in Sir Henry Bulwer's sense, was, as we have already seen, a purely imaginary notion. The facts in this case are as follows. The King, writing through his interpreter to the Bishop, requested him to send a message for him to Zululand, the character of which was by no means that of interference on his part as “King,” but of condolence and counsel for his friends and relatives (the Aba Qulusi) under the terrible calamity from which they had suffered,* and of consolation and advice for his family in their great sorrow. This message was to the following effect:—

“that Cetshwayo had heard of the massacre of the Aba Qulusi, and lamented greatly for them, and for the distress of his brother Maduna's family and tribe, which were his own flesh and blood;

* See vol. i.

that he himself could do nothing in the matter, since he had now no voice in Zulu affairs, but that Mnyamana should ask Hamu, Chingwayo, Umfanawendhlela, and Zibebu, on behalf of Maduna, Ziwedu, and the Aba Qulusi, since they all belonged together, what wrong they had done, and why they had made the Zulus fight one another. 'Let the Aba Qulusi be of good heart, and not disperse,* for I am going to the Queen in England, where all people are helped, not knowing, however, whether I shall succeed there. The English here are treating me kindly. Stay quiet only, and be of good heart.'—*February 13th, 1882.*"

This, it will be seen, was a very touching and harmless message from the captive King, as also were those about the girls, which had been equally distorted before they came into Sir Henry Bulwer's hands. The tone of those really sent may be seen from the following extracts in Cetshwayo's own words:—

"I beg you to send to Mbambisa and ask him if he will allow me to have one, at least, of his girls, Nobatwa, the eldest. Send to her, and hear from her own mouth if she would like to return to my family or not. She took care of me much more and much better than all my other Undhlunkulu.

"Talk and agree about this with Mr. John Shepstone [S.N.A.]. If Nobatwa objects to go to my family, that is another matter; but I am sure she is not against it."—*February 2nd, 1882.*

And again:—

"To Miss Colenso,—Please tell Umkosana to send to Majiya and tell him to take care of those girls of his, and not to listen to those who would have them married off,† and, if he does not see

* "Scatter" as a family or tribe, not "disperse" as in *impi*.

† This, and other expressions of the same sort were, no doubt, held by the official mind to imply an attempt on the King's part to forbid the girls of his late household marrying, even if they wished to do so. But this is a mistake. He wrote thus because he had heard from the men who had gone to him from Zululand,

that, he can send them to Maduna, to take care of them himself, or perhaps he might send them to Qetuka, and Umkosana might send also to Boro, as I have heard from Unconcwana and party that his daughter Guyase is stricken with illness. Is there, then, no doctor that can attend to her? Take great care of that girl, who is left all alone, that I may not have her snatched away from me by death, as all the others have been. Ask Gobongo and Nhlaka, son of Madinda, to take care for me of the girls of their family, and ask Majiya to send to Somopo to do the same; for I have heard that one of those girls is married. Why did they leave Maduna? I mean Mkyokase and Mbimbikazana. I hear that Palane's daughters are married to Malambule. Are you, then, also eating me up? Are you, too, imitating the Zulu [viz. Zibebu, who had taken some girls of the Umdhlunkulu]? Are you quite sure then that I shall never recover? Chingwayo says, 'I lament for my family, which I hear is scattered, and a new family formed out of it,' that one of my wives has been taken by my own brother, who has built himself a family by her. By whom now can I be gathered together, since our king, who shall gather us, is now dead?"

"I am shocked that the family of Chingwayo, who died (went into captivity) with me, has now been plundered by his own people. Was, then, that brother of his pleased at this death of Chingwayo? I am shocked that, while a man is still alive, another man should take possession of his wives."—*February 13th, 1882.*

that some of these girls had been forced into marriage with Zibebu and others, against their will, and there was one piteous story to be told of the bride's distress throughout the marriage ceremonies, dances, &c. It must be remembered that all the girls of the Umdhlunkulu (royal household) were of a rank to admit of the King's taking any one of them in marriage if he wished to do so. It is to be supposed that a King who had won so much devotion from his whole people as had Cetshwayo, would be regarded with great affection and respect by the young girls of the household, every one of whom might hope to be raised to the position of a queen; nor can we judge of their feelings in the matter by our own English ideas, but rather as we should of those of any other nation in which polygamy is the law. It is very improbable that any one of these girls would have willingly resigned the hope of Cetshwayo's return, and if the chance of it kept them single for a few years longer, it was probably no very serious misfortune to them.

The message to Mnyamana, sent by a Zulu who had come from that chief and was returning to his own country at the time, was (so it is reported by several trustworthy witnesses [*ibid.*, p. 50]), correctly delivered to Mnyamana, and correctly forwarded by him to the Resident. Mnyamana and the Princes, always anxious to avoid displeasing the Natal Government, especially while Cetshwayo's fate was so uncertain, thought it best to mention the matter to the Resident before trying, as Cetshwayo suggested, to make friends with these four fiercest of the appointed chiefs. But the Resident appears altogether to have misunderstood the matter, and is reported to have answered that if Mnyamana "had sent this message to these chiefs, they would have said 'we are turned out' [i. e. of their authority], and would have reported it to me, and I should have agreed with them, and given them leave to fall upon you, and sweep you off."

Mnyamana was astonished at this view of the matter, saying, "Does he [the Resident] say that the message amounts to turning out the chiefs? I thought that it meant nothing of the sort, but was merely asking them to be friends again," and he and the Princes sent messengers in haste to inform the Bishop of what had occurred.

"These men" [*ibid.*], writes the Bishop of Natal, "when they heard in what form the message had been reported to your Excellency, expressed their astonishment, as it differed so materially from what they themselves had heard twice from Umnyamana—first, on its arrival, and, again, when he repeated to them what he reported to the Resident. They said they did not see how it was

possible that Umnyamana's messengers to the Resident should have mis-stated it; and they said that 'what alarmed Umnyamana was that the Resident seemed to have quite misunderstood the message.'

"Concerning the girls, these men brought no message to me from Umnyamana. They said that he had told them that kind words had come from the ex-King asking for certain girls. But they had never heard of any message sent for all the fathers of the girls of the Umdhlunkulu forbidding them to allow the girls to marry, and knew not where this statement could have originated."

Mr. Osborn, on the other hand, warmly asserts [*ibid.*, p. 54] that this version of the affair is the correct one, and gives it as his impression "that the party of Zulus represented by Umnyamana and Undabuko are deliberately misrepresenting matters to the Bishop with the view of serving their own ends."

It would tax the utmost ingenuity to imagine what "ends" could possibly be served by the intricate and aimless chain of deception of which the Resident here accuses men who bear the best character for sincerity with those—white as well as black—who know them well. Any one who cares to follow it out for themselves will see that the simple fact of their asking the Resident's leave to deliver any message at all proves that there was no deliberate misrepresentation on their part. They themselves are positive that neither did they make any mistake in transmitting the message—and, in fact, the error must have arisen at the Residency, though by whose agency does not appear.

Mr. Osborn writes [*ibid.*, p. 55]:—

"There was no misunderstanding whatever on my part, and I do not believe that it was possible that I could have misunderstood,

as the Bishop has been informed. No other reply was given by me than that already reported to your Excellency. The version of my reply set forth in the Bishop's letter, being that given to him by the two messengers from Mnyamana is, I say it emphatically, untrue."

This is decided language, but no one can study the Blue Books of this period [1880 to 1883] without discovering for themselves that Mr. Osborn's understanding, like that of his successive chiefs, and other members of the official clique, was habitually directed towards one side of everything connected with the subject of Cetshwayo's return. And it must be remarked that it is a very curious circumstance that he did not give the reply, the version of which he calls "untrue," since it is precisely in accordance with what both his own and the Governor's despatches show to have been their opinion, the latter writing, for instance, of the message [3247, p. 46] as "an attempt to subvert the established and duly constituted authorities of the territories concerned."

Sir Henry Bulwer writes [3247, pp. 43, 47, 54] three despatches on the subject to Lord Kimberley, on the 3rd, 10th, and 15th of April, all showing considerable animus. It had been put beyond a doubt that Cetshwayo had never sent, nor the Bishop forwarded, any message assuming authority on the part of the captive king, and as no message, after all, was delivered to the appointed chiefs, it was nothing more than indulgence of temper which caused him so to represent the matter by cablegram home, as to

elicit the following telegraphic despatch from Lord Kimberley to Sir Hercules Robinson:—

“Inform Cetshwayo report having been received from Governor of Natal, that visit used for purposes of agitation in Zululand, and interfores with due consideration of future. Her Majesty’s Government consider it necessary to postpone visit for a time” [3247, p. 50].

How that postponement ended we have already seen, but it was a cruel thing, and most wantonly brought about.

Following the Blue Books we come to four more despatches [3247, pp. 57, 59, 85 and 86], from Sir Henry Bulwer, of April 20th and 22nd, and May 12th and 13th, all insinuating charges against the Bishop with reference to the deputations, &c., and then to a small Blue Book of twenty pages [3270], which is full of unmistakable innuendoes of the same description, followed by another, containing a despatch [3293, p. 4] of May 30th, which is an open and unmeasured attack, given on the authority of “two natives, both trustworthy men,” not named, and who, from the nature of their reports, certainly do not deserve the title, as their statements are entirely false. These, and similar stories, the Governor sent home without first referring them for explanation or denial to the Bishop, who saw them first when they appeared in the Blue Book. A month later, June 30th, appears the long despatch [3466, p. 70, No. 42], already quoted, the remainder of which is entirely taken up with discrediting the deputations, and complaints of the Bishop’s

(supposed) action about them.* These points have been sufficiently considered in a previous chapter, but one sentence from the despatch in question may be quoted as an instance of the writer's wilful blindness to what he did not wish to see. My readers will not have forgotten the circumstance of the appointed chief Seketwayo sending down his "Letters Patent," by the hand of a member of one of the deputations, to prove, beyond doubt, that the man was sent by him, which action put it out of the power of any one to deny, or explain away this chief's participation in the prayer for Cetshwayo.

Sir Henry Bulwer, with the facts before him, writes: "The fourth messenger, Nozaza, may have been sent by Seketwayo." He does not even attempt to give a reason for thus adopting the potential mood in speaking of a proved fact. The whole despatch is taken up with attempts to show that the Zulu people did not really pray for the King, and

* The only tangible complaints are, first, that the Bishop had told the Zulus who came to him that if it was really true as they asserted, that "all Zululand" wished for Cetshwayo's restoration, they should go to the Resident and ask for leave to come down to Maritzburg, and make their wishes known in a proper way to the Government. And, secondly, that, on being asked by certain Zulus if it was true that Dunn had represented their paying taxes as a proof of their satisfaction at the King's absence, he showed them all he knew himself on the subject, namely, that the *Natal Mercury* had published Dunn's statement to that effect. Had every one in Natal combined together to deceive these poor Zulus, they might even have gone home believing that they were paying taxes to ransom their king, and Dunn might have continued to say what he pleased. Was this desirable, or did Sir Henry Bulwer think it so?

that the deputations were got up between the Bishop and Ndabuko. He never seems to have realised that, were this latter assertion true, his case was lost. When a national feeling is strong, and the hearts of a people are burning with suppressed desire, it is easy for one man to rouse them into expressing it, and no doubt Undabuko did hold, and now, again, holds that honourable position amongst the Zulus, doubly honourable in that while leading them to dare and to endure for their king's sake, he restrained them from all violence, and, except when they were actually attacked, and obliged to defend themselves, he induced them to try peaceful measures instead of force. But no one man, nor all the Zulu Princes together, stripped as they were of every vestige of authority save what the people *chose* to recognise in them, could have roused a cold, reluctant people—glad at heart to have escaped from the power of a tyrant, satisfied with the new rulers placed over them, and well aware that no harm could come to them for holding to the latter—to beg for that tyrant's return. Still less could one man in another land, one like the Bishop, known to have no political position, have brought this about, and have induced the Zulus, against their real desires, to labour and suffer as they did for Cetshwayo's sake. Apparently, the Earl of Kimberley thought likewise, and had observed that Sir Henry Bulwer's efforts were mainly directed to showing how much (in his opinion) the Bishop had had to do with rousing the desire of the Zulus for their King's return. The wish of the Home

Government was to discover whether or no the Zulus had such a desire, and that it was so was plain enough, in spite of every effort to explain away appearances. How the desire had been aroused was of comparatively small importance in deciding the question of the King's restoration, and this would be plain even to those who did not see how palpably extravagant and strained were the continual accusations against the Bishop, and did not know how untrue they were. It was, indeed, before the last named despatch (that of June 30th) could have been received, that Lord Kimberley decided that, unless there were some more urgent reasons than those of which he had heard, "it would not be justifiable to further delay" Cetshwayo's visit to England. That despatch of Sir Henry Bulwer's, as well as others which followed, including the long-delayed "Report" [3466, p. 134] on the "Settlement of the Zulu country," certainly gave no new and urgent reasons, though they are full of repetitions of the previous ones, everywhere mixed with extravagant charges against the Bishop, which, indeed, seem to grow the wilder as they produced, apparently, the less effect upon the Home authorities.

After a while a fine opportunity of this sort turned up, and the Governor writes to Lord Kimberley on July 22nd:—

"I have the honour to forward . . . a memorandum from the British Resident covering statements made to him by . . . messengers from Chief Dunn, in reference to a Natal native named Fanegana [Fanewana], who was brought by them as a prisoner before him.

"This man is a native of Natal, who has been living in the territory of Chief Dunn.* It appears that Chief Dunn lately discovered him endeavouring to stir up the people in his territory against his authority. The Chief Mavumengwana stated that Fanewana had sent to him to say that he had some words to deliver to him; and in the presence of Mavumengwana, of Chief Dunn, and of many others, Fanewana admitted that this was true, and that he wanted to give Mavumengwana a message from the Bishop of Natal. The message was to thank Mavumengwana for having sent a representative with the other people on their visit to Pietermaritzburg, and that the Bishop of Natal saw now that Mavumengwana joined with him in complaining.

"Chief Dunn thereupon sent Fanewana in custody of some of his men to the British Resident. When before the Resident, Fanewana denied that he had been sent by the Bishop with any message, and, moreover, denied that he had admitted having said so a few days before.

"There can be no doubt that the man has been frequently at Bishopstowe, but whether he was ever sent by the Bishop of Natal with this message is best known to the Bishop."

This despatch, with its inclosures, Sir Henry Bulwer forwards, as usual, without putting a question to the Bishop; but something of the matter leaked into the newspapers, so that Mr. Saunders, M.L.C., brought it up in the Legislative Council, declaring that this supposed emissary of the Bishop's had been caught "red-handed," and the Bishop wrote to one of the local papers stating that he had never sent Fanewana to Zululand on any business or with any message whatever—that, in fact, he knew little or nothing about him, and should not be likely to make a confidant of a mere stranger. But as he was unaware that the Governor had adopted the accusation, he did not address him directly upon the

* This does not appear from the evidence, i. e. that he was *living* there.

subject. Meanwhile a long string of variations of the same story were going home. A despatch of August 30th incloses a number of statements collected by the Resident from various Zulus, some four or five of which are held to implicate the Bishop in what Sir Henry Bulwer always chooses to call "the agitation under Undabuko." But nearly every tale is referred to the same individual, Fanewana, and they are all of such an extravagant and even impossible nature, that any one not determined beforehand to believe *anything* against the Bishop, would have dismissed them at once as the inventions [3466, p. 169] of an "apparently doubtful character," as he is called by the Governor's Private Secretary, if not half-witted, as some have said. Who in their senses could believe that the Bishop had made such statements or sent such messages to the Zulus as these [*ibid.*, p. 157]:—

"The Resident will continue to refuse to give you permission to come into Natal, but you are to disregard his refusals, and come into Natal whenever you wish, to talk with me about the affairs of Zululand." And again, that the Princes were to come to Maritzburg at once, to receive Cetshwayo, who was waiting for them at Sobantu's house.

Fanewana is here reported to have said that "*he had with his own eyes seen Cetshwayo at Sobantu's,*" which in itself convicts the man as an imposter, if sane. Sir Henry Bulwer, however, stops at nothing, and even brings the most serious charge against the Bishop of direct breach of faith, based merely on a report from the chief Siwunguza, that a Zulu named

Nhlebo had arrived at his kraal from Sobantu with a message from Cetshwayo.* To this charge the Governor appends the Bishop's promise that, in compliance with His Excellency's request, he would "not send any more messages on the part of the ex-King to any one in Zululand," and making no comment on it, nor bringing it to the Bishop's notice in any way, leaves it to be understood by the Secretary of State that the latter had committed a deliberate breach of faith.

On this the Bishop writes,† "I have to reply that, since I gave the above promise, which I did out of respect to His Excellency's wishes only, I have never received from Cetshwayo any letter except through the offices of the S.N.A. at Capetown and in Natal,—that no such letter contained any message from Cetshwayo to the Zulus,—that I have not received from Cetshwayo any message for them in any other way,—and that I have forwarded none whatever."

As to Fanewana, whether he was knave or fool, he had no connection whatever with the Bishop. He was first heard of as a messenger, or spy, belonging to the coast column of our army during the Zulu war, when, as he had relatives amongst the Zulus of Cetshwayo's *impis*, he was, no doubt, more than ordinarily useful in that capacity, though it is to be

* It is quite likely that persons in the colony in no way connected with the Bishop, may, unknown to him, have used his name with the Zulus for their own purposes. That such irregularities should take place was only part of the general confusion consequent upon our invasion of Zululand, and the prolonged absence of Cetshwayo.

† In his letter to Lord Derby, after seeing the Blue Book, containing Sir Henry Bulwer's accusations.

questioned whether service of that description was the best calculated to induce habits of strict sincerity of speech. Sir Henry Bulwer's words, "*There can be no doubt* that the man has been frequently at Bishopstowe," have no foundation at all except in his own determination to see everything from his own point of view, but that and other kindred matters are fully explained in the Bishop's letter to Lord Derby * and need no further consideration here. Many other instances might be adduced of the determined and groundless official suspicions raised against the Bishop in these Blue Books, but enough samples have now been given for our purpose, while those readers who are not already convinced would remain unmoved by any number of similar accounts.

* See vol. i. Appendix.

CHAPTER IV.

SIR HENRY BULWER had delayed his visit to Zululand so long that the main question of Cetshwayo's return had at last to be settled without the help of his Report. In expectation of his immediate arrival, the Resident sent him the following despatch [3466, p. 171]:—

“ INHLAZATSHU, ZULULAND, August 5th, 1882.

Sir,—As your Excellency is about to visit Zululand personally, I think it right to lay before you a *résumé* of the present political condition of the country, indicating those pending questions which by reason of their importance and urgency appear to claim your early attention.

“ 2. The first case for consideration is that in which Umnyama and his tribe, and Undabuko and Ziweddu and their followers are concerned, and which formed the immediate cause of the late armed rising. Your Excellency is already acquainted with all the circumstances thereof, and I therefore need not recapitulate them, but I must state again that both Undabuko and Ziweddu continue to be anxious to be allowed to return to their former homesteads (in most of which the huts are still standing) in Zibebu's territory; and I think it not improbable, if permission cannot be obtained through your Excellency, that they will endeavour to occupy by force, if necessary. They ask to be allowed to re-occupy as soon as possible in order to commence planting. The appointed chief Zibebu will not consent to their returning to live in his territory.*

* That is to say, that as they had tried in vain every peaceable method of obtaining justice, and the possession of their own homes,

“3. The next case, which appears to me equally important and urgent, is that of the chiefs Umsutshwana and Umbopa, and the other headmen who with their people are encamped in the north-eastern part of Somkeli’s territory, and whose return to their kraal Zibebu will not permit for the reasons given by him. My endeavours hitherto to get Zibebu to allow them to reoccupy their kraals which are situated in his territory have not been successful, but, as I believe that the people, especially the families who are prevented from returning to their homes, are suffering much hardship from exposure and want, and that the sallying forth of men to recover corn, &c., resulting in hostile encounters, would be put a stop to if they could be allowed to do so, I have not relaxed my efforts to obtain Zibebu’s consent, and I am still in communication with him with that object.* The cases of Mahu, Hayiyana, and others [Zibebu’s brothers and cousins], who, with their followers, also seek to return to their homesteads, but are likewise forbidden by Zibebu, also claim your Excellency’s consideration. They, however, are not of the urgency attached to those of Umsutshwana and the others. In the meantime Zibebu complains that he and his people are constantly being attacked and harassed by small parties of these people, whose return to his territory he will not permit for the reasons given by him.” †

“4. Affairs in the territory of the appointed chief Dunn are also very unsettled. A section of his people belonging to the Usutu party, and headed by Cetshwayo’s half-brother Dubulamanzi, persist in refusing to acknowledge the chief’s authority within his territory, ‡ and he therefore desired them to remove out of his

Mr. Osborn thinks they may take the latter without leave at last. They could have done so by force all along, and nothing but their anxiety not to prejudice Cetshwayo’s cause by offending the “Government” had prevented their doing so.

* And this is the “amenable” Zibebu, who always pays such attention to the Resident’s advice, and of whom Sir H. Bulwer draws so flattering a portrait a little later.

† The “reasons given” are always that the people in question are in rebellion against him, which may always be rendered that they refuse to repudiate their king.

‡ Because they had discovered that he gave out that their acknowledgment of his authority was a proof that they disowned Cetshwayo. Dunn had never a chance after the betrayal by his friend the *Mercury* of that piece of treachery.

territory, which they also refuse to do. Dunn wished to resort to arms to coerce them, but I advised him against this course, having reason to believe that the calling up of an impi by him would result in disturbances in other territories as well.* His loyal people † are very much unsettled, and are urging him to take steps to assert his authority, and to put an end to the state of unrest in their midst. Dabulamanzi keeps assuring the people that Cetshwayo is in Pietermaritzburg [*ibid.*, p. 172], and will soon be in Zululand; and although his well-known unscrupulous character and disregard of truth would, under ordinary circumstances, prevent much mischief from arising out of his representations, I fear that by dint of reiteration on his part, and repetition from mouth to mouth on the part of others, coupled with the fact that he is in constant communication with unauthorised persons (but given out by him to be the Government) in Natal, that he effects considerable uneasiness in the minds of otherwise quietly disposed persons.‡

* It is not very plain whether Mr. Osborn here means to imply that he would have encouraged Dunn to "resort to arms," i. e. to slaughter the Zulus in his district, had he not feared that his doing so would have caused "disturbances in other territories," but there can be no doubt that it was well for Dunn himself that in this instance he was restrained. The hope of Cetshwayo's return, while it made the people very anxious not to offend those who could permit or prevent it, had also strengthened their determination not to let their real sentiments be concealed or misrepresented.

† Dunn's "loyal" people were only those personally attached to his service, numbering few if any real Zulus.

‡ Dabulamanzi, after his visit to Maritzburg, became the pet official scapegoat, in place of Ndabuko, whose blameless conduct has made it rather difficult to find a peg to hang an accusation upon. Dabulamanzi being of a hot disposition, and, also, residing in Dunn's district, was a far more convenient victim. There is nothing, however, in the Blue Books to support such vague accusations as the above, and "well-known" is a convenient phrase, the use of which is not justified by the existence of newspaper and other uncertain reports. Dabulamanzi's brave and honest conduct on his brother's behalf in repudiating Dunn on hearing of his treachery was, without doubt, at this time his greatest offence in official eyes. Mr. Osborn here apparently accepts Dunn's account of Dabulamanzi's supposed sayings and doings.

The state of affairs in Dunn's territory, I submit, forms another case the urgency of which requires an immediate remedy.

"5. Hamu's affairs also merit the serious consideration of your Excellency, especially his conduct as an appointed chief. The extensive seizure he made from Umnyamana and his people, and, subsequently, his attack on and killing of the Aba Qulusi, and his conduct in regard to General Wood's award, also his latest act in seizing one of Umnyamana's own kraals, and another from one of his men, are proceedings the effect of which, as part of the causes, directly or indirectly, of the late risings,* appear to me to claim your Excellency's attention, as also the case of the Aba Qulusi, who insist upon being allowed to return to their homesteads, from which they were driven by Hamu last year.

"6. The appointed Chief Seketwayo caused his people to arm and to take part in favour of the Usutu in the late armed demonstrations.* It was out of his territory that the Aba Qulusi issued to raid Hamu's people.

"7: For this paragraph see note to p. 218.

"8. I may state here that Undabuko, Usiwetu, Umsutshwana, Umbopa, Mahu, Haiyana, and the other headmen, with their followers and people, and the Aba Qulusi, all of whom are clamouring to be allowed to reoccupy their homesteads, say distinctly that they will not recognise the authority of the chiefs within whose territories these are situated; nor do they recognise those chiefs within whose boundaries they at present reside." †

* All these phrases in the official mouth refer to the arming of the Sutus and other loyal Zulus to protect themselves and the Princes from the threats of Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu, after the return of the Great Deputation. The whole of the circumstances have been so persistently misrepresented in the official despatches that it is necessary to remind the reader that there is no truth in the assertions that the Princes were the aggressors. The unfriendly chiefs threatened them before they left Zululand, hence, of course they were prepared for an attack on their return, but only in that sense can they be said to have "taken up arms" first, not in the sense of using them first, or of giving offence except that, as Zibebu says—the *fact of your going to ask for the "Bone" was an offence to me.*

† That is to say, they will not recognise any chief the recognition of whom would imply that they disowned Cetshwayo. But

The expected visit to Zululand never took place, although some time in September the Governor got as far as Rorke's Drift, and summoned Mnyamana and the Princes to meet him there. His own report of the proceedings is a very meagre one.

"My object," he says, "was to place the relations between Hamu and Mnyamana on a more satisfactory basis, and one less perilous to the public peace than was the case; and with regard to Ndabuko and Ziwedu, my object was to provide them with a suitable place where they could live and plant their crops" [3466, p. 212].

In the former case he "found it necessary to condemn in unmistakable terms" the conduct of Hamu; he "advised him strongly" to pay Sir E. Wood's award of cattle to Umnyamana through the Resident, and "decided that, pending the future settlement,* Hamu should not interfere with Mnyamana, or with any of Mnyamana's people, or attempt in any way to exercise authority over them.

"In the case of Undabuko and Ziwedu," he continued, "I made arrangements by which they will be enabled to return at once to their old lands in Zibebu's territory from which they were ejected last year.

* * * * *

"By these means the main causes of complaint on the part of Umnyamana, and on the part of Undabuko and Ziwedu against the appointed chiefs Hamu and Zibebu, will be at once practically removed without awaiting the new changes to be made in the settlement of the Zulu country; † and it is better they should thus

they were on good terms with Seketwayo, who had been loyal throughout.

* Namely Cetshwayo's return.

† The old mistake was here repeated of supposing it possible to separate the interests of the princes and people, or rather of shutting the official eye to the fact that they were one. Only the Princes and their immediate followers were to return to their homes, not the great tribe, or rather tribes, belonging to them. Such an arrangement removed no cause of complaint at all. But Sir Henry Bulwer would not believe in the national character of this loyalty to the Princes.

be removed beforehand, both in order to obviate present risks of collision,* and in order to prevent the inconveniences that might arise, at the time of the general change, from a too abrupt process of transition." †

The following statements, however, show what impression the Zulus received on that occasion, and how cruelly they must have been disappointed with the actual facts of the so-called "restoration." Without full official reports of what passed, it is impossible to speak with any certainty, but it is also impossible to avoid the conclusion that an attempt was made to induce Mnyamana and the Princes by bribes of land and position, to agree beforehand that Zibebu should possess an independent territory, and so to create another source of opposition to Cetshwayo, and virtually to deprive him of the support of his most important subjects. Both Sir Henry Bulwer and Mr. Osborn had repeatedly denied that either Mnyamana or the Princes were sincere in their petitions for the King's return, and had asserted that their "real desire" was to secure independent territories for themselves. This being the official belief, it would appear a feasible project to detach them from Cetshwayo's "party" by the offer of what was supposed to be their real desire. The single fact that the attempt proved an utter failure, as shown by the second of the three following statements, and by the absence of official reports of what passed

* Which risks had been allowed to continue for several years.

† The inconvenience of allowing Cetshwayo's return to herald in good luck to his most loyal subjects?

between the Government and the Zulu Princes and chiefs at Rorke's Drift in September 1882, is a conclusive reply to all the many efforts of the officials to discredit the Bishop's statements concerning the loyalty of these men. Had it been possible to shake that loyalty, and to induce them to desert Cetshwayo's cause, it would have thrown almost unsurmountable difficulties in the way of the restoration which Sir Henry Bulwer was so anxious to prevent.* But there was never the least chance of any such desertion, as the Governor might easily have learned from those who would never have advocated Cetshwayo's return had they not ascertained beyond a doubt that he would be gladly received by nearly the whole of the Zulu nation.

The first of these accounts was given at Bishopstowe on October 3rd by Mtokwane, a Zulu of good

* His utmost concession lies in the following passage [3466, p. 149]:—

“If it is considered that the necessities of the ex-King and of his position, which have created to a great extent the urgency of this question [of the future of Zululand], are such that he should be released from captivity and, if possible, restored to freedom and to some measure of authority in his own country, although the considerations which tell so conclusively [in Sir Henry Bulwer's own opinion] against his restoration to his former position, tell also against any restoration even in part; yet I do not think a partial restoration will be impossible, provided that we, on our side, are prepared to undertake such a measure of responsibility as will enable us to adequately secure the other interests and the other objects which are bound up in the question.” He then proposes annexation of part of the Zulu country, adding, “If we are not prepared to do this, then I believe the objections are insuperable.”

position and character.* He had taken up to Mnyamana and Ndabuko the newspaper accounts of Cetshwayo's visit to the Queen, his subsequent interview with Lord Kimberley, and the rejoicings of his whole party on hearing that he was to be restored. He stated as follows:—

“I called on the way up at Qetuka's † and heard that no one had been called to meet the Governor. I said, ‘Well! you ought to tell them all to go and pray for the King to the Governor, even those who are weak-kneed and afraid to come forward; or they will complain of you hereafter, saying, We were never told that we could pray for him.’ ‘Well!’ said Qetuka, ‘if Mnyamana sends for us, every one in this part of the country will come; there are none here who do not wish for the King.’

“Then I went on to the Prince Shingana and told him. Said he, ‘We have all been told not to go [to the Governor].’ Said I, ‘But do you not see that it will be the same as when Lukuni (Sir E. Wood) came? He heard no one speak, and then went back and said that the Zulus did not want the King.’ Shingana agreed, and sent to let many of the chiefs and people know that ‘here was the Governor come, and they should go and pray to him for Cetshwayo.’

“I went on and got to Rorke's Drift, on the Zulu side, on the very day on which Mnyamana, and then the Princes, had been sent for to come to the Governor. I gave the paper ‡ to Ndabuko, who said, ‘Let it go first to Mnyamana.’ So I took it to him, and he sent to a white man, a missionary, to ask him to read it to him. He came at once and read it, just as we have heard it at Bishopstowe. I told Mnyamana, ‘This is not written by Sobantu; it came from England, where the King is; it arrived one day, and I started with it the next. It is news which any one may see; you may show it to Mr. Osborn or to Mr. Jan [Mr. John Shepstone], or to the Governor himself.’ So Mnyamana said that we had

* Well known to the writer for some years as an honest and intelligent man.

† Qetuka, one of the great chiefs in Dunn's territory; a father-in-law to Cetshwayo.

‡ This was a London telegram from the local papers.