

# THE RUIN OF ZULULAND.



## CHAPTER I.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

\* C. 2482, p. 280.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## CHAPTER II.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\* The newly-appointed British Resident in Zululand.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

‡ Including attendants.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Translated it ran thus :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

But the Bishop of Natal criticizes this view as

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Dunn took all the cattle."

"Witnessed by me, NTSABA × his mark.

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

"Maritzburg, August 30, 1881. Sworn Govt., Interpreter."

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

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

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

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

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

"(Signed) FRED. B. FYNNEY,

"Sworn Govt. Interpreter.

"Maritzburg, August 30, 1881."

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

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

"Witnessed by me,

"UMJIBA × his mark

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

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

"FRED. B. FYNNEY,

"Sworn Govt. Interpreter.

"Maritzburg, August 30, 1881."

Additional statement of Mfutshane :—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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