

A CRITICAL STUDY OF
ANTHONY TROLLOPE'S
SOUTH AFRICA

Submitted for the Degree of Master of Arts
At Rhodes University

by

J. H. Davidson, B. A. Hons., (Melbourne)
January, 1970.

C O N T E N T S.

	<u>Page</u>
I. ANTHONY TROLLOPE, 1877	1
II. THE TOUR	9
III. RETURN TO ENGLAND; PUBLICATION AND RECEPTION OF THE BOOK	31
IV. ISSUES OF THE DAY: THE TRANSVAAL	55
V. ISSUES OF THE DAY: THE NATIVE QUESTION	96
VI. CONCLUSION	123
APPENDIX A : LETTER OF TROLLOPE TO SHEPSTONE	132
APPENDIX B : TROLLOPE'S ITINERARY	134
APPENDIX C : SOUTH AFRICAN ELEMENTS IN TROLLOPE'S FICTION	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	143

ABBREVIATIONS

T.A.	Transvaal Archives
C.A.	Cape Archives
N.A.	Natal Archives
S.A.L.	South African Library, Cape Town.

All references to Trollope are given in the form of volume and page number only.

I. ANTHONY TROLLOPE, 1877

In the year 1877, during a lull in the Eastern Question, the English newspapers discovered South Africa. There a Dutch republic, the Transvaal, had all but succumbed to the onslaughts of a native chief - or so it seemed; and now it was annexed to the British crown. Clearly, this was a corner of the world of which, as its colonists boasted, England would hear much more; and Parliament was shortly to set its seal of approval upon Lord Carnarvon's essay in imperial architecture, South African Confederation.

These developments had taken the English public by surprise. Some memory of the Kaffir wars remained, but Bishop Colenso, wines, diamonds and ostrich feathers between them were not sufficient to implant South Africa firmly in the public mind. The very term itself was unfamiliar: the Illustrated London News preferred to pluralise the original settlement into "the Cape Colonies". At the same time, the recent upsurge of interest in the Empire tended to pass South Africa by, for much of that interest was focused on those extensions of the mother country, the colonies of settlement, and from that point of view the country had grave limitations. Indeed ignorance of the Cape was actually condoned by a writer in the Nineteenth Century, who claimed that "there are few colonies of which Englishmen know less. This ignorance is pardonable because the Cape is not in the strict sense an English colony at all".¹ It was held to be a Dutch rather than an English settlement, and hence not many noticed that it was one of the few colonies unconnected by telegraph with Whitehall.²

1. Edward Wilson, "England and South Africa", Nineteenth Century September 1877. See also Times editorial, quoted in Empire (London), 6.ix.1877.

2. Empire, 27.ix.1876.

Yet Cape Town's strategic importance as the "true centre of the Empire" was already being urged in official circles, while the implementation of confederation would give South Africa as a whole an importance comparable to that of Canada. Between the lagging public interest in South Africa and its rise in official estimation there was a marked gap; and in the summer of 1877 Anthony Trollope resolved to bridge it.

The novelist was then sixty-two. For most of his life his literary career had run side by side with an official one; he was an executive in the Post Office until 1867, and is said, amongst other things, to have invented the red pillar box. Accustomed to making inspectorial visits, he had developed the ability to divine the essentials of a situation relatively quickly, whereupon he briskly committed them to paper in a simple, semi-verbal style. It was a style at once didactic and adaptable, and whatever the task in hand Trollope set to work in a craftsman-like manner. Indeed, his writing methods became notorious. "It ... is my custom," he divulged in the Autobiography, "to write with my watch before me, and to require from myself 250 words every quarter of an hour. I have found that the 250 words have been forthcoming as regularly as the watch went."² The dimensions of the work in progress were carefully calculated and publishers' deadlines scrupulously observed. By 1877, some fifty works had been produced in this manner, earning their author some £60,000;³ they ranged from biography and books of travel to plays, descriptive sketches, and, of course, the novels.

-
1. Minute of 1871, quoted in Gallagher, J. Robinson, R., and Denny A.: Africa and the Victorians (1961) p. 59.
 2. Autobiography (Fontana edition), 1962) pp.106-107, 217-218.
 3. *ibid.* pp. 281-2.

The most popular of these were the half dozen Barsetshire novels, which have also proved to be the most enduring. Originally published between 1855 and 1867, they lovingly explored the mechanics of polite society in the West Country. Barset is a Merrie England that was disappearing even as Trollope put it down on paper: an England where county towns thrive on their markets and the gossip emanating from the politics of the Cathedral close; where the countryside beyond remains, as it has done for centuries, in the hands of the gentry; where politics are inherited by these gentry as part and parcel of their patrimony, occasionally with a borough agreeably rotten so that they may effortlessly uphold them; and where the social order is bound together by the easy reciprocity of paternalism and deference. It is a county in which parvenu wealth, even when joined to a title, does not procure entrance to the houses of its gentry; where despoliation is the transitory work of foxes, hounds and huntsmen, not of industrialists; and where servants are seen, but not heard.

For Trollope, the life of the country gentleman seemed the ideal one. A great gentleman conducted his affairs with all the assurance that breeding, intelligence and a high sense of responsibility could give him. The novelist wrote of his Plantaganet Palliser that he was "a very noble gentleman" - which was quite true as he was both wealthier and nobler than most - and that "such a one justifies to the nation the seeming anomaly of an hereditary peerage and of primogenitur."¹ In this there is a touch of envy; for having discerned the patterns of gentry life, together with the precepts that could be emulated by lesser, landless mortals, Trollope found he could never fully belong to this milieu. Although schooled at Winchester and Harrow, the ill-clad, awkward Anthony had to bear the taunts of his

1. Autobiography, p. 151.

bettors until his father could no longer pay the bills; and although he later became intimate with members of the Ascendancy in Ireland, the fifteen years spent in Post Office service there increased his detachment from the upper echelons of English society. "It has been my fate," he wrote shortly afterwards, "to have so close an intimacy with Ireland, that when I meet an Irishman abroad, I always recognise in him more of a kinsman than I do in an Englishman."¹ (Similarly, he later struck a ready rapport with colonists.)² In 1859, however, he moved with his family to London; and despite his brusqueness, his clumsiness and his unrestrained laughter, a measure of social success came to him as the consequence of his growing fame. Upon the death of Thackeray a few years later, Trollope was elected to the Athenaeum, and came into his own. He wrote his novels before breakfast, attended to the Post Office afterwards, and twice a week indulged his passion for the hunt; but many of his leisure hours were spent at one of his three clubs,³ playing a rubber of whist, smoking cigars and discussing the politics of the day. When in 1868 a general election was called, Trollope had decided to stand in the Liberal interest for the seat of Beverley.

His politics were not as reactionary as the Barchinensis novels might suggest. In 1876, less than a year before he embarked on his tour of South Africa, he described himself as an "advanced.... conservative Liberal", a contradiction which he regarded "not only as a possible but as a rational and consistent phase of political existence." Trollope disliked the element of selfishness he discerned in the Conservative desire to preserve the status quo, and even more so

-
1. North America (1862) II. 373.
 2. The Queenstown Representative, for example, noted that when disturbances on the Frontier were being discussed "Mr. Trollope was observed to use the pronoun 'we', where most travellers speaking to colonists would have said 'you'". (6.xi. 1877)
 3. He also belonged to the Garrick and the Cosmopolitan.

the opportunism of Disraelian policy; on the other hand he found the notion of equality repugnant, and the demagoguery of extreme Liberals distasteful and dangerous. It seemed to him that the lower orders were slowly advancing both in political importance and in the enjoyment of creature comforts; and so long as they were sober, industrious, and prudent, it seemed right to help them to improve themselves, even if the process involved a little levelling of the upper classes. But the pace should not proceed too quickly, or else the fabric of society would be torn irreparably; and for this reason Trollope was "glad to be accompanied on his way by the repressive action of a Conservative opponent."¹

However the novelist was not given the chance to put his political philosophy into practice. "To sit in the British Parliament", he wrote, "should be the highest object of ambition to every educated Englishman";² but at Beverley he was defeated. Trollope did his best to bury his disappointment in the electioneering scenes of Ralph the Heir; but he could not do so as it became clear that he had reached the turning point of his fortunes. The year before Beverley he had resigned from the Post Office, while in 1869, the year after, the manuscripts of his two latest novels brought him £3200 apiece, which the publishers were unable to recoup from the sales.³ The steady decline in his popularity had begun. Meanwhile other events had moved a little too quickly for him. The 1867 reform bill had put an end to the club-like

1. See, in particular, Autobiography, pp. 230-232.

2. ibid. p. 230.

3. Sadleir, M.: Trollope. A Commentary (Oxford, 1961) pp. 298-9.

tone of the Palmerstonian parliament,¹ so that Trollope's exploration of its politics was already dated when the later Palliser novels appeared in the 'seventies'. Nothing seemed less likely than the prospect of that great gentleman heading a coalition, as postulated in The Prime Minister, for the duel between Gladstone and Disraeli was now at its height. However, Trollope continued to write other novels along familiar lines for a devoted but dwindling following. Then, shortly after his return from a journey to Australia and New Zealand that took some eighteen months in all, he penned a work of an entirely different character, The Way We Live Now. The novel was conceived as a satire, sketching the eclipse of the gentleman and his values by the speculator and the new materialism, and showing how low-born rogues were ushered into the houses of the great, became men of influence, and were even seated in Parliament. It did not, however, attract as much interest as it should have done, and its bitter tone prompted one paper to recommend to its author a change of air.²

By the summer of 1877, the novelist had come to the same conclusion himself. He had long had a real if spasmodic interest in the colonies, and was on intimate terms with some of the officials in Downing Street;³ and having already toured and written

-
1. See Bagehot, W.: The English Constitution. 1867. "Government by a club is a standing wonder". Fontana edition, introduced by R.H.S. Crossman, 1962, p.156.
 2. Vanity Fair, quoted in Cape Times, 29. i. 1877
 3. Trollope named his eldest son, Henry Merivale, for the Merivale family were among his oldest and closest friends; Hexman Merivale was Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies from 1847 to 1859. The novelist also appears to have been on good terms with Robert Meade, the financial expert at the Colonial Office. (Letter to H. M. Trollope, 18. x. 1877, in Booth, B.A., The Letters of Anthony Trollope, Oxford, 1951, p. 383; Goodfellow, C.F., Great Britain and South African Confederation 1870-1884 Cape Town 1966, p.54).

books on the West Indies (1859), North America (1862) and Australia and New Zealand (1873) he had for some time past harboured the desire to visit the lost "great Group" of colonies, those of South Africa.¹

However he was now an elderly man, and resolution might not have matured into action had he not come into contact with James Anthony Froude, the historian. The two men had been brought together by their hostility to Disraeli's Eastern policy the year before, convening with others a public meeting in St. James' Hall.² Although Froude was busy assailing the Government's conduct of foreign affairs, he was at the same time playing a constructive role in its South African policy, participating in Lord Carnarvon's abortive Confederation conference and regularly dining prominent colonists at his home in Onslow Gardens.³ Something of these activities may have been imparted to Trollope; and it is more than likely that the novelist may have been spurred to undertake the South African tour through witnessing the activities of one whom he had always been inclined to regard as a professional rival.⁴

1. I, 1.

2. Shannon, R. T. Gladstone and the Bulgarian Agitation, 1876 (London, 1963), p.204. See also Wolseley to Shepstone, 2. ix. 1877, Box 21, Shepstone Papers, N.A.

3. Letters in Burgers Papers, Folio 3 Group 13. T.A.: Atherstone Papers, passim, Cory Library.

4. Both Trollope and Froude had spent many years in Ireland, among the Ascendancy: they had in their day edited rival monthly journals (St. Paul's and Fraser's respectively). One must also remember that Victorian men of letters ranged widely both in their interests and productions, so that a sense of rivalry was probably stronger than a glance at lists of their respective works would suggest. Whenever Trollope does mention Froude in his works, it is to challenge him, e.g. in Cicero (2 vols, 1882) I, 360; II, 87. For his part, Froude regarded Trollope's tour as so much poaching on his South African preserve. "Old Trollope", he is reported to have said, "after hanging about the world so long, is now treading in my footsteps, and, like an intellectual blue-bottle, buzzing about at Cape Town. (Escott T.H.S.: Anthony Trollope, 1913, p. 286).

Hitherto Trollope had viewed the colonies primarily as places where emigrant English of the lower orders could settle, prosper, and fulfil political aspirations to an extent undreamed of at home: and in 1859, on finding these goals inapplicable to the West Indies in view of the alien nature of the majority of the population, he had urged the abandonment of these possessions.¹ But the temper of the times had changed in the twenty years since, and there was little question of abandoning South Africa for similar reasons. Rather, the points at issue were not so much whether the Africans should be abandoned, but how far an attempt should be made to civilise them: secondly, whether emigrant English in large numbers could be accommodated at all, let alone their political aspirations indulged, and finally, whether the relationship between master and servant was such as to require a monumental exercise in paternalism, taking the form of close supervision on the part of the British Government. At the time of his departure, announced to a gathering at the Royal Colonial Institute on June 7, Trollope had not yet formulated these problems clearly; but already he had come to the conclusion that the Native Question was likely to be the one on which all others turned.²

-
1. The West Indies and the Spanish Main (1859), esp. pp. 83-85.
 2. Discussion following D. Currie's paper "Thoughts upon the Present and Future of South Africa, Central and Eastern Africa". Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, VIII, 1876-7, pp. 405-6.

II. THE TOUR

Trollope came out to South Africa by the Castle liner S.S. Caldera.¹ "I don't like anyone on board", he confided to his son, "I fancy from all I hear and from the little I see that I shall find the Cape a most uninteresting place. The people who are going there on board this ship are just the people who would go to an uninteresting Colony".² There were many in the Colony who were also inclined to prejudge the encounter. As a novelist, Trollope's reputation was high: the formidable Mrs. Proudie had appeared in editorials before it was known that her creator would tour the country, and even in the distant Transvaal, the press had carried letters corroborating incidents in the novels.³ But the colonists were skeptical of Trollope the traveller. It was felt that he could not do South Africa justice in the time at his disposal, and the Observer of Port Elizabeth aired its doubts in a cartoon showing the novelist dressed as a magician, about to wave a wand over pieces of paper variously labelled 'club gossip', 'flying visit', and 'rapid survey', to produce "my second colonial success".⁴

-
1. Trollope's movements are not footnoted here, as his itinerary is given together with documentation in Appendix B.
 2. Letter to H. M. Trollope, 2. vii, 1877. B. A. Booth, ed.: The Letters of Anthony Trollope (Oxford, 1950) p. 373.
 3. Mrs. Proudie axes her way through Barchester Towers, Framley Parsonage, and The Last Chronicle of Barset. Her snobbishness was alluded to in a Cape Times editorial of 24. iii. 1877. Meanwhile the Transvaal Argus of Potchefstroom had published a letter on 22. ix. 1876 referring to an incident in Castle Richmond.
 4. Actually his fourth. Port Elizabeth Observer, 13. ix. 1877. Other disparaging remarks will be found in the Cape Argus, 10. vii. 1877 and 19. vii. 1877 (editorial); also in Lantern (Cape Town) 22. ix. 1877, p.3.

To some extent Trollope was paying the penalty for following in Froude's footsteps: there was an extraordinary rumour that his purpose was to popularise the annexation of the Transvaal, and that he would in all probability receive the K.C.B. for his pains.¹

Where there was not hostility there was often indifference, even in letters of introduction. "Of course," wrote Sir Henry Barkly in commending Trollope to Molteno,

"he will write a dissertation on South Africa, which may or may not be more impartial than the productions of other literary men, but as it is better he should have the opportunity of getting correct information if he chooses, I shall recommend him to your good offices".²

The novelist arrived at Cape Town on July 22, 1877. It was a wintry Sunday: there was neither the famous view of Table Mountain to entrance him nor an attendant Customs official to welcome him. Very much out of sorts, Trollope scanned the town from his room in the Civil Service Club and wrote to his publisher that "it seems like a poor, niggery, yellow-faced, half-bred sort of place, with an ugly Dutch flavour about it".³ It did not seem like the capital of a British colony at all. Nevertheless Trollope was concerned to meet 'the people' of the place,⁴ that is to say the people who ran it; the Governor, the members of Parliament,⁵ the English-speaking clergy and newspaper editors, and their ladies: after dining at Government House with Lady Frere, he regularly went into society accompanied by her daughters.⁶ His experience of Cape society was thereby somewhat

1. It seems to have begun in England, in the pages of Broad Arrows; but it was referred to by the Cape Times (23. vii. 1877) and the Diamond News (31. vii. 1877) amongst others.
2. Barkly to Molteno, 12.vi.1877. Molteno Papers, S.A.L., letter 539.
3. Letter to John Blackwood, Booth, op.cit.p.374. The letter is dated 21. vii. 1877, but must have been written on the following day (see Appendix B).
4. Letter to H.M. Trollope, 23.vii.1877, Booth, op.cit.p.375.
5. On Monday, July 23, the novelist sat in the gallery of the Assembly, listening to the debate on the estimates for the Frontier Police. It was said that in consequence Molteno conducted himself more civilly and that Paterson spoke more fervidly. (Cape Argus 16.iii.1878; Lantern, 28.vii.1877).
6. The Observer (Port Elizabeth) 2.viii.1877 journal of Miss Mary Maclear (entry for 1.viii.1877); Maclear Papers, C.A.

circumscribed, particularly as he shunned the attention of the public in general and was curt with the press.¹ However, he systematically inspected the leading institutions of the city from Parliament House to Miss Arthur's Orphanage, and, as time was short,² used it to seek out anyone who could enlighten him on native policy in general and the Transvaal question in particular.³ Among those he interviewed was ex-President Burgers, then living in Cape Town. The subsequent account of that meeting in the South Africa was one of the few to record Burgers' views after the annexation.⁴

After a fortnight spent in Cape Town, Trollope sailed by R. M. S. Natal to Port Elizabeth, which he reached on August 6. He was somewhat surprised to find the population celebrating the birthday of the Duke of Edinburgh; but the young Prince Alfred had arrived there on that day seventeen years before and the town had been celebrating it ever since. Despite the British flags and bunting, the town struck Trollope, installed in a newly enlarged and renovated Club, as having a pronounced Yankee flavour: there were only 15,000 inhabitants, but Port Elizabeth had "everything needed for the instruction, civilization and general improvement of the human race".⁵

1. Cape Times, 6.vii. 1877.

2. From the beginning he planned on spending only five months in South Africa. Letter to H. M. Trollope, 23.vii.1877, Booth op. cit. p. 375.

3. Letter to H.M. Trollope, ibid; Trollope to Molteno, undated letter in Molteno Papers, S.A.L.; report of dinner with Mr. Advocate Cole and Mr. Advocate Buchanan in Lantern, 4.viii.1877. Buchanan had recently been returned unopposed as M.L.A. for Worcester. (Cape Times, 24.iv.1877).

4. Il, 56-57.

5. Eastern Province Herald, 7.vii. 1877 and 31. vii. 1877.

Trollope made a brief visit to Uitenhage, and then left Port Elizabeth for Grahamstown. The railway to the interior, scarcely begun, took him only as far as Sandflats, where he changed over to coach. He was travelling light; on reaching the South African Barchester he came to regret that his dress suit rather than his books had been sent on to Natal. For when the Grahamstown Club reconstituted itself to give a dinner in his honour, the novelist caused much offence by appearing "... in a shepherd's plaid, combinations, and, we strongly suspect, a flannel shirt."¹ The colonists were quick to read Mother Country condescension into a traveller's expediency; for his part the novelist observed that "the people of Grahamstown are very full of their own excellencies".² At the time of Trollope's visit, the town was fearful for its future, and in consequence the assertion of these excellencies had become a little more strident. The military had already departed, the ecclesiastical establishment was rent by factionalism;³ and as the novelist noted, Port Elizabeth was already capturing the trade of the interior, while on the completion of the projected railways, Grahamstown would be thrust out on a branch line.⁴ The answer, according to Dr. Atherstone and Trollope's host, Jonathan Ayliff,⁵ was to develop the Kowie as a port, connect it by rail to

-
1. "Anna", "Popular Errors about South Africa", in the St. Andrew's College Magazine, Grahamstown, vol. iv, No. 2, May 1882, p. 28.
 2. I, 168.
 3. Gould, C. Grahamstown Cathedral: A Guide and Short History, (Grahamstown, 1924) pp. 30-34. "Conflict".
 4. I, 176.
 5. Cape Times, 17. viii. 1877.

Grahamstown, and then channel the inland trade through the town to revive its flagging fortunes.¹ Trollope wished them success.

Beguiled by the charms of the place, he was also sympathetic to its political aspirations; but on travelling further, he came to see that Confederation and the Eastern Province separatism Grahamstown so ardently espoused were lost causes.²

Progressing through the Eastern Province, Trollope inspected Heatherton Towers, the leading ostrich farm of the day.³ The whole industry, he noted with utilitarian disapproval, "depends entirely upon a freak of fashion", and with his intense dislike of all forms of speculation, he was quite unmoved by the 50% profits "not uncommonly made".⁴ The farmer who gambled his all on ostriches was one aspect of

1. Atherstone thought that the Port Elizabeth line "looks very much like an attempt [by the Dutch-dominated West] to ruin Graham's Town, and to stifle for ever the cry for 'separation' or 'removal' or 'alternative parliaments' in East and West - and keep the colony one with its centre at the extremity". (Letter to Godlonton, 20. vi. 1876, Godlonton Papers, Gubbins Library, Wits. A 43/6).
2. "The Eastern Province", writes Trollope on I. 47, "desires to be separated and formed into a distinct Colony as Victoria was separated from New South Wales, and afterwards Queensland". Originally there followed another sentence: "And it certainly seems that the reasons which were good in Queensland should be good here also". The same sentence appeared in print as part of T.L. 3, but was later struck out from the manuscript.
3. Cape Times, 21. viii. 1877: Grahamstown Journal, 10. iv. 1878
4. I, 176. However Trollope was impressed by the incubating machine invented by the owner of the property, Mr. Arthur Douglass. Douglass, the pioneer of ostrich farming at the Cape, later wrote Ostrich Farming in South Africa (London, 1881).

the feverish colonial temperament at work. recurrent talk of a fresh native war was another. When engaged in a shoot at Alice, Trollope had been struck by the peaceableness of the Ngqika beaters: and even after the outbreak of war with the Gcalekas, rashly predicted that they were unlikely to join their cousins in rebellion.¹ It was a serious mistake. But the Chief Siwani and his companions, whom he saw at King Williams Town, had been so scruffy and so mendacious in appearance that the novelist found it difficult to seriously consider their expressed dislike of white rule.² More important, white influence had progressed among the Africans to such an extent that a fresh outbreak of hostilities seemed unlikely.³

By far the most important agents for civilising the African were still the missionaries, and Trollope duly visited the stations at Heald Town, Lovedale and Peulton. At Heald Town he discovered that the Methodists taught no trade, and all his distaste for sanctimonious Nonconformity welled up within him when three times asked to hear the Africans sing hymns.⁴ Much more to his liking was Presbyterian Lovedale, where "religious teaching does not strike the visitors as the one great object of the Institution." He was impressed by the extensive facilities for training African tradesmen, remarking that "the direction of practical work seems to be the best which such an Institution can take";⁵ somewhat hastily he dismissed its literary efforts as a little premature.⁶ For their part the Africans of the

1. footnote. I. 192

2. I. 199.

3. I. 184.

4. I. 212.

5. I. 218.

6. I. 219-220. Trollope was referring to the Lovedale News in particular; but this was the least important of the Institution's three papers. The others were the Christian Express and its Xhosa counterpart Insigidimi Samaxosa ("Xhosa Messenger"). In addition, Lovedale in 1877 had one debating and two literary societies, all of which met weekly. (Stewart, J.: "Lovedale, South Africa", in Proceedings of the General Conference on Foreign Missions, 1878, London, 1879, pp.68-76.

Lovedale News disarmingly described the visitor as "the son of a famous mother, not an unworthy son," adding that he had "reached a high place among novel writers by great ability and hard work, without which great ability is only a misfortune".¹

Moving on to King Williams Town, Trollope found it to be "a thoroughly commercial little city with a pleasant club, with a railway to East London, and with smiling German cultivation all around it."² There he inspected the Cape Frontier Mounted Police, and was impressed; but the presence of imperial troops in the town led him to prophesy that one day there would be a serious difference of opinion between the Cape and Imperial authorities as to how they should be employed.³ On arriving in East London, the novelist was welcomed by the local newspaper, which forgave him his brusqueness, compared him favourably with Froude, and remarked: "We know of no Englishman more likely to get right notions about people and things, and more able to give a good idea on his return home."⁴ It also called upon the citizenry to entertain him; in the book Trollope owns to having been invited to three picnics. He could not, alas, find it in him to say anything favourable about the port, sandy, straggling and undeveloped as it was; but the £200,000 breakwater then under construction augured well for its future.⁵

-
1. Lovedale News. 20. viii. 1877
 2. I. 197-198.
 3. I. 194-196. Although Trollope foresaw the breach between the Imperial authorities and the colonial ministry that culminated in the dismissal of Molteno on February 6, 1878, it took the opposite form to that he predicted. For the dispute centred not on the imperial troops but on the colonial ones, the issue being whether they were responsible to the Prime Minister or to the Governor, as the co-ordinating agent of the Imperial Government. Nevertheless Trollope drew attention to his perspicacity by a footnote in the 1879 edition (p.54)
(Lewsen, P. "The First Crisis in Responsible Government," A.Y.B., II, 1942).
 4. East London Dispatch. 23. viii. 1877
 5. I. 205.

After some delay at East London, Trollope arrived at Durban on August 27 by the steamer Stettin. Carried across the notorious bar by a Post Office tug, he was soon installed in yet another Club and from there gazed out upon a somewhat ramshackle but 'pleasant town, clean, attractive and with beautiful scenery near it.'¹ The people of Durban, informed by their newspaper that in the presence of Mr. Trollope a household word had come among them, rushed to call on him. The Victoria Planters' Association, determined not to be misrepresented, besieged him with facts, while the Mayor took him on a tour of inspection of the sugar-growing districts of the North coast.² Trollope was impressed by the progress made, but deeply regretted that in supplying labour the African had been found wanting and that Coolies had to be imported from India.³

A few days later Trollope left Durban by mail coach for Pietermaritzburg, the capital of the colony of Natal. Like Durban, it was a town of some 4,000 whites, but it struck the visitor as having an infinitely more established air. Snug and prosperous, it did not have "that look of scattered failure which is so common to colonial embryo cities".⁴ The novelist thought he preferred it to all other South African towns. Having been asked by Sir Henry Bulwer to desert his hotel for Government House, Trollope moved into the centre of its society: The Victoria Club asked him to dinner, and the Mayor held a public banquet in his honour.⁵ The guest list, observed the

1. I. 263.

2. Natal Mercury. 30 viii. 1877. leading article: Natal Witness. 4. ix. 1877, and Cape Times of same date; Grahamstown Journal, 17 ix. 1877

3. I. 270.

4. I. 285.

5. Times of Natal. 15. ix. 1877. It would appear that there was also a dinner on the night of September 2, possibly given by Colenso; one of the Bishop's letters to his son, Frank, dated merely 'Monday morning' suggests this. Folio 12L. Colenso Papers. Killie Campbell Library, Durban.

Natal Witness, "represented every imaginable interest contained within the boundaries of the colony."¹ The calibre of the speeches Trollope found to be surprisingly high; the theme of his own was probably suggested by the leading article of the Times of Natal the day before. That paper, in considering the degree of political apathy besetting the colony, attributed the dearth of public spirit to the hopes which lay in many a colonial breast of ultimately returning to England.² But, said Trollope, should the colonist return to England he would soon wish himself back in the colony once more. Life there was easier than in Britain, and the "emigrant ... had more respect for himself and was far higher in society than those at home."³ The assembled company cheered the speech, for it flattered the self-made men in them all.

The most remarkable of these was Bishop Colenso. In attending the banquet - his first public appearance since the Langalibalele affair - the Bishop was repaying an old debt, for in 1864 Trollope had been among the most prominent subscribers to the fund set up to enable the Bishop to appeal to the Privy Council in his bid to retain his see.⁴ The two had never met, which makes it all the more

1. Natal Witness 11. ix. 1877.

2. "Amongst the mercantile classes, few have come to the Colony with the intention of doing more than making what they can in a short period, and returning again to the old country to enjoy their gains; and even among the agricultural portion of the community, the same notion very generally lurks in the background, and this deadens to a great extent ... public spirit." Times of Natal, 5 ix. 1877.

3. No full account of Trollope's speech - which was very short, and included an apologia for Froude - seems to have survived. Times of Natal, 6. ix. 1877; the account in the Natal Witness, 11. ix. 1877, has also been drawn on.

4. Letter of Frank Colenso, 5. ix. 1877, quoted in Rees, W. Colenso Letters from Natal (Pietermaritzburg, 1958) p. 337. Hinchliffe, P: John William Colenso, (London) 1964, p. 140.

surprising that the author of Barchester Towers should support a heretic against the Establishment. However, Trollope had seen the force of much of Colenso's biblical criticism, although with some reluctance; while as far as the argument over the temporalia of the Church was concerned, he felt that the most sensible solution would be to join the recalcitrant Bishop with the fraternity of liberal Deans in England.¹ No one would have been less satisfied with such a course of action than the Bishop himself. As Mrs. Colenso explained to an English friend, "theological hatred (there) is as bitter as ever... Here, though he has plenty of theological enemies, he has his place and his standing."² By the time of Trollope's visit, the Bishop's partisanship had spread from the Pentateuch to politics, to native policy in general and the Langalibalele affair in particular. He had championed the rights of the chieftain in England against the weight of public opinion in the colony, and in doing so had become a lonely if Olympian figure: he had parted company with his old friend Shepstone³, while the windows of his Cathedral were occasionally shattered and he was conspicuously uninvited to such gala occasions

-
1. Trollope: Clergymen of the Church of England (1865) ch. X: "The Clergyman who subscribes for Colenso", esp. pp. 128-29; also p. 37.
 2. Mrs. Colenso to Mrs. Lyell. 15. vii. 1875. Folio T 121, Colenso papers.
 3. In 1858 the chief Matayana had been summoned to a 'peaceful' meeting by Mr. John Shepstone, who produced a gun at the critical moment, arresting the chief and shooting one of his companions. The incident came to light after the Langalibalele affair, to which it bore some similarities. The Inquiry held in 1875 convinced Bishop Colenso that Theophilus Shepstone had criminally shielded his brother. Shepstone's minute on the affair was "so dishonest", the Bishop wrote to Froude, "that the last links of friendship between us ... was snapped asunder." It is to Shepstone's credit that as late as 1885 he remained "the leading lay supporter of the Colensoites". (Guest, "Natal and Confederation", p. 60; Brookes and Webb, A History of Natal, p. 119; Wolfson, "... Native Administration in Natal under Shepstone", p. 113; Colenso to Froude. 16. viii. 1875, Bishop's Letter Book, p. 118, Colenso Papers, N.A.; Bishop of Zululand to Shepstone, 9. vi. 1885. Colenso Papers. K.C.L.)

as the turning of the first sod of the Natal railway.¹ Now the Colenso family feared that Trollope, staying at Government House, "should fall completely into the hands of the officials and be hoodwinked". They therefore carried him off for a night and a day to Bishopstowe, their carpenter's gothic residence six miles outside the city. There they plied him "with some really trustworthy facts" concerning native policy; Trollope listened, but suspended judgment until he could meet Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the former Secretary of Native Affairs in the colony. When this proved impossible, he wrote a chapter on the Langalibalele affair that was nominally non-committal but in fact argued the government's case by insisting on the need to maintain prestige. The Colensos were to be bitterly disappointed.²

Meanwhile Government House was preparing for a vice-regal tour of inspection of the upland and sugar districts of the colony. Sir Henry Bulwer asked his guest to join him, so that the caravanserai of cooks, tentpitchers, butlers, aides-de-camp and private secretary come to include the peripatetic novelist. Trollope travelled as far as Greytown, and in the Governor's company entered the houses of Germans, Hollanders, and Boers as well as those of the colonial English. He was somewhat surprised at the readiness with which the settlers volunteered information about their progress until he reflected that the "colonial farmer is conscious that he has been trying an experiment and that any newcomer will be anxious to know the result".³ Bulwer found the novelist an ideal travelling companion, and commended him to Shepstone as "a cheery, good-natured hearty man";⁴ for his part, Trollope absorbed the Governor's fair-minded approach to the Transvaal

-
1. South African Mail (London) 4. viii. 1877, article on Natal; Colenso to Fletcher, 6. i. 1878, Folio Y90, Colenso Papers, K.C.L.
 2. Letter of Frank Colenso, 5. ix. 1877, quoted in Rees, Colenso Letters, p.337; Mrs. Colenso to Mrs. Lyell, 15. vii. 1878. Folio T98. Colenso Papers, K.C.L.
 3. I. 229.
 4. Bulwer to Shepstone, II. ix. 1877 (letter 43) Box 13, Shepstone Papers, N.A.

Boers and his reservations regarding the recent annexation of their territory.¹

On September 13, Trollope left Pietermaritzburg for the Transvaal. A two and a half day journey by post-cart brought him to Newcastle, where he had arranged to join forces with another traveller headed for the Diamond Fields who had already bought the necessary cart and team of horses. The companion was a young man, wealthy and well-connected, who had come out to South Africa as the representative of a large British firm dealing in agricultural implements: there is reason to believe that he later became famous as a director of the East Rand Proprietary Mines, and as Sir George Farrar was seated in the Transvaal Legislative Council.² The evidence

1. Bulwer's correspondence to Shepstone in the early part of 1877 states these reservations firmly; his good opinion of the Boers may be seen in his letter of 16.v.1877 and 20. iv. 1877 in particular. Box 13, Shepstone Papers N.A.
2. The manuscript originally divulged, as did the contemporary press that he was Mr. Farrar (or, owing to clumsy type-setting, "Farran") of Howard & Co. of Bedford (e.g. Cape Times, 17.x 1877). Any remaining doubt regarding the correct form of the name is set aside by the letter of Bishop Colenso to his son Frank (dated merely 'Monday morning' - probably 3.ix. 1877 - Colenso Papers. Folio 12L. K.C.L.) in which Frank is asked to invite Farrar out to Bishopstowe as he is the cousin of Colenso's old ally the Canon of Westminster (F.W.Farrar, 1831-1903, later Dean of Canterbury; best known to posterity as the author of Eric, or Little by Little.

There were two Farrar brothers who came to South Africa, and Trollope's Farrar could have been either George or his elder brother and partner Sidney; we know that the companion was 'about a third of my own age' (I.342), and in 1877 George would have been 18, Sidney 20; Trollope was then 62. Unfortunately the biographical dictionaries are vague about the early careers of the brothers, and particularly that of Sidney, the lesser luminary. The Anglo-African Who's Who (1907) tells us that George came out to join Sidney in Port Elizabeth, where the latter had already established the family firm; Rosenthal (1966) that Sidney qualified as a Civil Engineer and came to the Rand shortly after the discovery of gold. The Anglo-African Who's Who, however, definitely states that George had worked at the Bedford headquarters of the firm before coming out to South Africa; and Bishop Colenso, in the letter to his son Frank already cited, spoke of Trollope's Farrar as being a man of charm, a partner in the firm of Howard & Co., and a person "who will probably end by being a millionaire". One is therefore inclined to believe that he was George rather than Sidney.

also suggests that he was the author of an account of a journey from Natal to Kimberley that appeared in parts in the Cape Argus during November, 1877.¹ The writer states that he was one of two men who made the trip by cart; and throughout the account the unnamed 'friend' is given an unusual prominence, the writer only sometimes being included in the hospitalities extended him.² Moreover, many of the details in Trollope's narrative are reproduced here, such differences there are being either embellishments or unimportant discrepancies: for example both accounts mention encountering a detachment of troops held up on the road beyond Standerton by the loss of sixteen oxen, but where Trollope writes of beer being offered them by the officers the commercially-minded Farrar recalls that it was swapped for whiskey and tobacco.³ Again, Trollope asserts that their two lame horses were driven into Christiania, Farrar that they were led by the bridle.⁴ The one serious difficulty is that the 'friend' of the article is said to have left Pietermaritzburg one August 13. That, however, is the only firm date in the account; elsewhere the chronology is given in days of the week only and in that form corresponds exactly to Trollope's movements as we have them from the newspapers. We can only assume that the date August 13 was a slip of the pen, for the days of the week given

1. "From Natal to Kimberley", Part I, Cape Argus, 1. xi. 1877; II, 13. xi. 1877, III, 22. xi. 1877.
2. e.g. for inclusion, at the military camp at Newcastle; for exclusion, Pretoria, where the Colonel of the Royal Engineers (Colonel Brooke, administering the Government in Shepstone's absence) comes to take the 'friend' away. "From Natal to Kimberley", I, Cape Argus, 1. xi. 1877.
3. II, 22; c.f. Cape Argus, 1. xi. 1877.
4. II, 125; c.f. Cape Argus, 13. xi. 1877.

can only follow from September 13, which happens to be the day Trollope left Pietermaritzburg.¹ Why these articles were published anonymously, and why Trollope appears in them in such a shadowy form, remains a mystery; but a cryptic commendatory reference in the columns of the Cape Argus to the novelist's capacities as a cook on the veld strongly suggests that the paper was in touch with Farrar at the time.² The first part of the anonymous account had just been published some days before.

The travellers spent three days at Newcastle, waiting for the weather to clear. Trollope may also have hoped to catch Sir Theophilus Shepstone on his way through to Natal.³ On September 18 they moved off, and travelling at the rate of thirty miles a day, took a week to reach Pretoria. Here they stayed at farms, there at inns: conditions were crude, and only once, at an inn in the burgeoning little village of Standerton,⁴ were they able to take off their clothes before going to bed.

Pretoria, the capital of the new colony, was reached on September 24. After a long period of stagnation, the town was bristling with activity; in addition to the white population of 2,000, there were some 600 redcoats under canvas, "and soldiers", wrote Trollope, though their pay is low, are great consumers".⁵ Everything

-
1. Volkstem, 26.ix. 1877.
 2. Cape Argus, 10. xi. 1877.
 3. The Bulwer-Shepstone correspondence of August-September 1877 is full of references to a possible meeting. It did not eventuate.
 4. Land values had risen 100% as a result of increased building since the annexation. Gold Fields Mercury, Pilgrim's Rest, 23. viii. 1877.
 5. II, 69.

was very new and very raw. The streets and squares were laid out, but brick houses were only now beginning to fill them; meanwhile horses grazed at will in Church Square. Conducted on arrival to Government House, Trollope not surprisingly found the town attractive. But he was not as quick to endorse the annexation of the territory as his hosts would have liked. The young Rider Haggard, then a member of Shepstone's staff and imbued with a virulent anti-Boer prejudice he would later regret, found the old novelist to have "the most peculiar ideas" and to be as "obstinate as a pig". An official who had served the Republic, however, found him enthusiastic about the new British territory: as Trollope later admitted in the book, he tailored his opinion not to accord with the sentiments of present company but to provoke them into stating their own views fully and forcefully.¹ Hence he had hoped to confront Shepstone with objections to his native policy in Natal and his subsequent annexation of the Transvaal; but the Administrator was still touring the eastern districts of the colony. The novelist had therefore to express his reservations on paper, together with his thanks for courtesies extended.

"That the thing done", he wrote "has been infinitely to the advantages of the country, - Dutch, English, and natives, - there can I think be no doubt. The difficult question is this. If it be our duty to save this or another country from ruin by our money, by our arms, and by our energy, when is that duty to stop?.....It may be that at last we shall stretch our hands too far".²

-
1. Haggard, The Days of My Life, I. 78; Haggard to his mother, October 1877, quoted in L. R. Haggard, The Cloak that I left, p. 73; Kotze, J., Reminiscences, I, 516.
 2. Trollope to Shepstone, 30. ix. 1877, Box 21, Shepstone Papers, N.A. The tone of the portion quoted was later amplified in the Zululand chapter specially written for the abridged edition of 1879 (see particularly p. 182).

After an excursion to the Salt Pan north of Pretoria, Trollope and Farrar set off for the Diamond Fields on October 1. Their journey took them through a country in the grip of drought, and forage for their team of four horses was a constant problem. The animals either became lame or sickened and died, so that the travellers often had to dismount and lead their horses by the bridle. The open-handed hospitality of the Boer farmers, however, almost made amends for these difficulties. On entering their houses, vividly described in the book, Trollope was struck by their primitive living conditions and even more so by the grand simplicity of their lives; and in the courtesy of one of his hosts he recognised a touch of patriarchal superiority not unlike "some old Earl at home who in the midst of his pleasant amenities could not quite forget his ancestors".¹

Kimberley, capital of Griqualand West, afforded a rude contrast. Trollope and Farrar entered it on foot: their horses had given out, while to add to the novelist's discomfort, the trunk containing his manuscript had fallen from the cart. Fearful for his reputation lest it should get into the wrong hands and be prematurely published, Trollope was beside himself with anxiety and frustration: fortunately the trunk was recovered.² But Kimberley itself was scarcely a travellers' haven. With its dust, its heat, its corrugated iron dwellings and 13,000 people of all races grubbing about for diamonds, Trollope found it "a most detestable place".³ The Administrator, Colonel Lanyon, put up the novelist

1. II, 115.

2. Farrar, "From Natal to Kimberley" III, Cape Argus, 22. xi. 1877; Warren, C.: On the Veldt in the 'Seventies' (1902), p. 365. Trollope himself is silent on this incident in the book.

3. Letter to H.M. Trollope, 15. x. 1877, Booth op.cit. p. 383.

in his six-roomed Government House and avidly indulged his distaste for the town; Lanyon was dissatisfied with his status in the Colonial Service and acutely aware of the hostility of the populace he cordially despised.¹ When South Africa duly appears, Lanyon was delighted with the account of Kimberley, and told his father :

"I wish the good folks at the Colonial Office would read, mark, and inwardly digest the book, for I do not think they can have any idea of what my life has been and how great the discomfort. This combined with the small pay they gave me, notwithstanding that the funds of the Province were well able to bear an increase to it, should really give me a claim on them.²

In fact Trollope had needed scant encouragement from Lanyon. He had always disliked the gambling and the sharpness inherent in all mining activity, and took no pains to conceal it. A contemporary records that the novelist was taken to inspect "sundry offices..... where he was shown large parcels of diamonds, at which he gaped in astonishment and then through his spectacles glinted suspiciously round at the parties present as though he was hoping they had come to those riches honestly".³ Trollope was also irritated by the musings of a satirical broadsheet which admitted that the miners were adventurers, but added:

"So is yourself, and was Froude
You venture on books in the hopes of a 'hit'
We venture on 'gems' just as good".⁴

-
1. Lanyon to his father, 20. ii. 1877, 28. v. 1877, and 14. viii. 1877. Vol. 12, Lanyon Papers, T.A. Government House was on the site of the present Post Office, in Market Square. (Beet, G. : M.S. History of the Diamond Fields, p. 320, Kimberley Public Library).
 2. Lanyon to his father, 16. iv. 1878. Vol. 13, Lanyon Papers, T.A.
 3. Cohen, L., Reminiscences of Kimberley (London, 1901) p. 282. Trollope's dislike of diamond-getting remained with him to the end of his days, and can be seen in the late novel An Old Man's Love (discussed in Appendix C.)
 4. Fun, quoted in Cape Times, 24. x. 1877.

The culminating indignity, however, occurred when Farrar and he sold their cart and team of horses. It was necessary to ask Lanyon to send the police before the auctioneer handed over their money.¹

Nevertheless Kimberley had a polite society of sorts and Trollope became quite at home in it. Apart from Lanyon, whom he had once sat upon his knee years before in Ireland, there were the Lords, Judge Barry and Dr. J. W. Matthews, all on whom entertained him.² The novelist also struck up a friendship with Captain Charles Warren, who as Land Commissioner of the territory was endeavouring to regularise all titles and boundaries. He was shortly to return to England, and Trollope suggested they should sail home together. Although this did not eventuate, Trollope learned much from Warren. The Captain was able to supply information about the Kimberley mine, having recently completed an official report on it; and as the Ngqika - Goaleka war had just broken out, they probably discussed military matters. When the two men later came to expound their views on native policy and the use of Imperial troops, they were almost identical.³

Indeed Kimberley gave Trollope a new perspective on the Native Question. Hitherto he had seen Africans only on mission stations, on farms and as itinerant labourers; but at the Kimberley mine he gazed

1. Letter to H. M. Trollope, 15. x. 1877. Booth. op.cit. P.383.
2. It has also been asserted that he met Leander Starr Jameson; at any rate he did not meet Cecil John Rhodes, who had left for Oxford some weeks before. (Warren. op.cit., entry for 18. ix. 1877). Escott, an unreliable authority on many matters, quotes a letter which Trollope is supposed to have written a Scottish friend, prophesying a political career for Jamieson. The letter is not reproduced in Booth, though others quoted in secondary sources are. As Escott also claims that Trollope met Olive Schreiner and detected her talent, which was clearly not so, confirmation is awaited from other sources. Escott, Anthony Trollope, pp. 284 and 286; c.f. Meintjies, J.: Olive Schreiner: Portrait of a South African Woman (Johannesburg, 1965) pp. 36-48.
3. Warren, On the Veldt in the Seventies, (1902) pp. 364-66, 368, 385, and entry for January 3, 1878.

upon 3500 of them, an army of black ants hard at work below. He became hypnotised by the prospect and waxed eloquent in expounding the gospel of work. "Who can doubt, he asked, "that work is the great civiliser of the world?" Slowly but surely the savage was being disciplined by regular hours and developing a sense of independence from his tribe as he discovered the value of his own labour. Compared with this, missionary activity was ineffectual; to Trollope's mind there was no other place where the work of "civilizing a Savage is being carried on with so signal a success". It was an opinion shared by his host:

"This place, Lanyon wrote, "has done more to spread our power and a quasi civilization through the far interior, than any amount of soldiers, missionaries or traders".¹

The Big Hole was the crucible for the forces of modernisation in South Africa. In time, Trollope prophesied, other Kimberleys would arise; for the African had begun his trek into the white man's towns.²

When Trollope left Kimberley for Bloemfontein on October 22, he was accompanied by Major Lanyon, who probably went to discuss the survey of the new boundary with President Brand.³ Together they stayed at the Free State Hotel, which Trollope found to be excellent for a town so remote, quiet and sober as Bloemfontein. Surprised to find an Anglican establishment there, surprised to find the capital of a Dutch republic predominantly English, his judgment of South African affairs had nevertheless matured to the point where he could dispute the common colonial view and contend that even if the English language were to triumph over the Dutch, the Free State would remain a republic all the same. The rural interest, heavily over-represented in the

-
1. Letter (addressee not clear), 25. xii. 1875.
Vol. II, Lanyon Papers, T. A.
 2. 11. 187-190
 3. Friend, 25 .x. 1877; the State Secretary's correspondence of the period is full of references to the modifications of the boundary with Griqualand West agreed upon in London the previous year. GS/1516, O.F.S. Archives.

Volkersdorp, would ensure that; and as Trollope talked with President Brand, a man who seemed to have an "exact appreciation of both the highness and the lowness of the place he had been called upon to occupy,"¹ he came to feel that this unassuming man set the tone for this modest pastoral republic. Buttressed as it was from any external danger by British territory, unencumbered by debt, and possessing an adequate revenue, and successful in its single-minded pursuit of an exclusive native policy, Trollope saw that there was at once no inducement for the Free State to join a confederation and no possible pretext for a Shepstonian nutsch.²

After an excursion to Thaba 'Nchu, Trollope left Bloemfontein by coach for Port Elizabeth, where he boarded the Dublin Castle, bound for Cape Town. At Mossel Bay, however, he broke his journey and went off with the Magistrate, George Hudson, "in quest of grand scenery". But, Trollope wearily told his son "the grandest scenery in the world to me would be [home in] Montagu Square".³ The pair passed through George, which the novelist thought "the prettiest village on the face of the earth",⁴ and skirted the Outeniquas on their way to Knysna. The mountains were being denuded by "Dutch labourers... who live a foul, unholy life, very little, if at all, above the Hottentots in civilisation";⁵ as much as hearsay for Trollope did not see them. But holy life did not impress him either; with the vision of Kimberley dancing before his eyes, he despaired of stagnating mission stations such as Paarltsdorp near George. There it seemed that the Coloured had "land assigned to him just sufficient to enable him to live - with the assistance of a little stealing."⁶ His companion departing, Trollope went on to Oudtshoorn and

-
1. 11. 253.
 2. 11. esp. p. 255
 3. Mossel Bay Advertiser, 14. xi. 1877; letter to H. M. Trollope, wrongly dated 9. x. 1877 but clearly 9. xi. 1877, as written from Mossel Bay. Booth op.cit. p. 381
 4. 1. 103.
 5. 1. 109-110.
 6. 1. 113-114

the Cango Caves, where he found the form and variety of the formations infinitely finer than anything he had seen elsewhere.¹ He then returned to Mossel Bay, and on November 18 was once more in Cape Town.

This time Trollope stayed at Rathfelder's, a fashionable hotel near Wynberg.² Apart from calling on such diverse company as Langalibalele and Lady Frere,³ he kept very much to himself, writing against the clock to get his book finished. Indeed, had not Thomas Fuller taken him on a week's tour of the wine-growing districts of the Cape, he might never have gone. Fuller, local Manager of the Union Steamship Company, was an ideal companion. A man of moderate views, his own approval of the Transvaal annexation did not blind him to the fact that it had deeply offended the susceptibilities of the Dutch farmers of the districts they were now touring.⁴ Trollope was estatic; the mountain scenery he declared to be as fine as that of Switzerland or the south-west of France. But he was distressed by the under-productiveness of the valleys; the Cape Government needed to inaugurate extensive irrigation schemes, while the wines of the country

1. 1. 117.

2. See articles on Rathfelder's by A. H. Hattersley and F. R. Bradlow in collaboration with O. H. Sphor. Quarterly Bulletin of the South African Library, vol. 16 No. 4, 1962, and vol. 20 No. 2, 1965.

3. Warren, On the Veldt in the 'Seventies, p. 385; Sir Bartle was still in the Eastern Province.

4. Thomas Fuller (1831-1910) had been editor of the Cape Argus from 1864 to 1873; he was subsequently a member of Parliament (1878-1900) and Agent-General for the Colony in London from 1902 to 1907. His pro-expansionist views can be sampled in a speech given to Sir Henry Barkly's farewell banquet (Cape Argus, 4. iv. 1877); but he cautiously persuaded the Cape Town Chamber of Commerce to shelve a motion approving the annexation on the grounds that it was "too purely political in its nature to be discussed by them with advantage". (Cape Times, 8. v. 1877)

should not be dismissed so cavalierly but given a chance to prove themselves.¹ The villages, however, he found delightful.

With their oaks, spacious white-washed gabled houses and surrounding vineyards, their established air was enhanced by the ponderous courtesy of the Dutch owners. These farmers had created a society in their own image; and noting that even the Coloured peasantry spoke Dutch, Trellope the conservative envied the Western Cape countryside its apparent order and contentment.² Barsetshire, he knew, was disappearing; and as he boarded the Arabian for England four days later,³ it may have been with the hope that here, under another sky and by another name, it might go on for ever.

1. I. 136: 144-45.

2. esp. I. 157-58

3. December 11, 1877. Cape Times, 12. xii. 1877

III. RETURN TO ENGLAND: PUBLICATION AND
 RECEPTION OF THE BOOK

The last chapter of the book was penned as the Nubian crossed the Bay of Biscay,¹ and Trollope presented the completed work to his publisher in the same admirable fashion as he delivered the manuscripts of the earlier travel books: on arrival in England. The date was January 2, 1878;² Chapman and Hall released the first edition in mid-February.³ The London public, however, were to hear of Trollope and his tour before then.

Within a fortnight of his return, the novelist attended a meeting of the Royal Geographical Society at which a paper was read by Sir Rutherford Alcock on "The Geographical and Economic Features of the Transvaal, the new British Dependency in South Africa". Called upon to speak by the President, Trollope aired his view that South Africa was unique in that it constituted the only group of settlement colonies where the native population was expanding, a situation which entailed unfavourable competition for the emigrant labourer. As early as 1875 the novelist had hit upon the truth that the Empire was now expanding into territories that could never be effectively settled,⁴ but his present implication that South Africa

-
1. II, 327.
 2. Sadleir, M., Trollope : A Commentary (Oxford, 1961) p. 412.
 3. Sadleir, ibid., says the book was published in March. This is unlikely, as it was received at the Cape by March 19 - a news item in the Cape Times of that date announces that Juta now has copies for sale. Moreover, the first English review is dated February 16.
 4. Trollope, ed. B.A. Booth, The Tireless Traveller, pp. 199-200.

must be included in this category was an unpleasant novelty. At the time it was widely felt that colonisation was the ultimate justification for expansion: indeed it was sometimes argued that the more pronounced colonising tendency of one imperial power gave it the right to supplant another.¹ Thus the President of the Society felt constrained to politely repudiate Trollope's viewpoint, for although Britain had begun to steadily acquire more territory, further empire without settlement was as yet inconceivable. Trollope had, moreover, a peculiar mode of over-stating his case: a bad ethnocentric habit of excluding the Dutch population and counting only the British population in South Africa, which constantly invited misreporting or misquoting as the total European population. After this particular meeting, a letter to the Times was required to set the record straight.²

Trollope also began to give lectures on South Africa, and it is recorded that on March 27 he addressed the Working Man's Club and Institute Union on "the Kafirs and the Zulus".³ With the Cape-Xhosa War spluttering to its conclusion, South Africa was the object of much interest and some exasperation; consequently Trollope decided to re-work Chapter XIV of Volume Two as the article 'Kafir Land', which duly appeared in the Fortnightly for February 1, 1878. Newspapers scarcely had time to comment as the book itself appeared shortly afterwards.⁴

-
1. e.g. It was argued, for example, that the "colonising Anglo-Saxon race" must displace the "less active" Portuguese from Delagoa Bay. "The South African Question", Blackwood's, CCXXIV, p.101, July 1878.
 2. The Times: report of meeting, 16.i.1878; Trollope's letter, 17.i.1878.
 3. Empire, 4.iv.1878. This seems to have been the first of many such lectures. Trollope addressed the Society of Arts on March 30 (Empire, 4.iv.1878), and lectured at Nottingham on Zululand as late as October, 1878. (Booth, The Letters of Anthony Trollope, p.429).
 4. Fortnightly Review, vol.XXIII, New Series, p.191. The Pall Mall Budget did so however, on 6.ii.1878; reprinted in the Eastern Star, Grahamstown, 26.iii.1878. The Natal Witness of 9.iv.1878 ran an editorial on it and another recent article on the subject from Fraser's Magazine.

In England, South Africa was received most favourably; indeed T. H. S. Escott, Trollope's first biographer, later claimed that its success helped to restore his fading literary reputation.¹ The Times declared that the world ought to be grateful to Mr. Trollope for what he had done, while the Saturday, in a flippant review that was to exasperate many colonists, congratulated the author in that "on so very dull a subject as South Africa there is scarcely a dull page".² As a descriptive account of the country, the colonists of the Empire expected it to take first place.³ The British Quarterly agreed adding that Trollope "has done more to excite a popular interest in South Africa than any former writer, not even excepting Mr. Froude."⁴ Indeed it seemed remarkable that anyone could assemble the necessary materials so readily: it was, after all, only eight months since Trollope had announced his intention of going out to South Africa. "We may well doubt", mused the Examiner, "whether any country but our own could furnish such a marvel of productive energy".⁵ Other reviewers were more cautious, and wondered whether such a breakneck pace of production could be achieved without serious factual error; but there were few who

-
1. Escott, Anthony Trollope, p. 286.
 2. The Times, 18. iv. 1878; the Saturday Review, no. 1165, 23. ii. 1878 p. 241.
 3. Empire, 7. iii. 1878.
 4. British Quarterly Review, vol. CXXXIV, p. 556. April, 1878.
 5. Examiner, 2. iii. 1878, p. 272.

were able to move beyond such speculative soundings to pinpoint actual mistakes.¹ Even the one outrightly hostile review, in the Illustrated London News did little more than declare the work too hurried and too opinionated.² But the general consensus of opinion was that it was the "comprehensive survey of a rapid, but not hasty, visitor and observer",³ and that Trollope's name was a guarantee that South Africa and its problems would become familiar with a class of readers who normally would have shown no interest in it at all.⁴

In South Africa, of course, this argument could not be expected to hold, and here the book did not fare quite so well. Part of the explanation lies in a series of Travel Letters - the book in embryo - that Trollope had contracted to supply the publisher Trubner for distribution in a number of provincial newspapers. To his great embarrassment the first few of the series of fifteen were

1. One of the few journals to do so was the Athenaeum (16.ii.1878), which categorised the errors as stemming largely from Trollope's ill-advised excursion into history writing or, as in the case of the Basutoland chapter, when he had written of places he had not seen. The reviewer, realising the importance of the book, concluded rather airily that "so long as Mr. Trollope confines himself to subjects within his own observation, there is no reason to doubt his accuracy."
2. "Mr. Anthony Trollope's new book.....is as readable as was to have been expected of the clever writer; but the two volumes contain little solid information.... We are told more of what Mr. Trollope said, or might have said, to the colonial politicians, than of what he learnt, or might have learnt, from them, as he appears to be a good talker but an indifferent listener." (I.L.N., 23. iii. 1878).
3. The Fortnightly was not given to reviewing books; this summary appeared in its list of current books of note. New Series, CCXXVII, p.803, May 1878. It had, of course, published the article "Kafir Land" three issues earlier.
4. "The South African Question", Blackwood's, CCXXIV, p. 100, July 1878.

published immediately they were received, and came out to confront him while he was still at the Cape.¹ Published in the Cape Times, they were taken up and reprinted, wholly or in part, across the country. The colonists were not impressed; the blunt style of the articles, together with the inaccuracies that riddled the early 'historical' letters,² created an unfortunate impression which the book never quite overcame. After the letters, the Cape Town satirical weekly Lantern viewed its arrival in the colony with scepticism; then, with rare solemnity, it charged Trollope with having come out to South Africa "docketed and labelled with a government post-mark", and that after having been led around the country "with a ring through his nose", he had presumed to publish a book that should never have been written. He was clearly relying on the prestige of his name to make up its deficiencies. However when the Saturday duly arrived, with a review that spoke of Trollope's "inexplicable fancy" in going to South Africa, the paper revised its opinion in the novelist's favour. Others, unfortunately, allowed their righteous indignation at the antics of the Saturday reviewer to sway their judgment of South Africa itself.³

Nevertheless, the book was not unfavourably received, although a number of papers endeavoured to be condescending in view of

-
1. For Trollope's anxiety, see Joyce R. B. : "Editorial Problems in Presenting Trollope's Views on Australia", Queensland Heritage (Brisbane) No. 1, 1965, p.6, and his letter to H.M. Trollope, 25.vii.1877, Booth p. 375. The Letters were published in the North British Daily Mail (Glasgow), the Manchester Weekly Times, the Northern Whig (Belfast) and the Northern Echo (Newcastle), and possibly elsewhere. The series ran in the Cape Times from 20.xi.1877 to 4.iii.1878; Trollope left South Africa on ii.xii.1877.
 2. "In his second letter, published in our columns today", wrote the Cape Times of 27.xi.1877, "there is little which has not been told elsewhere, and that little is only fresh because it is at variance with fact." Numerous errors were listed, the most notable being the assumption that the Xhosa cattle-killing of 1857 was European-inspired; it was also pointed out that Trollope's Lutheran churches were in fact Calvinist. (I, 44 and 32). A rather more trifling inexactitude on the part of Trollope, to the effect that Vasco da Gama sailed on to India "where we lose sight of him". (T.L.2, Cape Times, 20.xi.1877 was seized upon by the Standard and Mail as the launching-pad for an acrimonious attack on the Cape Times. (S.& M., 22.xi, 24.xi, and 27.xi.1877; Cape Times, 23.xi, 26.xi.1877).
 3. Lantern, 26.i.1878 and 30.iii.1878; Times of Natal, leading article 8.v.1878.

the fact that it was written primarily for the edification of the public at home.¹ But the Cape Times, which had attacked the letters, considered the work remarkably good in view of the haste with which it had been written.² The Cape Argus also declared it a much better book than expected, although it found Trollope evasive on key issues such as the Native Question. It also found his account of the Cape a poor one, and it tartly suggested that the reason why those of other territories seemed better may have been because they were other territories.³ The reviewer in the Cape Monthly, while recommending the book, regretted that it carried no fresh information or new and original views on the country's political and social condition; he also listed errors and declared that the work would not bear the test of close examination. But, he went on, Trollope's views on those subjects closest to colonial readers "will meet with very general assent".⁴ The same point was made by the Natal Mercury, which compared him favourably with Froude.

"One might think", it opined in an editorial, "of these two writers - each so eminent in his own sphere - that the novelist would be more likely to err against absolute truth than the historian; but so far as we have been able to follow Mr. Trollope [the editor was commenting on the Travel Letters], the comparison as regards fairness and accuracy

-
1. Best stated in the Journal editorial of 10.viii.1877, welcoming Trollope to Grahamstown; see also reviews in the Cape Argus, 21. iii. 1878; Standard and Mail, 21. iii. 1878; Het Volksblad 23. iii. 1878; and the Journal, 10. iv. 1878.
 2. Cape Times, 20. ii. 1878.
 3. Cape Argus, 16. iii. 1878.
 4. Cape Monthly Magazine, vol. XVI. pp. 374, 362, June 1878.

is altogether in his favour, while as regards temper and tone it is no less so.¹

Indeed the book was widely held to be fair and outspoken, and it was commended by papers ranging from the 'patriotic' Standard and Mail to the conservative Journal of Grahamstown. This last mentioned paper, however, was the only one to point out that Trollope's opinions were not to be regarded as the ill-considered effusions of a mere visitor, but as the observations of a man who had travelled extensively throughout the Empire.²

However, once discussion of South Africa advanced from generalities to particular issues, the broad agreement as to its excellence disappeared. First and foremost of these were the policy of Confederation, the recent annexation of the Transvaal and the perennial Native Question, which were not only highly contentious issues themselves, but cast a political complexion even on descriptive passages of the book such as the favourable account of the Boers.

If the English reader who picked Trollope's volumes sought enlightenment on any single political issue, it was probably the policy of Confederation. Despite the intractability of the Cape, Confederation had moved to a climax the year before with the annexation of the Transvaal and the passage of the South Africa Act; and with the recent resignation of Lord Carnarvon over the Government's handling of the Eastern Crises, the question in March 1878 was whether the policy would proceed unaided by its architect. Trollope's view that the obstacles involved would overwhelm

1. Natal Mercury, 8. ii. 1878

2. Standard and Mail, 21. iii. 1878; Journal, 10. iv. 1878

it occasioned comment both in England and South Africa, but received scantier consideration than deserved. He had, after all, declared that having supported federal policies in the West Indies, Canada and Australia, he had hoped to do the same in South Africa;¹ but too often the tone of the earlier travel books were remembered and his caution construed into crypto-separatism.² Trollope's actual position was more correctly noted by Emile Montégut, writing in the Revue des Deux Mondes, as being midway between the separatists on one hand and those who regarded the colonies as the source of England's glory on the other.³ To this latter group the policy of Confederation was a measure of imperial statesmanship that could not founder;⁴ eventually the objections of the Orange Free State would be overcome and the stray republic settled within the fold - by a little 'squeezing', if need be.⁵ But Trollope's misgivings about Confederation, although discounted by those who chose to ignore the difficulties involved, were not entirely wasted. The Edinburgh and Blackwood's in their reviews took up his point of the incompatibility of South African sectional interests and developed it.⁶

1. II. 343.

2. See, for example, the Academy, 6.iv.1878, p. 295; also the Journal Grahamstown, 15.iv.1878.

3. E. Montégut: "Les Boers et le Gouvernement Colonial Anglais", Revue des Deux Mondes, Tome 32, 1879, p. 914. It is interesting to note that Montégut was the first foreign critic to respond favourably to Trollope the novelist - he reviewed The Warden, Barchester Towers and D. Thorne very favourably in the Revue des Deux Mondes in 1855 and 1858. H. S. Davies: Trollope (London, 1960), p. 38.

4. The Times, 18.iv.1878.

5. Saturday Review, 23.ii.1878, p. 242.

6. Edinburgh Review, CXLIX, pp. 547-48, April, 1879; Blackwood's CCXXIV, p. 97, July 1878.

This incompatibility is immediately apparent from the discussion of Confederation in the South African reviews. Somewhat parochially the pre-Boer Standard and Mail joined the Cape Argus in stating that Trollope was rather severe on the Cape Government for not refunding customs revenues to the inland states; but somewhat stridently the same paper expressed its delight with his views on Confederation, which it discerned to be "in the style of a South African patriot."¹

Similarly, the protagonists of the policy were also at cross-purposes.

The Grahamstown Journal, after propounding a persuasive case to show that the anglicisation of the Free State was proceeding inexorably, turned its attention to the Cape colour-blind franchise and the difficulty it posed for Confederation with Natal. This, it concluded, was commonly felt among the settler population to be "a very dangerous fault in the Cape Constitution, which must be redressed." There was no alternative: Trollope himself had said that to extend the franchise to the natives would be to invite the clearing of the Colony of its white inhabitants. However the Journal agreed with him that a measure of Imperial intervention in the affairs of South Africa was a necessity. Confederation was to be welcomed as the means of consolidating this tie for all time, for South African Confederation must of necessity be different from the relatively independent Canadian form as Britain was directly involved in its defence.² But this view was not widely held: certainly not in Natal, the colony with which the Journal was most anxious to see the Cape confederated. There the Mercury was pressing for less imperial intervention, and for responsible government as the means by which native management would be carried out effectively. Of course the novelist's opposition to this was noted, but instead of attributing it to a reluctance to place a large native population in the hands of a tiny white ruling caste, the Natal Mercury told its readers that

1. Standard and Mail, 21. iii. 1878; Cape Argus, 21. iii. 1878. For its part the Times of Natal found Trollope's views on Confederation to be expounded "in an unusual manner". (8. v. 1878).

2. The Journal, 12. iv. 1878; 15. iv. 1878.

Trollope's books "shew him to be no ardent admirer either of democracy or of democratic institutions", so that "we are not surprised to find that he prefers the old system of governing colonies to the new,"¹ which was to misread him thoroughly.

To some extent Trollope invited misreading, as his non-fiction works are marked by a tendency to temperise, sometimes to the point of inconsistency. Alternatively, his conclusions are often qualified to the point where it is difficult to ascertain exactly where he stands. Thus reviewers made of the book what they would, declared it evasive on key points, and felt that it was not altogether satisfactory.²

Indeed Trollope's account of the annexation of the Transvaal satisfied no one. In London the Empire thought it unfortunate that he had re-opened the issue;³ at the Cape, the Standard and Mail attacked him for writing that in all South Africa ex-President Burgers was the only person he had found who was opposed to it,⁴ while the fiercely annexationist Cape Argus could not see what was wrong with giving the ex-president a pension anyway.⁵ In Britain, the Academy disliked the mass of "hard or ambiguous" adjectives Trollope used when analysing Shepstone's commission and conduct,⁶ while Blackwood's regarded this passage of the book as so much irrelevant textual criticism, embarked upon "with a naiveté that does credit to his honest heart". Shepstone after all had been in England when the commission was drawn up, and could be presumed to know exactly what Lord Carnarvon required.⁷ The Journal of Grahamstown, however, implied that Trollope

1. Natal Mercury, 28. iii. 1878
2. e.g. Cape Argus, 16. iii. 1878; Lantern, 16. ii. 1878. p. 1.
3. Empire, 31. i. 1878.
4. II. 56; Standard and Mail, 21. iii. 1878
5. Cape Argus, 21. iii. 1878.
6. Academy, 6. iv. 1878. p. 295.
7. Blackwood's, CCXXIV. p. 116, July 1878.

also enjoyed Carnarvon's confidence, so that the reservations about the annexation in the book were in substance His Lordship's; but in fact Trollope was known to the ex-Colonial Secretary only as a fellow member of the Athenaeum, and did not become a frequenter of Highelore until after his return from South Africa.¹ Reservations or no, the annexation had been accomplished and the Journal took the view that the best argument in its favour was the vast new settler market that could be expected to develop in what was still largely a wilderness.²

Some nine months after Trollope's book appeared, Alfred Aylward's The Transvaal of Today was published in Edinburgh. Aylward, an Irishman and reputed Fenian, had been involved in the miners' rising in Griqualand West before drifting to the Transvaal. There he took charge of the mercenaries at the close of the Sekhukhune War, and his services were such that Shepstone maintained him in office despite his dubious past. However he resigned, espoused the Boer cause, and returned to Britain. There he wrote his thoroughly partisan book, of which Chapter XIII, 'Blundering', is a sustained attack on Trollope's account of the annexation. The novelist's motive in writing, Aylward claimed, had not only been to make money but also to justify the annexation by fair means or foul. He had done all he could to show Boer 'incapacity' in dealing with the native races. Quite rightly, Aylward attacked Trollope for his allegation that slavery 'was rampant' in the Transvaal,³ for the sublime simplicity of his account of the Sekhukhune War, for the inane remark that if the Republic was half-Dutch it was only less than half-English. Perhaps he was not wrong, either,

1. Escott Anthony Trollope. p. 286: Empire. 7. ii. 1878

2. Journal. 12. iv. 1878.

3. I. 52; see discussion below pp. 72-73.

when he discerned that Trollope's attitude towards the Boer was conditioned by the fact that initially they had been rebels repudiating British authority. But much of Aylward's criticism was heavy-handed, stemming from the realisation that the Transvaal question would soon become a burning one, and that Trollope's misconceptions would be broadcast far and wide.¹

But in remarking that Trollope mixed only with the slanderers of the Boers and encapsulated their opinions in his volumes, Aylward overshot the mark. Trollope may have been unsympathetic to Boer republican pretensions, at least in the Transvaal, but his real significance lay in the favourable descriptions he gave of Boer life, which were widely commented on and which were one of the first signs that the British attitude toward the Afrikaner was to improve.² The Times noted that the Boers, "perhaps the best abused nationality in the world by the English settlers", had favourably impressed the visiting author; despite their rough exterior, he had found them courteous and obliging.³ Another journal passed on to its readers Trollope's observation that the peculiarities of the Boer were to be attributed to isolation rather than to congenital inferiority or decadence, and noted that the Free Stater showed no sign of 'falling off'.⁴ But there were some both in England and South Africa who thought he had written somewhat extravagantly of them. In Cape Town, the Dutch newspaper, Het Volksblad, noted incredulously that Trollope found the Transvaal Boer to be a true gentleman;⁵ but the Standard and Mail, while noting that he had attempted to be fair to the Boers, felt

1. Aylward, A.: The Transvaal of Today (Edinburgh, 1878), Chapter XIII. pp.262-285.

2. e.g. Blackwood's. CCXXIV. p. 103. July 1878; also Cape Argus. 16. iii. 1878. Lantern. 30. iii. 1878

3. The Times. 18. iv. 1878

4. Academy. 6. iv. 1878. p. 295

5. Het Volksblad. 23. iii. 1878

that this was nothing compared with the damage the book would do in spreading the notion that the annexation had unqualified support throughout South Africa.¹ However Trollope's sympathetic account was not a matter of no importance, as the Standard and Mail believed; at least one English reviewer claimed that the novelist had been somewhat unjust both to the colonists and the natives because he tended to exaggerate the good qualities of the Boers.²

Once again Trollope's tempering allowed reviewers to make what they would of his views on the Native Question. The Natal Mercury deemed him "quite a colonist" in his way of looking at it;³ the Cape Monthly, on the other hand, decided after reading Trollope that "we are in too great a hurry to civilize and Christianise the native",⁴ and took issue with him for questioning both the work of missions and the allocation of land to peasant proprietors. It particularly resented the suggestion that South Africa was not, strictly speaking, an English colony. It feared that the book would be particularly misleading in the vital matter of emigration, for those thinking of settling at the Cape would turn to those volumes and be told, contrary to all experience, that this was a black man's country and that white men could not do well in it.⁵ Similar fears were expressed in Natal.⁶ The Grahamstown Journal, however, felt that Trollope

-
1. Standard and Mail. 21. iii. 1878.
 2. British Quarterly Review. CXXXIV. April, 1878, p. 556
 3. Natal Mercury. 7. ii. 1878
 4. Cape Monthly Magazine. XVI. p. 365, June, 1878; see also Standard and Mail, 21. iii. 1878
 5. Cape Monthly Magazine. XVI. pp. 368, 374; June, 1878
 6. Times of Natal, 8. v. 1878; Natal Mercury, 10. v. 1878. These leading articles were occasioned by the arrival of the Saturday's review, which led the Mercury to doubt whether Trollope was the friend of Natal it had first taken him to be. (28. iii. 1878).

was substantially correct: he would remain so until the colony restricted the franchise and took steps to introduce a form of job reservation.

"... the welfare of the native races," it concluded, "no less than our own, imperatively demands that we should strive to fit him [the African] for the humble but happy position which he alone is fit to occupy; and not turn his head with nonsensical ideas of his equality with us in internal powers and social rights. Christianity, to be successful with Kafirs, ought to be studied more in connection with spade and shears, saucepan and flat-iron, than with slate and copy-book.... Nor do we greatly care to see trade schools established for the natives. Experience does not show that they really practise the trades they are taught in such institutions.. If they did, it would be with the result of driving the white man out of the country; for Mr. Trollope concludes from his wide experience, that the two classes will not work side by side..."¹

In Britain, there was some comment on Trollope's temporising with regard to the franchise,² and occasional remarks on the surprising emergence of racial discrimination among the colonial English.³ His under-estimation of the seriousness of the Ngqika-Ccaleka War was also noted.⁴ But the colonial fears that he would broadcast false notions about South Africa in general were to some extent justified, for it was Trollope's views on the place of the country in the imperial scheme of things that received the greatest attention from the English reviewers. His belief that the Cape had not answered the purpose of an English colony was widely noted, the Saturday reviewer restating

-
1. The Journal. 15. iv. 1878.
 2. Academy, 6. iv. 1878. p. 295. The Times (18. iv. 1878) observed that Trollope believed in educating the African "for his manifest destiny, to be the owner as well as the ruler of South Africa"; The Examiner (2. iii. 1878), on the other hand, stressed Trollope's insistence that the franchise qualification be adjusted in order to keep the native electorate at manageable proportions.
 3. e.g. Athenaeum. 16. ii. 1878. p. 211.
 4. Edinburgh Review. CXLIX. p. 356, April, 1879; the Graphic, 23. ii. 1878. p. 203; Pall Mall Budget, 6. ii. 1878 (reprinted in the Eastern Star, Grahamstown 26. iii. 1878)

it to the point of caricatures

"A handful of struggling English people making bad brandy, collecting feathers, and cropping bad wool hardly answers our ordinary notions of a colony at all".¹

As was observed by another paper appearing on the same day, the emigrant could not get land as easily as elsewhere, could not himself labour freely because of competition from the natives, while to crown all, the black man had the vote in the Cape and might be manipulated by

some unscrupulous carpet-bagger to the detriment of the whole

community.² Thus, chimed in other papers, neither artisans nor gentry were attracted to the country.³ Indeed its overall position invited

comparison with Ceylon, India, or the Southern States of America, rather than with Canada and Australia;⁴ even the diamond mines, noted the Times, would not reverse the trend, for they were more conspicuous as agencies for improving the lot of the African labourer, rather than means of enriching the European entrepreneur.⁵ Thus Trollope's book had

1. Saturday Review, 23. ii. 1878. p.242; See also Edinburgh Review, CXLIX. p. 540.

2. Graphic, 23. ii. 1878.

3. Illustrated London News, 23. ii. 1878. p. 274; British Quarterly Review, CXXXIV. p. 557, April 1878.

4. Graphic, 23. ii. 1878; Academy, 6. iv. 1878, p. 295; Saturday, 23. ii. 1878. p. 242. Colonies and India, however, argued (and was alone in doing so) that the situation would one day be reversed. "As long as there is a demand for overseers", it wrote "they [whites] would be fools if they undertook harder work for less money; but whenever the number of Europeans becomes so great that superior positions are not to be obtained, they will be led into other lines of occupation. In a land and climate suited to Europeans, this result is sooner or later certain." (18. v. 1878)

5. The Times, 18. iv. 1878

brought home to its English public a new appreciation of the complexities of South Africa and of British responsibilities towards it, responsibilities that could not now be abandoned.¹ As Emile Montégut noted with Gallic detachment.

"the ship is of English construction and flies English colours, but the passengers are Dutch² and the crew Kaffirs, Zulus, or Hottentots."

The appearance of Trollope's book drew the reflection from some reviewers that, owing to the Eastern Question, South Africa had been altogether neglected by the public in recent years. The general run of books appearing on the country were accounts of missions, war, and sport, all "more or less interesting in their way", but if anything dispelling the prospects of the Cape as a colony of settlement.³ The publication of South Africa, however, could be taken as another sign that interest as well as involvement in the country was increasing.

For this reason it would be interesting to discuss the influence of the book in terms of sales patterns, but unfortunately this is now impossible as the publishers, Chapman and Hall, lost all their records in the Blitz.⁴ Nor can it be inferred from the sum of £850 listed as receipts from South Africa in the Autobiography, for throughout his career Trollope's earnings came from outright sale of manuscripts rather than from royalties.⁵ Hence to infer as Sadleir

-
1. Edinburgh Review, CXLIX, p. 545, April, 1875.
 2. Montégut, E. : "Les Boers et le Gouvernement Colonial Anglais" (a review of Trollope and Lady Barker), Revue des Deux Mondes, Tome 32, 1879, p.916.
 3. Edinburgh Review, CXLIX, p. 535, April, 1879; Graphic, 23. ii. 1878
 4. Letter from Associated Book Publishers (in which Chapman and Hall are now merged) to the author, 9. ii. 1967.
 5. Autobiography, Fontana paperback, 1962. p. 282.

does that the book was relatively unsuccessful because it earned him some £400 less than North America and Australia and New Zealand, is to miss the point:¹ it does, however, show how far Trollope's stocks had fallen in the late 'seventies,² and may also indicate that the publisher believed that a book on South Africa would command less attention than those in Australia and North America. The Cape-Xhosa War, however, sustained South Africa in the unusual prominence it had attained with the annexation of the Transvaal and the passing of the South Africa Act, with the result that the first edition rapidly sold out and was replaced by another.³ Two more were to follow in the course of 1878; all were mere reprints of the first, save for the correction of minor errors.⁴ With the outbreak of the Zulu War the following year, Trollope produced a highly abridged, single volume edition of the work, which cut out nearly all the chapters on the Cape but contained an extra one on Zululand.⁵ Thus the book ran through five editions in all. An 'edition' in nineteenth century publisher's parlance usually meant a printing of 1000 copies - but the abridged fifth edition, designed for popular consumption, was probably much larger than the others. At the very least then, some 5000 copies of the book were printed in England. It was also published in English by Tauchnitz of Leipzig,⁶ but unlike the Australia and New Zealand was not reprinted by the colonists.⁷

-
1. Sadlier, M. : Trollope, A Commentary, Oxford 1961. p. 323.
 2. Another indication is that the Annual Register, which in 1873 had given a long review of Australia and New Zealand, did not review the book.
 3. Natal Mercury, 10. v. 1878.
 4. e.g. The 'Fort' Elizabeth of the first three editions is corrected in the fourth.
 5. Chapter XI.
 6. The undated edition of The Fixed Period, first published in 1882, has the book listed in an advertisement. Tauchnitz editions were paperbacks, largely directed at the itinerant Englishman abroad.
 7. Joyce, R. B.; "Editorial Problems in Presenting Trollope's Views on Australia", Queensland Heritage No. 1. Brisbane, 1964 pp. 6-7, discusses the various editions.

South Africa probably knew Trollope best from the fifteen Travel Letters published in The Cape Times between November 1877 and March 1878.¹ Unfortunately the office of that newspaper does not now have daily circulation figures before 1934, so the possibility of ascertaining whether there was a significant increase in sales of those issues in which Trollope's letters appeared is now closed. It would seem from contemporary comment, however, that the paper usually sold something less than 3000 copies.² In addition, some of the letters appeared in other newspapers. The Port Elizabeth Telegraph and Observer, Grocott's Penny Mail and The Eastern Star of Grahamstown, The Express of Bloemfontein,

-
1. See bibliography for detailed list.
 2. The Diamond News (Kimberley, 25. viii. 1877) carried an item stating that no journal in South Africa had a circulation of more than 3000; two papers followed closely by a third, fell short of this figure by less than one-third. Cape Town's population at the time has been estimated to have been about 40,000, all races, who were served by six newspapers appearing at least three times a week. This figure, though conservative, is therefore quite credible.

the East London Dispatch and the Queenstown Representative reprinted some of them, usually those of local interest;¹ occasionally, when Trollope's views coincided with the political opinion of the paper, they were taken from context and thrust into the news column with a pointed comment.² Usually the reprinted letters were also intended to serve as notices of the book, for in most cases no review subsequently appeared in the papers concerned. Others, such as the

1. The Letters were reprinted as follows:

<u>Port Elizabeth Telegraph.</u>	18. xii. 1877. Present Political Condition 12. ii. 1878. Kimberley
<u>Observer.</u>	20. xii. 1877 Present Political Condition 10. i. 1878. Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown. 4. ii. 1878. The Zulus 11. ii. 1878. Natal 7. iii. 1878. The Free State.
<u>Eastern Star</u>	24. xiii. 1877. Present Political Condition.
<u>Grocott's.</u>	8. i. 1878. Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown. 12. ii. 1878. Kimberley
<u>Express & O.F.S. Advertiser.</u>	10. i. 1878. Present Political Condition. 14. iii. 1878. The Free State; headed 'Another Champion for our State.'
<u>E. L. Dispatch.</u>	7. iii. 1878 Kimberley.
<u>Queenstown Representa- tive.</u>	31. xiii. 1877. Present Political Condition. 6. i. 1878. Legislature & Executive. 15. i. 1878. Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown. 22. i. 1878. British Kaffraria and Lovedale. 29. i. 1878. The Zulus. 12. ii. 1878. Natal. 19/26. ii. 1878. Kimberley. 19. iii. 1878. Krelli and his Kafirs.

2. e.g. the possibility of Grahamstown becoming capital of the Confederation. Journal. 5. iv. 1878; time Molteno retired. Grocott's, 8. i. 1878.

Graaff-Reinet Herald (which had expected "a capital book") were quite happy to rely on someone else's judgement, and merely regurgitated reviews, in this case from the Cape Argus.¹ The Cape Town Daily News and the Friend of Bloemfontein must have exasperated their readers by reproducing most of the review from the Saturday.² in Natal readers of the Witness were served the review from the Times.³ When these reprints of the letters and reviews are added to the original notices of the book given in South Africa, it is found that some twenty newspapers gave it their attention.

In view of the extensive reprinting of the letters, sales of the book in South Africa were probably unspectacular. Unfortunately there is now no way of verifying this, as the main distributors, Juta's of Cape Town, were burnt out in 1894; although some records survived, those covering sales and distribution of books did not.⁴ Nevertheless there are additional reasons for believing the sales have been low.

The book was expensive: the modern practice of charging an extra 25% above the English price has a long ancestry. The two volumes which in England retailed for 30/- were sold here for 38/6d.⁵

Finally, and as a consequence of the original price, the book is today surprisingly scarce in South Africa.⁶

1. G. R. Herald. 21. xi. 1877; 30. iii. 1878.
2. C. T. Daily News. 28 and 29. iii. 1878; Friend 18. iv. 1878.
3. Natal Witness. 8. vi. 1878.
4. I am indebted to Mr. Lawrence, General Manager of the firm for this information.
5. Contemporary advertisements.
6. Mr. Struik of Cape Town, Africana specialist, informed me in 1967 that he had not handled a copy of the book for about two years.

Nevertheless the book had been widely read in the country by June, 1878, when the Cape Monthly published its review,¹ and leader writers made several references to it. Both the Cape Times and the Cape Town Daily News, in taking up opposing positions on the dismissal of the Molteno Ministry, took Trollope's anticipation of trouble stemming from the ambiguity of authority over the deployment of Imperial troops as their starting point.²

The Cape Times, having grown tired of the widespread delusion that the natives courted British rule, had already spoken a few months before of the refreshing frankness of Trollope's account of his interview with Siwani at King William's Town.³

But the book had been written essentially for the public at home, and it was there that it had its greatest impact. Escott tells us that it was the South Africa that ripened the acquaintance of the Earl of Carnarvon into friendship; copies of the book were no sooner in circulation than his lordship summoned Trollope to join him and Froude at Highclere.⁴ The influence of the book can also be traced in Parliament. On July 26 there occurred in the House of Commons a debate on the Administration of Native Affairs in the Colony of Natal. The recurring theme of the speeches was most clearly stated by the Colonial Secretary, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach: the 'peculiar position' of South Africa lay in the fact that "alone among the colonies of the world, the White race and the Native race have prospered side by side".⁵ It is not

-
1. Cape Monthly. XVI. p. 362. June, 1878.
 2. Cape Times. 21. iii. 1878; Cape Town Daily News. 22. iii. 1878
 3. Cape Times. 8. i. 1878.
 4. Escott. Anthony Trollope. p. 286; Empire. 7. ii. 1878.
 5. Hansard. 3rd Series. Vol. CCXLII, col. 468. 26. vii. 1878.

unreasonable, in view of the vigour with which Trollope stated this same idea, that its unusual prominence in the debate may be attributed to the recent publication of South Africa. The book was also used by speakers addressing less august houses. A few months before, at a meeting of the Royal Society of Arts, a lecture had been given on Natal by Dr. Sutherland.¹ Froude, who had privately described the book as "the buzzings of an intellectual blue bottle,"² was in the chair; from that vantage point he heard it described as brilliant, and Trollope's view of the civilising influence of the diamond fields endorsed.³ At subsequent public meetings the book was further commended by Sir Bartle Frere⁴ and Dr. James Stewart.⁵

It must be pointed out, however, that Trollope's influence can also be traced in its negative forms. The author of the article "The South African Question" in Blackwood's, which reviewed Trollope along with other recent books on the country, was heavily indebted to him for factual material. This can be seen throughout: in the reservations about Confederation, in the description of Dutch Colonial days, in the doctrine of the necessity of prestige when dealing with the natives. It can also be seen in his absorption of the stereotyping Eastern and Western Province into English and Dutch, and the way he throws around the term 'slavery' in connection with the Portuguese and the Boers of the Orange Free State.⁶ This writer did not explicitly

-
1. Dr. Peter Sutherland (1822-1900) was Surveyor-General in Natal from 1853 to 1886. (Rosenthal).
 2. Sadleir, M.: Trollope: A Commentary, p. 323.
 3. Empire. 2. v. 1878.
 4. Sir Bartle Frere. "The Industrial Resources of South Africa". Journal of the Society of Arts. XXIX. No. 1473. 11. ii. 1881. p. 205.
 5. Stewart, James. "Lovedale, South Africa", in Proceedings of the General Conference on Foreign Missions, London 1878 (1879). p. 76
 6. Blackwood's. vol. CCXXIV. esp. pp. 97-105. July 1878.

link slavery with the Transvaal, but some of Trollope's other reviewers did.¹ It is unlikely, in view of the Anti-slavery Agitation of 1868, that Trollope implanted this view in their minds; but it is certain that he strengthened the misconception.

The book continued to exert influence at the time of the Zulu war. John Morley, in an angry editorial directed against Conservative South African policy, used Trollope anonymously against Shepstone as "a writer ... on his own side" who supported the annexation but was opposed to its arbitrariness.² In the same year Ewing Ritchie published his pamphlet "Imperialism in South Africa: Trollope's views on Transvaal slavery were attacked, but many of his other points were reproduced with the acknowledgment that the novelist was "our best authority on the subject."³ But after the Zulu war, the publication of Froude's Two Lectures and Majuba, the book's influence declined because it had rapidly become superseded.⁴

To Hugh Walpole, writing in 1928, the book still had some interest, as alone among the four travel books it had "a lively and amusing narrative".⁵ But it was more than that. It could still

-
1. Saturday Review. 23 ii. 1878; Athenaeum. 16. ii. 1878. p.211.
 2. "The Plain Story of the Zulu War", Fortnightly Review. CXLVII, p. 330. March 1879.
 3. J. Ewing Ritchie; Imperialism in South Africa. London. 1879. p. 28 and passim.
 4. A late reference is found in Lord Colin Campbell: "Annexation and South Africa", Nineteenth Century March, 1882. p. 439. Trollope's view of Colonial Office policy is under attack.
 5. Walpole H.: Anthony Trollope (1928) p. 154.

spark a controversy when Sarah Gertrude Millin, in the opening pages of the book The South Africans, praised Trollope for having produced "as sane and wise a book on South Africa as has ever been written". She spoke of "his characteristic swift and imperturbable thoroughness", and the way his book had caught for all time that moment when the old Africa ended and the new Africa began.¹ For the opposing view soon appeared: Trollope could never reveal the 'soul of Africa' because he was basically unsympathetic to it.² It was the same question which had taxed the first reviewers: would the advantages of a novelist's insight and descriptive power adequately compensate a mere passing acquaintance with the country and its problems? It is the question we must now attempt to answer.

-
1. S. G. Millin: The South African (1926) pp. 1-2
 2. Callaway G.: South Africa from Within, made known in the Letters of a Magistrate, London, 1930. pp. 17-18.

IV. ISSUES OF THE DAY: THE TRANSVAAL

At various places in the book Trollope tells us that the tour of South Africa was occasioned by the annexation of the Transvaal, and that the new colony was the prime object of his visit.¹ No sooner had he arrived in Cape Town than the rumour got about that he had come out to popularise the annexation and would receive a K.C.B. for his pains, a rumour promptly denied by the more responsible press.² The annexation, then, was not only uppermost in his own mind but remained a cause of controversy in South Africa, and for these reasons Trollope's presentation of the issues involved is worth discussing at some length.

In some ways it is a curious account of the last days of the republic and the events leading up to the annexation. It is uneven, and sometimes misinformed, for Trollope is not interested in the intricate politics involved; it is also surprisingly narrow in its interpretation of Shepstone's actions. However its very thinness and narrowness of range has enabled the novelist to focus on the moral issues involved, which were perhaps the only ones of abiding interest to his English reading public.

The tale as Trollope tells it does not have a hero - his misgivings about the annexation were too profound for that - but it is not without its anti-hero, President Burgers. Burgers, whom Trollope met in Cape Town, seems to have made an indelible impression on the novelist: years later he was to re-emerge as ex-President Neverbend in The Fixed Period.³ Highly imaginative but somewhat erratic, Burgers is chided in South Africa for his pretensions. His unrealistic education scheme,

1. I, 1; II, 1 & 25.

2. supra, p. 10.

3. see Appendix C.

together with his frolicking with flags, a coat of arms and gold sovereigns were but rhetorical gestures in a state where taxes were often unpaid and laws were often unheeded. It was to these basic problems, said Trollope, that Burgers should have directed his attention. Instead, he looked beyond the boundaries of the republic to indulge dreams of a united Dutch South Africa, mismanaged the ambitious project of building a railway to Delagoa Bay to the point where the country was placed irretrievably into debt, and committed the unpardonable sin of unsuccessfully waging war against the native chieftain Sekukhune. 'With his coins and his flags and his railway', wrote Trollope, 'he seems to have lost that power of inducing his Dutchmen to fight which the Dutch leaders before his time have always possessed'.¹ Clearly Burgers' presidency had been disastrous; but in passing judgment Trollope pointed out that he had after all been given a mandate to govern by the people. That Burgers was 'sanguine, unsteady, and utterly deficient in patience and prudence', he concluded, 'was the fault of those who elected him rather than of himself'.²

To Shepstone, however, he was not so generous.

The Transvaal, he conceded, was in a parlous condition, and he summed it up in a few staccato sentences. 'Slavery was rampant. The Natives were being encouraged to rebellion. The President was impotent. The Volksraad was stiff-necked and ignorant. There was no revenue, no order, no obedience'.³ But did such a condition warrant annexation? 'I doubt', wrote Trollope, 'whether there is a precedent for so high-handed a deed in British history'.⁴ For Shepstone had apparently exceeded the terms of reference of his Commission, which had stipulated that any annexation of the Transvaal or part of it must take place with the approval of the inhabitants of the

1. II, 46 & 47.

2. II, 44.

3. II, 52.

4. II, 50.

country or of its legislature. As Trollope wrote,

'A nation with a popular parliament can only be held to express its opinion to another nation by the voice of its parliament;- and the Volksraad of the Transvaal was altogether opposed to the interference of Great Britain'.¹

Despite these irregularities, Trollope came to the conclusion that the annexation was justifiable. Shepstone had been compelled to act with incomplete authority by the exigencies of the situation: the native difficulties of the Transvaal were such that someone had to intervene, and given the fact that there was no other European power available to render assistance, British involvement was absolutely necessary. Moreover, the annexation could be expected to benefit all concerned. The natives would now be protected, and the lot of the Boer immeasurably improved. For perhaps the real justification of the act lay in the influx of capital and the rise in land values that was already occurring when Trollope visited the territory six months later. Confidence had been restored; property was secure. Hence the novelist related that the only person he found in South Africa who opposed the annexation was ex-President Burgers,² and in view of the fact that he was subsequently reported to have accepted a pension from the British Government, that opposition was of somewhat limited significance.

Far more serious, in Trollope's view, was the prospect that the British Parliament, having already approved a Special Grant of £100,000 to assist the new colony, might come to look upon its acquisition with profound misgivings in the event of being asked for further sums to set the Transvaal upon its feet. However Trollope believed that the policy of the Conventions had been a mistake; 'the Dutch who trekked across the Vaal,' he wrote, 'were our subjects as much as though they were English'.³

1. II, 51.

2. II, 56.

3. II, 64.

Hence Britain must pay for that mistake, if necessary. Should the Mother Country decline to do so, then this would herald retrenchment in the Transvaal, not abandonment. Indeed the more he reflected upon it, the more Trollope approved the new order in the Transvaal. A couple of chapters further on from his cautious endorsement of the annexation, he roundly declared that 'had I been in Sir T. Shepstone's place and done as he did, I should have been proud of the way I had served my country'.¹

Before considering the passage of events in the Transvaal, it is necessary to place them, as Trollope did not, in a wider perspective. In view of his belief that the annexation was but the corollary of Sand River, the novelist's failure to suggest any connection between the annexation and the attempt then under way to range the colonies and states of South Africa in confederation is all the more surprising. Carnarvon's confederation scheme was not the first to be considered for South Africa; but it was the most serious one to date and the one most clearly sustained by imperial initiative. The difficulties encountered have recently been admirably outlined elsewhere²; for our purpose it is sufficient to establish the connection between this policy and the course of events in the Transvaal. In 1875, at a time when both the Cape and the Orange Free State had declared themselves against Confederation, the Transvaal was apparently acquiescent. President Burgers, then in London, discussed the matter and impressed Carnarvon with his 'loyalty'³; at the same time he wrote to Acting-President Joubert stating that Carnarvon would not press for Confederation, having been acquainted with the republic's reservations in no uncertain terms.⁴ Hence the Transvaal Executive Council saw no

1. II, 113.

2. C.F. Goodfellow, Great Britain and South African Confederation 1870-1881 (Cape Town, 1966).

3. ibid., p.78.

4. Burgers to Joubert, 6. v. 1875 and 12. v. 1875, quoted in Engelbrecht, S.P.: Thomas Francois Burgers, pp. 118 & 128.

danger in participating in a general South African conference to discuss native policy and other matters of common interest. But the proposed conference was never held, and when Carnarvon convened one in London a year later, the Transvaal was conspicuous by its absence. Burgers then complained to Barkly that after accepting the initial invitation, he had not been kept informed of subsequent developments¹; but his denunciation of Confederation as an 'unholy alliance' and the tone of letters received from Froude strongly suggests that there was a deliberate decision on his part not to participate², a decision which probably sprang from the suspicion that Carnarvon had exerted influence to sabotage the President's attempts to raise a loan to finance the Delagoa Bay Railway³. For his part, Carnarvon felt betrayed by Burgers' apparent volte face⁴.

The estrangement between Burgers and Carnarvon meant that the Transvaal had become dangerously isolated from the current of South African affairs. Although the London Conference had spluttered to a conclusion without the full participation of either Brand or Molteno; the Colonial Office had come to terms with both of them before they returned to South Africa. Molteno had been pressured into agreeing to incorporate Griqualand West in the Cape, while Brand had dropped all Free State claims to the territory in exchange for the sum of £90,000 by way of compensation. It was in this context that the decision to annex the Transvaal was taken. A few weeks after Molteno

-
1. Burgers to Barkly, 15. ix. 1876, Encl. No. 1 in Barkly to Carnarvon, 2. x. 1876, C 1748, p. 142; Sand Arund, 11. vii. 1876.
 2. Uys, G.J.: In the Era of Shearstone, p. 168; Froude to Burgers, 22. 1. [1877?] and 12. iii. 1877 in particular. The first of these remarks: 'You ought to be here - indeed you ought -'. Group 17, Folio 4, Burgers Papers, T.A.
 3. This is discussed in Uys, op. cit., p. 153.
 4. Goodfellow, op. cit., pp. 112 & 126.

left England, Carnarvon set to work upon the Bill that was to become the South Africa Act of 1877¹. It had been found that an Imperial Act would be necessary to enable the Cape to incorporate Griqualand West, and so the opportunity was taken to draft a more comprehensive measure that would facilitate Confederation. It was known that Houtenro was opposed to Confederation; but by encouraging Eastern Province separation or by bolder strokes of policy in the Transvaal, it might be possible to suborn the Cape. A widely-framed act would enable any combination of states and colonies to confederate: should the Cape remain intransigent, the importance of the northernmost state became immediately apparent.

Whereas the Orange Free State was now enjoying peace and a modest prosperity, the Transvaal had drifted into war with the Pedi. Carnarvon, excited by a telegram telling of Boer defeat in highly exaggerated terms, became excited at the possibilities the situation presented. When further news reached London of Boer reverses, together with a query from Barkly as to whether he should accept 'the proposed cession' of the Transvaal, Carnarvon wrote to Disraeli stating that he would telegraph the High Commissioner at once and authorize him to 'act on his best judgment and to lose no chance of acquiring the Transvaal'. For once the Transvaal had been acquired, the Free State could be expected to follow, 'and the whole policy in South Africa for which we have been labouring' would be 'fully and completely justified'². Five days later, on September 20, a second letter was sent to the Prime Minister: the Boer army was at the end of its tether, and it seemed that some of the Republican

-
1. 40 and 41 Victoria Ch. 47, An Act for the Union under one Government of such of the South African Colonies and States as may agree thereto, and for the Government of such a Union; and for Purposes connected therewith.
 2. Monypenny and Buckle, Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Vol. VI p. 413; letter of 15. ix. 1876. See also Uys, op. cit., p. 174.

authorities desired British intervention. Thus he proposed to send out Sir Theophilus Shepstone with a secret commission to take over the territory and administer it in the name of the Queen. 'I have every confidence in his judgment', wrote Carnarvon, 'and knowing my mind, he will under almost any circumstances, I believe, act rightly'. Should these circumstances change '- as unfortunately is possible though I hope not likely - he will hold his hand.'¹ But the troops despatched in the Special Commissioner's wake a few days later reduced the margin of doubt about the outcome of the mission.² Never was Trollope so mistaken as when he imagined that Carnarvon 'must have been more surprised than any other man in England' at the news of the annexation³; for if Shepstone had exceeded the terms of the Royal Warrant, there can be no doubt that he appreciated the purpose of his aristocratic master.

That Trollope could pronounce with such certainty on this aspect of the annexation may strike the reader as being either presumptuous or naive. The novelist himself concedes that had he met Shepstone he would not have been able to speculate so freely⁴; in point of fact he would have had to revise his whole interpretation. For Trollope imagined that Shepstone's commission had been sent out to him, and that the Special Commissioner was obliged to take the Royal Warrant at face value, as he was; he seems to have been quite unaware that Sir Theophilus brought it out from England himself⁵. However, it must be pointed out that wider considerations of policy

1. Carnarvon to Disraeli, 20. ix. 1876; Monypenny and Buckle, op. cit., VI, 414.

2. Butler, W.F.: The Autobiography of Sir William Butler, London, 1911, p. 194.

3. Although Trollope read Blue Books, he does not seem to have read Hansard, Third Series, CCXXXIV col. 354, where Carnarvon explicitly stated: 'I need hardly say that I am not surprised at what has occurred'. (7. v. 1877).

4. II, 58.

5. II, 59; also T.L. XIII, One Times, 11. ii. 1878.

seemed irrelevant to the novelist; he had long harboured grave doubts about the viability of small, self-governing territories, and had remarked even of British colonies that a parliament 'selected from a few scattered inhabitants' would neither function properly nor gain the respect of the world at large, 'and the smaller the number, the greater will be the danger.'¹ To Trollope, the shortcomings of the Transvaal were self-evident. It scarcely seemed necessary to look beyond its boundaries to account for its annexation.

* * *

The Transvaal, as a Boer republic, owed its existence to those descendants of the emigrant farmers who had spawned across the country in thirty gigantic clans.² Political cohesion was minimal, as the rugged individualism of the Boer tended to reduce the state to a federation of farms. The Keale Award of 1872, however, demonstrated the need for effective leadership to counter British diplomatic pressure, whereupon the Transvaal Boers elected the sophisticated Cape predikant, Thomas Francois Burgers, as their President.

Trollope discerned that Burgers had been entirely miscast as the leader of a turbulent frontier community: a man of undoubted brilliance (he met and corresponded with Charles Darwin)³ his intellect was outshone only by his instability, so that in the fulness of time he not only exasperated his supporters, but lost

-
1. Australia and New Zealand (1873) I. 160.
 2. de Kiewiet, C.W.: The Imperial Factor in South Africa (Cambridge, 1937) p. 125.
 3. see Darwin to Burgers, 24. v. 1875, Burgers Papers Folio 3, Group 13, and subsequent tribute to Burgers by Darwin's daughter.

the friendship of kindred spirits such as Froude.¹ Burgers had hoped to raise the Transvaal to the point where it could work decisively for a united Dutch South Africa, but his lofty aims were belied by the bareness of his assets. He began with an almost worthless paper currency, an irregular revenue, a minimal public service, and a backward electorate almost untouched by the educative influence of the press, itself largely in the hands of the English of the towns. 'You have before you,' warned a missionary friend in writing to congratulate him on his election,

*the arduous task of constructing a new edifice from old materials and with a very indifferent body of workmen; of initiating in fact an era of progress in a country where the majority (its ruling power) is either inert or opposed to progression.*²

But instead of patiently seeking to win the confidence of the burghers - which he needed to do as, like Trollope, they construed his secularism into atheism³ - he alienated them with his new flag and golden sovereigns bearing his effigy. Some 600 conservative Doppers, as much exasperated with his government as they were eager for more land, had quit the country in 1874. Others were following them.⁴

Burgers was in dire need of a panacea. For some years

-
1. There is a brief of 9 letters from Froude in the Burgers' Papers, Transvaal Archives. In that of 19. v. 1875 (Folio 3, Group 14), he writes: 'You are good enough to express your confidence in me. In quarters perhaps which you would not suspect I was warned against placing confidence in yourself. From the first half hour's conversation I had with you at Pretoria I learnt that as usual my informants had interpreted your motives through the observation of their own.' But on 12. xi. 1876, Froude wrote to van de Sandt de Villiers: 'Burgers has not adhered to his own private promises to me. I hear that he boasts that he took me in....' (encl. de Villiers to Burgers, 13. i. 1877, Folio 4, Group 17). Froude's disappointment is also apparent in his later letters to the President himself.
 2. Nicholson to Burgers, 1. xi. 1872. Burgers Papers, Folio 3, Group 11.
 3. II, 84.
 4. Tabler, C.: The Far Interior (Cape Town, 1955) p. 411.

past there had been talk of constructing a railway from Pretoria to Delagoa Bay,¹ and Burgers resolved to build it. If this were done the future of the state would be assured. Immigrants would pour into the country, and exports would flow out; the railway would also free the Republic from 'the trammels of British ports and influence.'² The Volksraad, meeting in secret session, approved the scheme, and the President set off for Europe in an attempt both to buy the harbour and raise money for the railway. There he was feted and decorated by the kings of Portugal and Holland, presented to Queen Victoria, and treated to a performance of the Verdi Requiem;³ but he returned home without Delagoa Bay and with but £90,000 of the £300,000 he had hoped to raise. For the Colonial Office had already secured first option on the harbour in the event of the Portuguese wishing to sell, and through contacts on the Stock Exchange may have exerted influence to sabotage the railway loan.⁴ On returning home, however, Burgers allowed the Transvaal public to imagine that the loan had been fully subscribed, an impression strengthened by the spending of most of the money on engines and railway stock.⁵ Meanwhile the Portuguese government, announced that it would withhold its subsidy until the railway was completed. The Lobombo Company was created to commence the operation; and when that failed, Burgers transferred the whole scheme to the Belgian firm of Cockerill and Sons in exchange for the most extravagant concessions in land and minerals. As Trollope perceived, these manoeuvres were but attempts to tread water:

-
1. see 'Damang-Wato': To Ophir Direct. (1868) p. 16.
 2. Burgers: 'Vindication' (1881) p. 159, Burgers' Papers Folio 6 Group 22 - Annexation.
 3. Engelbrecht, Op. cit., pp. 120, 131-132.; see also Lady Sefton to Froude, 11. v. 1875, and Darwin to Burgers, 8. vi. 1875. Burgers' Papers, Folio 3, Group 13.
 4. Uys, op. cit., p. 155; Engelbrecht, op. cit., p. 119.
 5. de Kiewiet, op. cit., p. 98.

although it was necessary that the Transvaal should have a railway, the attempt had been made too soon.¹ The finances of the scheme were such that they imperilled the future of the state; meanwhile the railway materials were gathering rust at Delagoa Bay.

Burgers' difficulties with the proposed railway were soon eclipsed by the outbreak of war with Sekhukhune, chief of the Pedi. The issues involved are expounded vaguely and unsatisfactorily by Trollope, as the novelist believed that detail was immaterial when considering the question of confrontation between black and white in view of both the inevitability and necessity of a European victory.² Sekwati, the previous chieftain, had signed a treaty with the Lydenberg Boers in 1857, in which the Steelport River had been acknowledged as the boundary between them. On Sekwati's death in 1861, a succession dispute broke out: Sekhukhune, having the weaker claim but the stronger character, soon triumphed over his rival. A despotic ruler, he built up the power of his tribe, and became intolerant of Christians, with the result that his half-brother, Johannes Dinkwayane, led a migration out of his territory and finally settled in the Spekboom valley. Eventually the two came to terms, but in acknowledging Johannes as a chieftain within the Pedi tribal cluster, Sekhukhune had in fact extended his hegemony beyond the Steelport River and thus contravened the 1857 treaty.³ Soon he sent further parties across the river to settle; Boers in the area either evacuated their farms or paid tribute.⁴ Inevitably, a trivial incident involving a Boer with a wagonload of wood provoked a clash, and across the Republic the cry went up for war.

1. II, 43 - 44.

2. II, 46; 61.

3. Mönig, H. O.: The Pedi, pp. 26 - 28.

4. Encl. no. 1. (a private letter) in Dispatch 123.
Bulwer to Carnarvon 22. ix. 1876, 61748, p. 153.

In his perfunctory account of the war, Trollope places much of the blame for its failure on President Burgers' mismanagement.¹ With this judgment it is hard to disagree, although it must be modified on certain important points. It is not clear from Trollope, for example, that Burgers did all he could to avert the war, realising that it would spell the end for the Delagoa Bay railway scheme. The President knew that Sekhukhune was no mean foe: he had been accumulating arms from the Diamond Fields² and from Delagoa Bay³ for years, and although poorly made bullets were to reduce their efficiency, the assessment of his mountain fortress as well-nigh impregnable proved to be correct. At the time newspapers were sceptical of a Boer victory,⁴ some prophesying defeat,⁵ and Burgers had been warned by a missionary in the district that 'Boer Commandos officered and equipped as they have hitherto been, are quite incapable of reducing the Hill Forts the Kaffirs now possess.'⁶ Hence to deal with the situation, Burgers ordered out a Great Commando, consisting of no less than 4,000 whites supplemented by native auxiliaries.⁷ This was not, as Trollope implies⁸, a

1. II, 46 - 48.

2. It was claimed that with the wages earned in three months on the Diamond Fields Sekhukhune's men could return with a good Enfield rifle. Letter of J. Viljoen to The Times of Natal, reprinted Cape Argus, 10. x. 1876.

3. Colley: Confidential Report on the Political Position in the Transvaal (1875). § 38. Memo. for Sir Garnet Wolseley. G.H. 1634 - 36. H.A.

4. Cape Times, 12. xii. 1876.

5. Spectator, quoted in Empire, 22. viii. 1876.

6. Nicholson to Burgers, 1. xi. 1872. Burgers Papers, Folio 3, Group 11.

7. Read: Reminiscences of the Sekhukhune War, IV, p. 532. Charles Read, a member of the Potchefstroom Commando, wrote an extensive account of the campaign C.1907; it has an immediacy and pungency about it which suggests that it was an elaboration of notes made at the time, while the inclusion of quotations from contemporary official correspondence suggests a conscientious attempt at reworking the material. It may have been written with a view to publication; in the late 1920's there was an abortive attempt to publish it with the Van Riebeeck Society. It was a pity it came to nothing; for the account is vivid, sane, and a rare articulation of that forgotten group, the English of the towns who were loyal to the Republic.

8. see last few lines of II, 46.

cheap theatrical gesture on Burgers' part: the President had no wish to lead the force himself,¹ while its assembly had the immediate effect of making many natives pay their taxes for the first time.² But it was ill-advised. For Sekhukhune was not among those over-awed, and the Republic had no other resources to draw upon. Scarcely a fireside in the country was not represented in the force³ and travellers passing through reported that in some districts wives and families had been left defenceless.⁴ The Transvaal could not afford to have anything but a quick and easy victory.

It soon became apparent, however, that the whole venture was grossly disorganised. Although Trollope does not indicate it, the campaign went well enough at first. Mathebis Kop was taken, and then the kraal of Johannesburg. The chief himself was killed, but the fruits of victory were soured by the defection of the Swazi auxiliaries, angry at the way they had been allowed to bear the brunt of the fighting.⁵ It would have been well for Burgers to have taken stock of the situation and to have gone no further: Johannesburg was acknowledged to have been a rebel by British authorities, whereas Sekhukhune was not,⁶ while the successful

1. Burgers had requested Kruger and Joubert to do so. Vindication, Burgers' Papers, pp. 160 - 161.

2. Volksstem, 15. vii. 1876.

3. Transvaal Argus, 21. vii. 1876.

4. Cape Times, 18. viii. 1876.

5. an eye witness account is given in E.V. C.: The Promised Land, pp. 109-111. 'The Boers, instead of advancing, lit up their pipes, and chose convenient positions from which to watch the Swazies advance.' See also Cape Times, 18. viii. 1876.

6. Bulwer, writing to Carnarvon on 9. x. 1876, notes that Johannesburg, unlike Sekhukhune, was definitely living on Republican territory (despatch no. 152, C.1748 p.189). Carnarvon, writing to Barkly on 30. xii. 1876, specifically mentions the Steelport River as the boundary; the map published opposite this dispatch in the same Blue Book (C.1748, p.255) shows Johannesburg town to be in Transvaal territory, whereas Sekhukhuneland is not.

assertion of Republican authority might have acted as a warning to Sekhukhune not to come out of his mountain fastness. Instead, the decision was taken to press on. But many of the burghers had come to the front ill-equipped,¹ while the Commisariat's slowness in sending up food and ammunition now began to tell;² fed on pap and with the prospect of fever and horse-sickness before them,³ the morale of the burghers began to sag. Insubordination grew.⁴ On August 2, an assault was made on Sekhukhune's mountain. It was a disaster: one of the commandants, Pretorius, had accepted native protestations of loyalty at face value when clearing the country, and the result was that as the burghers advanced up the mountain they found themselves sniped at from all sides.⁵ Panic set in, and the Boers withdrew. In Pretoria, Volksstem anticipated Trollope by accusing the soldiers of cowardice;⁶ at the front, President Burgers addressed his men and pointed out that retreat now would spell the annihilation of the Republic. Only four burghers had been killed, so the Commando must attack again. 'He would have carried his point', wrote a participant,

'but that he went too far, and said that he did not consider the last affair to be worthy of notice, and would not think the burghers had done their duty until at least a hundred men had fallen.'⁷

Discontent spread, and at succeeding meetings it became clear that Burgers had lost all authority. Even the threat of English intervention was not enough to keep the burghers at their posts, and when ex-President Pretorius threatened to turn a cannon on the first retreating wagon, twenty broke camp simultaneously. Soon

-
1. Burgers later claimed in the Volksraad that 90% of the burghers from some districts were without arms. Volksstem, 9. ix. 1876, Supplement.
 2. Read, op. cit. II, 314; III, 322.
 3. Cape Times, 18. viii. 1876.
 4. Read, op. cit. III, 322.
 5. Transvaal Argus, 25. viii. 1876.
 6. II, 19; Volksstem, 2. ix. 1876.
 7. Read, op. cit. III. 383 - 87.

some 436 wagons had inspanned, ready to trek.¹ As had happened many times before, the call of the plaas had triumphed over the call of the land.²

'The burghers and volunteers were very good for a commando or a spasmodic struggle....[but they] could not long remain absent from home.' Thus Trollope described the difficulties of the Free State burghers in the Basuto Wars when he came to write his Orange Free State chapters some six weeks later;^{3a} and it is at once a tribute to his growing insight and a condemnation of his thoroughly perfunctory manner of writing that the book should be so severe on the Transvaalers' military operations and yet quite sympathetic towards the almost identical ones of the Free Staters. As far as he was concerned, the real crime of the Transvaalers was not to have fought the war, but to have apparently lost it;^{3b} for Trollope accepted the view that the reversal at Sekhukhune's mountain had placed all of South Africa in danger. But this was not so. The request for aid that the British authorities were expecting never came,⁴ for Sekhukhune showed little inclination to press his advantage. Burgers had succeeded in retrieving the

1. ibid. III, 388 - 398.

2. Colley's Confidential Report on the Political Position in the Transvaal (1875) 81. (Natal G.H. 1634 - 36) describes a Commando sent in 1875 to Swaziland that had been intended to march on to the Zululand border, 'but this which might possibly have brought on a collision was abandoned principally I believe owing to want of provisions and the discontent, almost amounting to mutiny, among the Boers at having been kept out so long and as it seemed to them for so little purpose.' Warfare in the Transvaal seems generally to have been carried on in an ad hoc fashion. Bamangwato, op. cit., p. 31 states that a veldt-kornet could be persuaded to let a man visit his wife, and that war was sometimes halted while a burgher was sent off to a British port for more ammunition.

3a. II, 225; Trollope Papers vol. II. MS Don C.10, f.44.

3b. II, 46.

4. Bulwer to Shepstone, 26. ix. 1876. Shepstone Papers. Box 13.

situation to the extent of having two forts constructed and manned by volunteers,¹ and whenever the Pedi came down upon the plains they were soundly beaten.² A war of attrition and crop-burning began, ultimately leading to Sekhukhune's capitulation on February 15, 1877.³

By that stage other events had moved too far to save the Republic, and Shepstone was already in Pretoria. Although Bulwer had offered his services as mediator in the early stages of the war, the policy being formulated in Downing Street was singularly uncompromising, as Trollope noted.^{4a} On July 12, 1876, Carnarvon wrote to Barkly and told him that

'the President of the Transvaal should be informed without delay that they (Her Majesty's Government) cannot consent to view passively, or with indifference, the engagement of the Republic in foreign military operations, the object or necessity of which have not been made apparent.'⁵

Later that same day a second despatch was sent, together with one to Bulwer, requesting that proclamations be issued forbidding British subjects to participate in the war.⁶ Similarly, although

1. Read, op. cit., III, 399 - 469.
2. This point was made both in a report by J.H. Shepstone (encl. Bulwer to Carnarvon, 24. xii. 1876, C.1776 p. 36) and by Burgers during the course of the interview Shepstone had with the Transvaal Executive on March 1, reprinted in the Kaffrarian Watchman, 18. iv. 1877.
3. Nonnig, op. cit., pp. 29 - 30; Read, op. cit., vol. III. However the treaty he signed with the Republic, in which he acknowledged himself to be a Transvaal subject, was to prove to be of little value. Sekhukhune was finally reduced in 1875, by a third expedition led by Sir Garnet Wolseley.
4. see Bulwer to Lydenburg Defence Committee, 23. viii. 1876; encl. 3 in no. 95, C.1748, p. 122; also reply of Burgers, declining the offer: encl. in Bulwer to Carnarvon, 22. ix. 1876, no. 122 in C.1748, p. 151.
- 4a. II, 47
5. Carnarvon to Barkly, 12. vii. 1876, no. 31 in C.1748, p. 46.
6. Carnarvon to Barkly, 12. vii. 1876, no. 32 in C.1748, p. 47; Carnarvon to Bulwer, 12. vii. 1876, no. 34 in C.1748, p. 48.

Carnarvon had established that under international law the Republic had every right to commandeer British residents,¹ Barkly pressed a complaisant Burgers into granting them exemptions.² The policy of harassment had begun. Ammunition destined for the Transvaal was delayed, while in view of the "aggressive temper" now manifest in the country, its claims to suzerainty over Swaziland and to sovereignty over the Keale Award area were emphatically repudiated.³ Meanwhile, the diggers on the Lydenburg goldfields were becoming increasingly turbulent. They refused to pay the war tax,⁴ and only a handful volunteered to join the commando,⁵ and on occasion ill-feeling between Boer and Briton resulted in bloodshed.⁶ A mere 600 strong,⁷ it was they who clamoured vociferously for British intervention. Barkly, in forwarding their petition, endorsed it thoroughly: 'the Republic,' he declared,

'seems about to fall to pieces through its own weakness... ..the position of the large number of British subjects scattered about on farms, or resident in the towns and at the Goldfields might fairly claim the humane consideration of Her Majesty's Government, even if there were not other reasons for interposing to save so fine a country from so miserable a fate.'⁸

However, Carnarvon was not yet ready to act precipitously, and sharing Trollope's distaste for mining communities, suggested that

-
1. Carnarvon to Barkly, 22. v. 1876, C.1748, p. 27.
 2. Carnarvon to Barkly, 31. viii, 1876, G.H. 1/73 Cape Archives, Carnarvon wrote that as Belgium and the Netherlands had special treaties guaranteeing exemptions, Britain should be satisfied with no less.
 3. Carnarvon to Dulwer, 9. xi. 1876, no. 138 in C.1748, p. 168; Carnarvon to Barkly, 20. ii. 1877, no. 44 in C.1776, p. 69.
 4. Cape Times, 10. xi. 1876
 5. Cape Argus, 9. ix. 1876, gives the figure of nine.
 6. There are stories in the papers of the day alleging occasional wilful murder of Britons by Boers. See, for example, Gold Fields Mercury, 28. xii. 1876.
 7. Gold Fields Mercury, 24. v. 1877.
 8. Barkly to Carnarvon, 30. x. 1876, no. 148 in C.1748, p. 178.

those who felt they were inadequately protected should reconsider whether they should live beyond British frontiers.¹

The annexationist party, however, embarked on a systematic campaign designed to bring about British intervention. Letters appeared in the Gold Fields Mercury² telling of atrocities supposedly committed by mercenaries, their proper names conveniently blanked out; the letters were reprinted in The Cape Argus,³ which observed that 'while millions of our countrymen....were denouncing the Bulgarian horrors, Englishmen, in the pay of the Transvaal, were butchering women in cold blood.'⁴ The comparison was not lost on Lord Carnarvon. He was forwarded such extracts by Barkly, who wondered, as Trollope did later with regard to slavery,^{4a} whether 'the Government of the South African Republic has the power, even supposing it to have the will, to put a stop to further atrocities on the part of this band of "Filibusters."'⁵ Carnarvon read these accounts 'with very great pain'⁶, and although he had taken steps which showed similar allegations of the use of poisoned bullets by the Boers to be groundless,⁷ he was very much inclined to believe them.⁸ Barkly was requested to verify these accounts, and repeatedly requested to protest about the conduct of this 'wholly gratuitous and unjust war.'⁹ It is clear that atrocities were committed

1. Carnarvon to Barkly, 27. xi. 1876, G.H. 4/1 Conf (Cape Archives).
2. Gold Fields Mercury, o.g. 7. ix. 1876; 4. xi. 1876.
3. Cape Argus, 7. x. 1876.
4. Cape Argus editorial, 14. x. 1876.
- 4a. II, 48.
5. Barkly to Carnarvon, 12. xii. 1876, no. 16 in C.1776, p.12 (enclosing extracts from Cape Argus, 12. xii. 1876 and 19. xii. 1876).
6. Carnarvon to Barkly, 12. x. 1876, no. 101 in C.1748, p.125.
7. see Barkly to Carnarvon, 6. vii. 1876, no. 42 in C.1748, p. 58; also Crown Agents to C.O., 17. viii. 1876, no. 52 in C.1748, p. 75.
8. Carnarvon to Barkly, 16. xi. 1876, G.H. 1/73 Cape Archives.
9. Carnarvon to Barkly, 25. i. 1877, no. 20 in C.1776, p. 25 The strongest of these protests was held back in case it should interfere with Shepstone's mission. Carnarvon to Barkly, telegram, 29. i. 1877, no.26 in C.1776, p. 34.

in the course of the campaign but most of them were the work of native auxiliaries rather than of the Boers or the volunteers.¹ Newspaper reports were often distorted and exaggerated.² The President himself was most concerned about them and later investigated the charges with the mercenary captain von Schlickmann. Although a copy of this correspondence was sent to The Times,³ it had little impact.

The measure of this can be seen in that although Trollope does not give an opinion as to whether atrocities were committed or not,⁴ he nevertheless penned the sentence, grand in its simplicity, "Slavery was rampant."⁵ The existence of an indenture system of apprenticeship gave the charge a certain plausibility; the tiredness of an old man writing against time did the rest. For in 1877 there was no slavery in the Transvaal, although even those who advanced the Boer cause at the time of Majuba conceded that dealings in 'black ivory' had taken place in the Republic in the period before Burgers' election in 1872.⁶

-
1. The judicious Bulwer regarded these reports as "in some cases, only too well founded"; to Carnarvon, 9. x. 1876, no. 152 in C.1748, p. 190. See also Read, op. cit., esp. I, 156 - 57.
 2. Volksstem editorial, 12. viii. 1876, cites an incident and shows the degree to which it had been distorted in the colonial press. Another report told of an African being assegaied to death by auxiliaries only thirty yards from where President Burgers was standing. In fact he was a Zulu spy who had been tried and found guilty by a Council of War, and who was despatched in this way to perpetuate tribal hostilities: Burgers himself was then campaigning with the other division. (Cape Argus, 9. ix. 1876, c.f. Read, op. cit., II, 244 - 45.)
 3. Burgers to von Schlickmann, 9. ix. 1876; the latter's reply, 25. ix. 1876; published in The Times, (London) 30. x. 1876.
 4. II, 47 merely quotes relevant extracts from official despatches.
 5. II, 52.
 6. Moodie, G.P., The Annexation of the Transvaal (London, 1881) p. 14.

The Cape Argus, however, held that there had been no change at all; these days it was a little harder to track down because "greater secrecy is observed." Slavery "as an unbroken practice has been one of the peculiar institutions of the country, mixed up with all its social and political life," a special correspondent argued, and "if every offender were punished, according to the measure of his crimes, the Transvaal would be turned into a penal settlement."¹

Now Trollope, when in Cape Town, made the acquaintance of Saul Solomon, the owner of the paper, and of T. E. Fuller, a former editor; it seems likely that he imbibed his emphatic opinion there. Nor did he moderate it, as he should have done: for slavery was quite unmentioned by Shepstone both in his crucial meeting with the Transvaal Executive on March 1 and in that recital of the Republic's shortcomings, the Annexation proclamation.²

However Trollope came closer to the truth in the other staccato sentences of the same paragraph: "The President was impotent. The Volksraad was stiff-necked and ignorant. There was no revenue, no order, no obedience."³ Those returning to Pretoria from the Selchukhune campaign found to their dismay that

"No official notice whatsoever was taken of our arrival, and on our requesting rations, we were curtly told by the local officials that Government had neither food or money in hand, in fact that both the Commissariat and Treasury were empty. Being without means, we then requested an order on the Butcher, and the Baker, but were again met with a short refusal, and informed that the Government had no further credit among the local tradesmen."⁴

The Republic was in a state of near collapse. What remained of Burgers' prestige evaporated completely when it came to be known that the railway loan was under-subscribed.⁵ In the months that followed meetings were held across the country, protesting against

-
1. Cape Argus, 12. xii. 1876; see also 19. xii. 1876.
 2. as was noted with glee by Het Volksblad (Cape Town), 19. iv. 1877.
 3. II, 52.
 4. Read, op. cit., IV 505 - 06
 5. note tone of Transvaal Argus editorial, 13. x. 1876.

the war and railway taxes. Opposition was muddled and confused - a Heidelberg meeting deemed taxation unfair because levied unequally, yet "insufficient for attaining its purpose though pressing heavily on the country"¹ but everywhere it was decided. Even at Utrecht, confronted as it was by Cetshwayo's impis, the capable Landdrost Rudolph was unable to carry more than seven burghers with him for the government.² The result was that by March 1877 incoming taxes had been reduced to a mere trickle: only one-tenth of the war tax had come to hand.³ Meanwhile the Cape Commercial Bank, which had advanced the government some £50,000, not only refused to grant further credit but demanded immediate repayment of £26,540.⁴

Trollope does not indicate that there was also increasing political polarisation. The two main factions, the 'progressive' led by Burgers, and the Dopper led by Kruger, drifted further and further apart. Clerics called upon the people "in the name of God and religion to abandon the Liberal President", while those supporting Burgers did not care to support a state of which Kruger was likely to become the chief.⁵ The prospect of voting for either in the forthcoming election horrified The Transvaal Argus, articulating as it did the sentiment of a third group, the English of

-
1. reported in Transvaal Advocate, 20. xi. 1876.
 2. Cape Times, 20. xi. 1876. By February 1877 Rudolph had found some 83 burghers who were prepared to support Burgers against Kruger in the forthcoming election, but as the Landdrost wrote to Burgers, "I have had hard times I can assure you for standing firm for your Honour and the Government." Letter of 2. ii. 1877, Burgers Papers, Folio 4 Group 17.
 3. Burgers' speech to Volksraad. 3. iii. 1877. Supplement to Volksstem, 14. iii. 1877; Cape Times, 5. iii. 1877.
 4. Burgers' Vindication, p. 162; de Kiewiet, op. cit., p. 105; Englebrecht, op. cit., p. 197.
 5. Burgers' Vindication, p. 162.

the towns, many of whom had fought for the Republic in the recent war.¹ "The choice," it declared, "is between a step back into the dark ages of ignorance, oppression and slavery, and a step forward in political absolutism and muddle."² Another paper stated that many would vote for Kruger in the hope that he would bring the country to such a pass that British intervention would be inevitable.³ A fourth group, the English of the Goldfields, were working for it openly.⁴

For some time Sir Throphilus Shepstone had watched the course of events in the Transvaal from Natal, but on January 7, 1877, he crossed the frontier with a select corps of officials and his twenty-five policemen.⁵ Trollope thought the force "too small to intimidate even so weak a government as that of the South African Republic;"⁶ Shepstone coolly wrote to Burgers that "As I assume that Your Honour will entertain no objection to my being so accompanied, I shall not think it necessary to await your reply before setting out on my journey."⁷ As he progressed, meetings of burghers bade him welcome; but they did little else.⁸ Volksstem noted that the party that went out to conduct him into Pretoria

-
1. Sons of the editors of both English newspapers in Potchefstroom took part in the campaign. See Transvaal Argus, 21. xii. 1876 editorial.
 2. Transvaal Argus, 12. i. 1877, editorial.
 3. Transvaal Advocate, 5. ii. 1877, editorial.
 4. see editorials of Gold Fields Mercury, from 4. ix. 1876 onwards, also letter of its editor, Phelan, to the Cape Argus, 21. ix. 1876.
 5. Engelbrecht, op. cit., p. 209.
 6. II, 53.
 7. Shepstone to Burgers, 20. xii. 1876, encl. in Barkly to Carnarvon, 16. i. 1877. Despatch 38, C.1776, p. 41.
 8. See sub-enclosures of addresses from Wakkerstroom and Flak Fontein, 12. i. 1877, in Shepstone to Barkly 18. i. 1877, encl. in Barkly to Carnarvon 6. ii. 1877, Despatch 50 in C.1776, p. 82; also sub-enclosure 1. Pretoria address, 22. i. 1877, in Shepstone to Barkly, 26. i. 1877, Despatch 59 in C.1776, p. 89. All of these addresses of welcome are couched in very general terms.

contained "not one of the original settlers of the country."¹

Single-mindedly the Special Commissioner set about securing his object. At first Sekhukhune's "wonderful forbearance"² appeared to create a difficulty, but with the deepening financial crises Shepstone perceived that the Republic was "moving more surely in the direction of collapse."³ A fortnight after arriving in Pretoria, he wrote to Barkly of the impossibility of withdrawing without having effected a change of government. The 'men of property' were behind him, the 'hopes of thousands' had been raised, and anarchy would surely follow an inconclusive result.⁴ To the circumspect Bulwer, who constantly enjoined caution, Sir Theophilus airily remarked, "when the deed is done I have no doubt I shall have addresses enough."⁵ Meanwhile the internal weakness of the state was such that even Volksstem was now prepared to consider some form of association with the rest of South Africa;⁶ but the other English newspapers of the territory discerned that Shepstone's mission was more likely to end in outright annexation.⁷

The greater the distance newspapers and commentators were from the Transvaal, the larger the Zulu danger loomed in their estimation of the difficulties confronting the Republic.⁸ Trollope, writing six months after the events in question, alludes to it briefly and in very general terms, except when he makes the

-
1. Volksstem, 27. i. 1877.
 2. Shepstone to Herbert, 12. xi. 1876. Letter book, Box 7, Shepstone papers, Natal Archives.
 3. Shepstone to Herbert, 23. x. 1876, Letter book, Shepstone papers, Box 7, see also letter to Barkly, 23. xi. 1876.
 4. Shepstone to Barkly, 9. ii. 1877. Shepstone papers, Box 7.
 5. Shepstone to Bulwer, 14. iii. 1877. Shepstone papers, Box 7.
 6. Volksstem, 13. i. 1877.
 7. Gold Fields Mercury, editorial, 9. xii. 1876; Transvaal Advocate, 12. ii. 1877.
 8. e.g. Times editorial, 13. ii. 1877. "We do not wish to exaggerate the importance of a border quarrel, but the invasion of the Transvaal territory while the North-East Caffres are still fighting may be the signal for a general Native war."

novel suggestion that had Sekhukhune overcome the Boers, the Zulu King would have duly attacked and conquered him in turn.¹ It was known that the Zulus were intent on attacking the Swazis, and it is this which the novelist seems to have misconstrued. The Swazis were allies of the Boers, and although the Zulus would have to cross a strip of territory disputed with the Transvaal in order to attack them, the likelihood of war between the Boers and Cetshwayo would depend on how seriously the former regarded the protectorate they had proclaimed over the Swazi. Colley in 1875 had seen that there was "far more chance of war arising from attacks of the Zulus on the Swazis than from attacks directed against the whites,"² and in that respect the situation remained unchanged. For despite the fiasco at Sekhukhune's mountain, Cetshwayo played his hand very cautiously. Raiding parties sent into the disputed territory were headed by Umbelini, a renegade Swazi prince, who could be supported or repudiated as the Zulu king saw fit.³ In England, these forays were construed into attacks on the Boers;⁴ in fact, the Boers

-
1. II, 53. Subsequently some historians, noting that the Zulus were restive at the time, have argued that Shepstone seems "to have been obsessed with the idea of embroiling the Transvaal with the Zulus" (Uys, C.J., In the Era of Shepstone, p. 220). To the contrary, his main fear before going to Pretoria, as expressed in a letter to Wolseley, was that Cetshwayo "may suppose that I have gone to form a coalition with the Boers against him, become amiable to the Boers, and so remove a very wholesome pressure." (Letter of 24. xi. 1876, Letter Book, Shepstone Papers Box 7.) Although the Zulus would be useful as a "wholesome pressure", it should be noted that in the same letter Shepstone wrote that the Republic's worsening financial crisis "will ripen the pear more thoroughly than almost any other." (see also Shepstone to Herbert, 2. xii. 1876, Shepstone Papers, Box 7).
 2. Colley's Report. 74, G.H. 1634 - 36, Natal Archives.
 3. Bulwer to Carnarvon, 12. i. 1877. Despatch 42, C.1776, p.52.
 4. e.g. by The Standard. 14. ii. 1877, quoted in Empire, 15. ii. 1877.

sometimes took the initiative,¹ so that Bulwer later put down the recent mustering of the Zulu army to fears of Boer attack.² If there had been a danger that Cetshwayo would act in concert with Sekhukhune,³ that danger had passed by the time Shepstone crossed the Transvaal border.⁴ The south-eastern frontier remained turbulent, the policies of Cetshwayo unpredictable; and it was this uncertainty - an uncertainty, Trollope noted, shared with the rest of South Africa⁵ - that Shepstone played upon when he told the Executive on March 1st that failure to accomplish the object of his mission would result in Cetshwayo invading the country.⁶

The Republic's fortunes were ebbing, as Trollope's account suggests; but they did not ebb inexorably. Shepstone had two major obstacles in his path, the intransigence of the platte-land Boers and the deviousness of President Burgers. Platteland opposition was immediately apparent when a Commando came into Pretoria to challenge the purpose of Shepstone's mission, and later when anti-confederation memorials with some 2,326 signatures attached were submitted to the Volksraad.⁷ The implacability of the platte-land Boer in his desire to preserve his independence was to have

-
1. Acting Resident Magistrate, Newcastle, to Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, 15. iii. 1877; encl. Bulwer to Carnarvon, 29. iii. 1877. Despatch 104 in C.1776, pp. 137 - 38.
 2. Bulwer to Carnarvon, 19. iv. 1877. Despatch 115 in C.1776, p. 150.
 3. This was Shepstone's opinion before he went to England. Minute, 28. iv. 1876, encl. in Bulwer to Carnarvon, 29. iv. 1876, C.1743, p. 30.
 4. Rudolph, Landdrost of Utrecht, writing to President Burgers on 2. ii. 1877, held that the situation had much improved. A few farms had been evacuated; but "Cetewayo's manner is changed for the better. We can be sure that he will not make for open war." Burgers Papers. Folio 4, Group 17.
 5. II, 53. "When men have talked of our South African house being in danger of fire, Cetwayo the King of the Zulus has been the fire to whom they have alluded."
 6. See also Shepstone to Carnarvon, 6. iii. 1877, encl. Barkly to Carnarvon, 20. iii. 1877, Despatch 87 in C.1776, p. 110.
 7. Volksstem, 17. ii. 1877.

been expected, having been anticipated by Colley two years before;¹ but Shepstone, looking at the increasing factionalism in the country, concluded that such opinion could either be manipulated or justifiably ignored.²

His ally, so he thought, was President Burgers.

"Burgers says he knows what is best for the country and for himself," Shepstone told Bulwer.³ But despite the inducement of a pension of £1,000 p.a. which the Special Commissioner claimed to have promised the President on arrival in Pretoria,⁴ Burgers' conduct was highly ambiguous throughout. At first, he collaborated unequivocally. He sent away the commando of hostile Boers after apparently satisfying them,⁵ discussed with Shepstone his opening speech to the Raad, and even suggested that Sir Theophilus should retire to Natal and return with a larger force.⁶

"I must allow him," Shepstone wrote to Barkly, "to do it more or less in his own way, retaining and occasionally exercising a sort of guiding control over him, because I find that he does not understand that complex thing human nature."⁷

In point of fact Shepstone had scant understanding of a complex human nature such as Burgers', in which charlatanry and idealism were mixed in equal proportions. His previous experience of rulers had been limited to native chiefs; he could handle the ruses of witchdoctors more easily than the subtle machinations of an

-
1. Colley's Confidential Report, 62-63, G.H. 1634 - 36, Natal Archives.
 2. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 17. iv. 1877. Despatch 122 in C.1776, p. 128.
 3. Shepstone to Bulwer, 7. ii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 4. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 18. iv. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 5. Shepstone to Bulwer, 7. ii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 6. Shepstone to Bulwer, 13. ii. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 7. Shepstone to Barkly, 16. ii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 7.

erstwhile theologian. At the same time, his very pride in his understanding of human nature often blinded him to the significance of Burgers' actions.

For the President soon saw that he could turn Shepstone's presence in the Transvaal to his own advantage. As The Natal Witness observed at the time, "They are two very clever fellows and we cannot guess who is playing the deepest game."¹ It has been argued that Shepstone, playing for time while troops were brought up to the Natal border, at once told Burgers that effective constitutional reforms would satisfy him while working for their rejection in the Volksraad.² But it can be equally shown that Burgers out-maneuvred him. After the rejection of the reform bill, rejected because it would have vastly increased presidential power, Burgers underscored Shepstone's arguments when the Special Commissioner met the Transvaal Executive on March 1. "At the present moment you cannot govern yourselves," he told them in Shepstone's hearing. "My opinion is that you cannot go on." In making these remarks Burgers was admonishing the Executive rather than supporting Shepstone, as is usually contended, for he still hoped that radical reform might save the day.³ The sequel was the appointment of a commission by the Volksraad to investigate ways and means of preserving the state; the commission examined the constitutional reform bill, and sent it back to the Raad where the greater part of it became law on March 7. The Volksraad then rose after passing another law forbidding burghers to work for the intercession of another power in the affairs of the country. Shepstone was taken by surprise, and it is apparent

1. Natal Witness, editorial, 16. iii. 1877.

2. Uys, op. cit., pp. 341 - 350.

3. A transcript of this interview was published in the Gazette of the S.A.R. for March 24, reprinted in the Kaffrarian Watchman of 13. iv. 1877.

from a letter to Bulwer that the full significance of Burgers' machinations had escaped him:

"I should be in a position now to act," he wrote, "except for Burgers' bad generalship; he allowed the Volksraad to break up half believing that the new constitution and treason laws which they passed without hesitation would rehabilitate the Republic. I fancy he thought that the great powers which these together give the President would induce them to reject both and accept the alternatives presented by my mission, but they swallowed both, and he was checkmated by his own scheme..."¹

In fact, if Burgers' self-righteous Vindication may be believed, he toyed with the idea of expelling Shepstone by force.² But the fabric of the state was too weak: once the Volksraad rose, the Executive met fitfully, and promises of advancing money to the government were not kept. Burgers found the state withering away before his eyes as people awaited the approaching British millenium. Even his wife obliged with "God Save the Queen" on the piano at the conclusion of one of Shepstone's many parties.³

Trollope's hearty endorsement of the manner in which the annexation was carried out⁴ was shared by others. Even Alfred Aylward, an inveterate fighter for the Boer cause, described it as "an unparalleled triumph of tact, modesty and firmness."⁵ For Shepstone planned the denouement carefully. Having decided on March 20 that he would annexe the territory, he told Barkly that he would wait until the April Nachtmal ended, and act just before the annual removal of cattle to the Lowveld took place. In this way any planned resistance would completely disrupt the usual domestic

-
1. Shepstone to Bulwer, 14. iii. 1877, Box 7. Shepstone Papers: see also Shepstone to Lanyon, same date.
 2. Burgers' Vindication, pp. 168 - 69; Burgers Papers.
 3. Natal Mercury, 20. iii. 1877 - Special Correspondent, March 5.
 4. II, 112 - 113.
 5. Aylward, op. cit., p. 300.

arrangements,¹ while the presence of the 2nd Buffs at Newcastle² and the suspension of gunpowder supplies from Natal³ rendered such opposition unlikely. On April 8 all was ready. Burgers "has been with me the whole of this evening," Shepstone told Bulwer, making arrangements. "His protest is a sham too.... Burgers himself will do all he can to keep the peace so long as he saves himself as he thinks he will on both sides by his protest."⁴ On April 12, with the annexation of the Transvaal to the British Empire, Shepstone successfully completed his mission, and an adulatory chorus from the press struck up immediately.⁵

Opinion of Burgers, on the other hand, was harsh.

Trollope wondered "whether he is to be regarded as a banished patriot or a willing placeman,"⁶ but others were less equivocal. In the newspapers there were tales of his collaboration,⁷ allegations that he had planned the annexation at the Colonial Office when in England,⁸ and rumours that when it was accomplished he would be knighted.⁹ But the question that really divided his sympathisers from his critics was that of the pension he was to receive from the

-
1. Shepstone to Barkly, 20. iii. 1877, Shepstone Papers Box 7.
 2. see particularly Shepstone to Bulwer, 14. ii. 1877, encl. No. 1. in Bulwer to Carnarvon 3. iii. 1877, Despatch 77 in C.1776, p. 102; also Bulwer to Shepstone, 27. ii. 1877, encl. no. 7, in same despatch.
 3. Bulwer to Shepstone, 7. iii. 1877 and 28. iii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 13.
 4. Shepstone to Bulwer, 8. iv. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 5. see Uys, *op. cit.*, pp. 406 - 410 for the English reaction; in South Africa enthusiasm was tempered by doubts as to whether Shepstone had exceeded his instructions. (see below p. 85.
 6. II, 57; c.f. Cape Argus, 10. vii. 1877, editorial: "Was this statesmanship, or was it treachery?"
 7. Cape Times, 13. iii. 1877.
 8. see letter to Die Afrikaans Patriot, 4. v. 1877, and leading article in the same paper, 11. v. 1877.
 9. Fort Beaufort Advocate, 13. iv. 1877.

British government. Trollope's stand was predictable: for the President to receive such a pension would be dishonourable, particularly as he had only a month or two more of his term of office to run, with no prospect of re-election.¹ For this view he was chided in the Cape Times, which held that to withhold a pension from the ex-president would be ungenerous.² It has since been argued that as no previous president had been given a pension on retirement, Burgers had no right to one; and it has also been claimed that his financial losses resulting from carrying the burdens of government were only temporary.³ But the real issue is whether Burgers was promised the pension when Shepstone arrived in Pretoria, as the Special Commissioner claimed,⁴ or after the annexation had been accomplished, as Burgers wrote in his Vindication.⁵ It is a point that will never probably be satisfactorily resolved; but it should be noted that Burgers' open acknowledgment of the pension,⁶ the wide support he received from the press in accepting it,⁷ together with the fact that Shepstone does not seem to have mentioned the matter to any one before the annexation,⁸ all suggests that in accepting it Burgers did not compromise his integrity as he is usually said to have done. For although he spoke after Shepstone had issued his proclamation and urged all officials to remain at their posts,⁹ and although his protest

1. II, 64 - 66.

2. Cape Times editorial, 13. iv. 1878.

3. Uys, op. cit., pp. 414 - 415, c.f. Vindication pp. 170 - 172, Burgers Papers.

4. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 18. iv. 1877. Shepstone Papers Box 7.

5. Vindication, Burgers Papers, p. 170.

6. "I declare with all openness that I will accept it (a pension) without hesitation if offered me by the Transvaal Government, not as a gift, but as due to me in all justice." quoted in Lantern, 2. ii. 1878.

7. e.g. Cape Times, 13. iv. 1878. Eastern Province Herald, 27. vii. 1877. Lantern, 2. ii. 1878.

8. It is first mentioned in a private letter to Carnarvon dated 13. iv. 1877. Shepstone Papers Box 7.

9. Engelbrecht, op. cit., p. 284.

spoke of the impossibility and undesirability of resisting a power such as England,¹ the fact remains that he made it.² Moreover, the Executive of the country, while still sovereign, also issued a protest and authorised Kruger and Jorissen to go to England in an attempt to secure the reversal of the annexation.³

Hence the Transvaal was annexed, not only without the approval of the Volksraad as Trollope noted,⁴ but without the invitation or approbation of any of its governmental institutions. There was also some doubt as to the real wishes of its people. Shepstone appreciated that there would be a section, "more or less important" of people opposed to the annexation, but as their objections were founded "more or less upon sentiment or prejudice," these could be brushed aside. Good British government, he felt, would eventually win them over.⁵ Meanwhile it would be best to avoid discussion of the issue, for Shepstone's view was at one with

-
1. encl. in Despatch 122, C.1776, p. 155.
 2. Shepstone's explanation of the Protest is ingenious but unconvincing: "The idea that seems to find favour just now is to acquiesce in the change, and protest to America and Germany against it. This notion has been put into the Boers' heads by the party in favour of annexation, and the object is to let off the excitement without any show of actual resistance, which a few of the more fanatical portion might perhaps be inclined to offer; and the result will be a strange one i.e. that those who wish for the change, and those who oppose it, will equally protest against it, but such will be the true history of the matter if the protesting idea be adopted to any extent." (Shepstone to Barkly, 28. iii. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.) On annexation eve Shepstone had misgivings, pointing out to Burgers that a protest "appeared...to pledge the people to resist bye and bye"; but he accepted the President's assurance that it was merely a device to tide Shepstone over any difficulties before the troops arrived. (Shepstone to Herbert, 11. iv. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 7).
 3. encl. in Despatch 122, C.1776, p. 156.
 4. II, 51.
 5. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 12. iii. 1877, encl. in Barkly to Carnarvon, 27. iii. 1877. Despatch 90 in C.1776, p. 125.

Trollope's: "It was almost cruel to ask him [the Boer] to consent to annexation, but it would have been more cruel not to annexe him."¹

Cruel or not, the problem for Trollope was whether Shepstone had exceeded his instructions. Trollope's analysis of Shepstone's Commission² was utterly conventional, and followed the pattern of much editorialising at the time. Indeed even those papers that approved the annexation as a political measure, such as the Cape Argus, thought it within the bounds of possibility that Carnarvon might repudiate it altogether, on the grounds that Shepstone had acted precipitously.³ But as the Special Commissioner had acted in accordance "with the wishes of the majority of the intelligent inhabitants,"⁴ the paper hoped there would be no revocation of the annexation. It had been thrown off the scent by a statement made by Under-Secretary Lowther in the Commons that Shepstone's instructions bore no relation to the state of affairs in the Transvaal,⁵ for the text of this denial arrived in Cape Town not long after the news of the annexation.⁶

Apart from the wider considerations of policy already discussed, a reading of the Carnarvon-Shepstone correspondence leaves no doubt that the Special Commission was sent out to South Africa to take the territory: the possibility of aid being given to the Transvaal without it coming into "closer connection with the Crown" had been ruled out in official despatches.⁷ In a private

-
1. II, 63; c.f. Shepstone to Herbert, 31. viii. 1877. "I believe that the people will accept fully Lord Carnarvon's decision and be thankful that they are not put to the trouble and unpleasantness of doing more than accepting it." Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 2. given in full in C.1776 as No. 2, p. 1.
 3. Cape Argus, 1. v. 1877, editorial; see also Het Volksblad, 19. iv. 1877; Standard & Mail, 7. viii. 1877.
 4. Cape Argus, 26. iv. 1877, editorial; my italics.
 5. Lowther in House of Commons, 22. iii. 1877; Hansard CCXXIII, col. 327.
 6. News of the annexation reached Cape Town on April 17 (Cape Argus telegram); Lowther's statement was the subject of an editorial on May 1st to be followed by a more bitter one in the Zuid Afrikaan the following morning.
 7. Carnarvon to Barkly. 23. ix. 1876, Despatch 73 in C.1748, p. 103; also editorial, London Times, 24. i. 1877.

letter written on October 4, Carnarvon told Shepstone that he would not issue specific instructions, as they might very well be obsolete by the time he received them. Nevertheless, he outlined the considerations which must be borne in mind. As far as possible the deed must be done with the assent of the Dutch part of the population; it was 'extremely desirable' to have the consent of the Volksraad, as it would be 'dangerous' to take over the country without it; if this could not be procured on a first attempt then there must be a second. But Carnarvon's caution was outpaced by his enthusiasm. Press on, he told Shepstone; in providing "for every possible contingency we may lose the real substance; which is perhaps now for the first time within reach."¹ "The more I consider the prospect of affairs," he wrote a week later when discussing Confederation, "the more important does it seem to me to obtain the Transvaal." The opportunity to take the territory might never recur.² A handsome tribute to Shepstone's abilities prepared the Lords for what was to come.³ But once the annexation had been accomplished, Carnarvon was quite dilatory in writing to Sir Theophilus. It must have been an anxious time for him; as a friend wrote from Kimberley, "you have ... undertaken a responsibility which a weaker man might have considered that he was not justified in assuming from the letter of his instructions."⁴ Eventually the words of approval came, and although disappointment was expressed at Shepstone's failure to carry the government of the country with him in the annexation, Carnarvon's "only immediate cause of anxiety

-
1. Carnarvon to Shepstone, 4. x. 1876. Shepstone Papers, Box 14.
 2. Carnarvon to Shepstone, 11.x. 1876. Shepstone Papers, Box 14.
 3. during the Second Reading of the South Africa Bill, Lords, 23. iv. 1877. Hansard, CCXXXIII. col 1649.
 4. J. D. Barry to Shepstone, 27. iii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 12.

lay in the financial position." Shepstone was told to ask for no more money than was absolutely necessary. His Lordship explained, in language close to Trollope's, that "the feeling in Parliament is now, I believe, very favourable to the whole policy: but Parliament does not like to be made to pay even for what it approves."¹

In advising Shepstone to reconcile considerations of economy with those of effective government, Carnarvon had set an impossible conundrum. The total debts of the new territory were estimated by the Colonial Office to amount to some £200,000, but the Treasury was requested to advance £100,000 only, a sum that Carnarvon expected to be repaid in full.² Shortly afterwards it was announced that the Imperial government did not intend to discharge all the debts of the late republic;³ at that very moment a financial statement was on its way from Shepstone indicating that claims in excess of £100,000 had been made on the government already, with the prospect of more to come. In decorous language he pointed to the political necessity of meeting these debts;⁴ privately he wrote to Frere that default "would be a ruinous policy and one which I should not like to be the instrument in carrying out."⁵ But the Colonial Office was implacable: the loan, it was pointed out, had been intended for current government expenditure.⁶

-
1. II, 63; c.f. Carnarvon to Shepstone, 30. v. 1877, Shepstone Papers Box 14; also Carnarvon to Shepstone 25. vii. 1877, encl. Carnarvon to Frere, 25. vii. 1877, Cape Archives, G. H. 1/74.
 2. C.O. to Treasury, 8. vi. 1877, Despatch 3 in C.1814, p.5.
 3. Lowther, replying to question of A. Mills, 19. vii. 1877; Hansard CCXXXV, col. 1527.
 4. Shepstone's financial statement, 6. vi. 1877, encl. Frere to Carnarvon 19. vi. 1877. Despatch 3 in C.1815, p. 2.
 5. Shepstone to Frere, 6. viii. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 6. Meade to Shepstone, undated minute, encl. Carnarvon to Frere, 11. ix. 1877. Cape Archives, G. H. 1/74.

Thus when Trollope visited the Transvaal the Administration was in serious financial difficulties. Shepstone had thought it expedient to abolish the unpopular War Tax;¹ but imperial views of expediency, governed by the need to have inducements to lure the Transvaal into confederation, meant that there was not even remission of customs duties to fall back on.² Before long the new government had accumulated debts of its own,³ including the salaries of its officials;⁴ the new taxes it devised were more successful in alienating the vociferous English of the gold fields⁵ than in retrieving the general financial situation.⁶ "My great difficulty," Shepstone ruefully wrote to Burgers, "is what yours was, want of money."⁷ Yet part of the difficulty was of his own making. Shepstone's miscalculations in expenditure began before he left Natal,⁸ while Frere found it necessary to pass on elementary financial advice;⁹ later W. Sargeant had to remind him to draw the balance of the Imperial grant - some £50,000 - before it lapsed in six weeks' time.¹⁰ "I may, rightly perhaps, be thought less able

-
1. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 18. iv. 1877. Despatch 123 in C.1776 p. 164.
 2. see account of interview with Kruger and Jorissen, July 17; Carnarvon to Frere, 13. ix. 1877. G. H. 4/1, confidential, Cape Archives.
 3. Gold Fields Mercury, 4. x. 1877; Cape Argus 28. vii. 1877.
 4. Gold Fields Mercury, 12. vii. 1877; Cape Argus 24.xi.1877.
 5. Gold Fields Mercury, 28. vii. 1877.
 6. Shepstone claimed that revenue exceeded expenditure by £2,000 in the five months following the annexation. Shepstone to Carnarvon, 9. xi. 1877, encl. Shepstone to Frere of same date. Cape Archives G.H. 1/74.
 7. Shepstone to Burgers, 7. viii. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 8. Shepstone to Bulwer, 22. xii. 1876. encl. no. 10 in Bulwer to Carnarvon, 3. i. 1877. Despatch 40 in C.1776, p. 49.
 9. Frere to Shepstone, 30. vii. 1877; 14. viii. 1877; 12.ix. 1877 (these last two chide him for using part of the £100,000 grant to pay back bank loans). Shepstone Papers, Box 15. See also de Kiewiet, op. cit., p. 144.
 10. W. Sargeant to Shepstone. 13. ii. 1878. Shepstone Papers, Box 19.

to manage money than men." Shepstone confessed to Frere,¹ an opinion which the Treasury thoroughly endorsed when still engaged on the business of straightening out Transvaal accounts eight years later.²

Shepstone was absent from Pretoria while Trollope was there, so the novelist had to discuss these matters with others. He soon learned that hopes were pinned on raising a loan guaranteed by the Imperial government,³ but he knew that such aid was unlikely. Hence the ideas of a railway then being entertained in Pretoria would have to be postponed, and Trollope thought it salutary that the infant colony should take slow and ordered steps towards self-advancement.⁴

In point of fact Shepstone had postponed all ideas of a railway to Delagoa Bay, although not of one to Natal if that colony could be induced to bring the line up to the Drakensberg.⁵ Trollope in imagining that Natal would do nothing of the kind because such a line would be of greater benefit to the Transvaal than to itself, was quite mistaken.⁶ At the time it was asserted that Natal carried three-quarters of the Transvaal trade,⁷ and complaints were aired in the Cape papers that Shepstone might ignore the "natural" Delagoa Bay outlet "simply through mistaken notions of polity, and a too generous desire to serve old friends."⁸ With

-
1. Shepstone to Frere, 6.viii.1877. Shepstone papers, Box 7.
 2. Treasury (R.E.Welby) to C.O., 13. vii. 1885. Shepstone Papers, Box 21.
 3. II, 102; for an example of this kind of official thought, see Cunyngname to Frere, 16. x. 1877, Cape Archives, G. H. 1/74.
 4. II. 101.
 5. Volkstem, 11. vii. 1877; Shepstone to Herbert, 23. vii. 1877, Shepstone Papers Box 7.
 6. II, 101; c.f. Natal correspondent of Kaffrarian Watchman, 22. vii. 1877.
 7. Cape Times, 11. v. 1877. Probably grossly exaggerated; but see letter of A. Fass to President Burgers, 22.xi.1876. Burgers Papers. Folio 4. Group 16.
 8. Cape Times, editorial, 22. viii. 1877.

his decided preference for Delagoa Bay, Trollope's opinion was at least independent, however misinformed; for he was moving amongst what was in effect a Natal clique. Shepstone himself had described the annexation as worth £100,000 to the colony,¹ and some of the members of his staff had considerable business interests there.² As a result complaints were made not only in the press³ but also to the Colonial Office, which duly advised Shepstone to recruit new blood.⁴

Although Trollope felt that a railway must wait, he was rather more vigorous in proposing a solution to the country's need for more people. Having pronounced throughout Australia and New Zealand that land must be made freely available to all settlers,⁵ he saw no reason to change his views in the Transvaal, even though the Boer farmer enjoyed freehold tenure whereas the Australian squatter⁶ did not. The country would continue to limp along underpopulated and with an under-nourished economy until these vast farms were subdivided; and if this could not be done arbitrarily, as was

-
1. Shepstone to Bulwer, 16.v.1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 7.
 2. The Cape Times, 3. v. 1877, was suspicious of Henderson's presence on the financial commission; in fact it was his money that tided the mission over its financial difficulties in the early stages. (Shepstone to Bulwer, 24. vii. 1877, Shepstone Papers, Box 7).
 3. P. E. Telegraph, quoted Cape Times, 4. ix. 1877, pointed out that the Government Secretary (Osborn), The Secretary for Native Affairs (Henrique Shepstone), the Registrar of the Court (Rider Haggard) and the Superintendent of Education (Dr. Lyle) all had close Natal connections. Bulwer had in fact complained to Shepstone that he had taken all his best men. (Bulwer to Shepstone, 8. viii. 1877, Shepstone Papers Box 13). See also Cape Times for 19. ix. 1877, and Cape Argus, 25. ix. 1877.
 4. Herbert to Shepstone, 30. vi. 1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 16.
 5. Australia and New Zealand, (1873) esp. Chapter VI.
 6. the 'squatter' in Australia is not a 'bywoner', but the large landowner. The term is still used, and originates from the fact that the New South Wales government originally attempted to confine the bounds of settlement; those who went beyond them 'squatted' on Crown land.

desirable,¹ then "the Government might try the experiment of buying land."²

Trollope's approach to the land question was curiously apolitical: most people who raised it did so when discussing the anglicisation of the territory.³ For as The Times hopefully ventured,

"a few years hence, in all probability, there will be more settlers of English than of Dutch descent in the Transvaal, and thus the probabilities of having to deal with a small Ireland in South Africa will, we may hope, rapidly grow less and less, and in no long time will disappear altogether."⁴

Others looked to gold to bring in an English population,⁵ while there was talk of joining the territory either with Natal⁶ or Griqualand West,⁷ thereby creating a strong British colony that could be safely granted representative institutions. For it had become clear, despite the pledge in the Annexation proclamation, that it was impossible to call together the old Volksraad;⁸ as the

-
1. II, 107 - 110.
 2. Ms. II, 108. This passage was later cut, either because the suggestion was made extremely tentatively, or because Trollope felt on reconsideration that a government should not intervene in the economy in this way.
 3. e.g. minute of Glanville to Carnarvon, c. 6.vi.1877, quoted Goodfellow op. cit., p. 141; Cunynghame, Sir. A.: My Command in South Africa, 1874-1878 (1879) p. 272.
 4. The Times, 21. v. 1877, editorial.
 5. Wolseley to Shepstone, 2.ix.1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 21.
 6. Carnarvon in Lords. 15.v.1877. Hansard, CCXXXIV, col. 980; and on 9.viii.1877, Hansard, CCXXXVI, col. 649; his Lordship would be prepared to amalgamate the colonies if both parties were willing. But in the Transvaal there was little enthusiasm, such ideas being opposed even by the Gold Fields Mercury, 12. vii. 1877.
 7. This proposal had much more support, at least in Griqualand West. There were petitions, and editorials advanced in its favour (Diamond News, editorial 1. xii. 1877; also letter, signed Fairplay, 11. viii. 1877), while the officials of the territory expressed regrets that this alternative merger had not been contemplated instead of that with Cape Colony. (Lanyon to Shepstone, 14.viii.1877 and 21.viii.1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 17.)
 8. This was pointed out to Shepstone by N. J. Swart, State Secretary of the late Republic; letter of 30.vii.1877. Shepstone Papers Box 19. See also Shepstone's correspondence with Frere on the subject, the High Commissioner having suggested that the Volksraad be called. (Frere to Shepstone, 22. v. 1877, Box 15; Shepstone to Frere, 6. vi. 1877, Box 7).

Transvaal Argus pointed out in an editorial, "It is by its Constitution indissoluble, and its voice is law. How then could the Administrator of a Government, whose principles are monarchical, countenance such a power?"¹ Hence Shepstone governed by proclamation, as the Crown Law officers had advised that the Transvaal was to be regarded as a ceded or conquered territory.² By the time Trollope visited the territory, some dissatisfaction with arbitrary government was evident, particularly among the English population.³

"Never in the most noisy days of agitation," wrote the editor of the Gold Fields Mercury a few months later, "did I hear more discontent with 'the powers that be' spouted at Pilgrim's Rest than I now hear daily at Pretoria."⁴ Yet the novelist is silent on this point, discussing Transvaal political affairs only in an imperial context. As he discussed the forms of government of the other states and colonies in some detail, we may take it that his silence is but a circumspect reticence stemming from the fact that he failed to meet Shepstone.

However Trollope did meet Burgers; and one of the most astonishing of his pronouncements is that the ex-President was the only man he met in South Africa who questioned the propriety of the annexation.⁵ While it is true that the novelist moved in establishment circles and was unable to make direct contact with the Dutch farmers in their own language, such an opinion is not the gross misrepresentation it may at first sight appear to be. There is reason to believe that when Trollope visited the Transvaal in September, many of the Boers had suspended judgment. Nothing could be done until Kruger and Jorissen had returned from their mission to Europe, and in the meantime the performance of the new govern-

-
1. Transvaal Argus, 4. v. 1877.
 2. Malcolm to Shepstone, 27.vii.1877, Shepstone Papers Box 18.
 3. The Gold Fields Mercury sharpened its tone considerably in criticising the administration, beginning with an editorial dated 20. ix. 1877.
 4. Gold Fields Mercury, 3. i. 1878.
 5. II. 56. In his Travel Letter on the Transvaal, however, Trollope did refer to the protest made by Dutch academics. Cape Times, 11. ii. 1878.

ment could be scrutinised carefully. Moreover, Burgers' ambiguous stance, whatever its intention, had muddled the situation by giving usurpation the complexion of a mere transfer of authority.

Hence the most vociferous criticism of the annexation had come from elsewhere in South Africa, bolstered as it was by the belief that true Transvaal opinion was being suppressed.¹ The Volksraad of the Orange Free State passed a resolution expressing its "deep regret" at the extinction of the sister republic, trusting that its independence would shortly be restored;² simultaneously the Bloemfontein Express railed against England and spoke of Brand having accepted £90,000 'blood money', so extravagantly that in attacking the President it outpaced republican sentiment with the result that the editor was burnt in effigy for his pains.³ In the Western Cape, there were meetings of protest in the Boland,⁴ and the Dutch press urged its readership to sign the memorials then circulating in protest. Carnarvon's conciliatory policy had come to an end, declared Het Volksblad; confederation was now "out of the question."⁵ There was some hope that the Colonial Secretary, realising this, would square Shepstone's actions with his published instructions and cancel the annexation.⁶ Failing that, the Rev. S. J. du Toit suggested, the Afrikaners should exploit the strategic importance of the Cape and invite a third power to take over the Transvaal.⁷ "Our grievances," du Toit told a Malmesbury audience, "will be handed on for generations, so that one day the people will

-
1. Zuid Afrikaan, 6.v.1877; Die Afrikaanse Patriot, 15.vi.1877.
 2. Theal, G.McC: A History of South Africa, 1873-1884 (1919) I. 276.
 3. Cape Times, 8. v. 1877.
 4. Cape Times, 7.v.1877; Die Afrikaanse Patriot, 8.vi.1877, 15.vi.1877; Die Zuid Afrikaan, 6.vi.1877.
 5. Het Volksblad, 17. iv. 1877.
 6. Het Volksblad, 19.iv.1877; Die Afrikaanse Patriot, 11.v.1877, 4.v.1877.
 7. Die Afrikaanse Patriot, 11. v. 1877.

rise against the English and have their revenge."¹ This was the language of the 'patriot' party, and Trollope seems to have heard none of it.

It can be pointed out in his defence that the anti-annexation agitation outside the Transvaal had blown itself out by the time he reached South Africa, while the Boer delegation to London was charmed into acquiescence by Lord Carnarvon. Kruger and Jorissen, brandishing memorials against the annexation signed by 5,000 of the 6,000 burghers of the country², asked for a plebiscite, which was curtly refused. However vague promises were made regarding the use of Dutch and the restoration of a form of representative government,³ whereupon they withdrew leaving Carnarvon a cordial note in which it was explained that their moral position had been maintained by protesting.⁴ Carnarvon, writing to Shepstone, believed that the pair "left in a good and loyal spirit, and I can only trust that it may ... last." He added by way of postscript that Jorissen "was the chief speaker but Mr. Kruger assented to all he said."⁵ In fact Kruger had fallen out with Jorissen,⁶ and was keeping his ear to the ground; it is revealing that he had not wanted notes taken of the Colonial Office discussions.⁷ Back in the Transvaal, Kruger first described the mission a failure and

-
1. report of Paarl meeting, Die Afrikaanse Patriot, 15.vi.1877.
 2. Cape Town Daily News, 4. vi. 1877.
 3. C.O. Confidential Print: encl. Earl Carnarvon to Sir Bartle Frere, 13.ix.1877, G.H.4/1, Confidential, Cape Archives.
 4. Kruger and Jorissen to Carnarvon, 28.viii.1877. encl. Carnarvon to Frere, 12.ix.1877; G.H. 4/1, Confidential, Cape Archives.
 5. Carnarvon to Shepstone, 1.xi.1877. Shepstone Papers, Box 14.
 6. Joubert to Burgers, 9.iv.1878, quoted Engelbrecht op.cit., p. 326; Osborn to Shepstone, 26.xii.1877, Shepstone Papers Box 18.
 7. Carnarvon to Frere, 13. ix. 1877, G.H. 4/1 Confidential, Cape Archives.

advised the Boers to settle down under English rule.¹ But when 1,000 burghers, many of them armed, assembled in Church Square to hear him speak, Kruger at once saw that the situation had changed and announced that he would speak again two days later. A somewhat larger crowd flocked to hear him; this time he organised a committee to hold meetings and sound out public opinion.² Thus the road to Majuba was taken: too late to have influenced the writing of Trollope's book, but early enough to make it obsolete the moment it appeared.

It must be conceded that Trollope's account of the Transvaal and the annexation is riddled with shortcomings. Unillumined by contact with either Shepstone or the Boer leadership, it is drawn from restricted materials. But Trollope's independent cast of mind lighted upon the dubious legality of the annexation, and emphasised it to his readers; so that although he expected British occupation to be justified ultimately by success, the genuineness of his doubts combined with his good opinion of the Boers meant that the English public could still profitably turn to the South Africa at the time of Majuba. Although he preached the doctrine of the necessity of annexation, the breadth of his account would in due course sustain the morality of withdrawal.

-
1. Osborn to Shepstone, 26. xii. 1877, Shepstone Papers. Box 18. According to a report in the Gold Fields Mercury, Kruger had stated that "if there had been treachery anywhere, it had been on the part of the people and not on the part of the English government." (17. i. 1878.)
 2. Gold Fields Mercury, 17. i. 1878.

V. ISSUES OF THE DAY : THE NATIVE QUESTION

Trollope's views on the Native question are perhaps the most important in the book. As he declared to the Royal Colonial Institute before setting out, the subject was one "which, of all others, would be most interesting to him in the tour he was about to make."¹ Indeed, it was a subject he could not leave alone: as late as eighteen months after the publication of the two volumes he was still lecturing on the South African natives and still modifying his views.²

The novelist had been uttering pronouncements upon the negroid races for some twenty years before the South African tour, and had come to have no doubt of their inferiority. When considering the future of the West Indies in 1859, he had decided that although the islands might one day be populated by a race of Mulattoes as proud of their negro ancestry as of their European, for the moment it must be recognised that God had created men of superior and inferior races.³ Negroes seemed to have been intended as servants; and in discussing slavery in America Trollope was more concerned with the degeneration it produced in the European than with the exploitation of the black bondsman.⁴ The Negro was scarcely fit for emancipation until he learned to work without coercion.⁵

It is no exaggeration to say that Trollope's view of the world was shaped by his own relentless industry. Work was not only a duty, not only the best means of civilising the savage,⁶ but ultimately the arbiter determining which races would survive in the world and which would not. In America the Indians, a non-working people, would be

1. Discussion following the paper given by Donald Currie, "Thoughts upon the Present and Future of South Africa," Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, VIII, 1876-77, pp. 405-07.

2. As late as October 1879 Trollope gave a lecture on the "Kaffirs and Zulus" at Nottingham. Nottingham and Midland Counties Daily Express,

3. The West Indies and the Spanish Main (1860 edition) p. 61. 7/24.x.1873

4. North America (1862), II, 61-62; 135.

5. Negro unwillingness to work is discussed in The West Indies, passim, but especially pp. 217-225; also in Australia (Joyce & Edwards edition), I. 176; emancipation in North America, II. 61.

6. I. 9.

exterminated. "As the soil of the world is required for increasing population, the non-working people must go."¹ At first Trollope was inclined to regard this process as 'filibustering', albeit of a necessary kind,² but in the fulness of time he came to incorporate some of the rhetoric of Social Darwinism. In 1873 he had written that the Australian aborigines were 'doomed' to extermination;³ two years later he explained that "so sad a result ... is justified in our consciences by the opening of new homes to men of higher races."⁴ The great increase in Britain's population had, he believed, "been given to us in order that we might populate such lands."⁵ By the time he reached South Africa he divined in this process the hand of Destiny.⁶

But here, unlike Australia, New Zealand and North America, Trollope found a native population that showed no inclination to melt away before the mighty onrush of white civilisation: it both worked and reproduced itself in earnest. For Trollope, this was the greatest single discovery of the tour. "South Africa", he finally declared, "is a country of black men, - and not of white men. It has been so; it is so; and it will continue to be so."⁷

This was an emphatic opinion, but one which needed to be stated. For at the time there was an assumption in Britain that the non-European races were doomed to extermination. It was given utterance by Goldwin Smith,⁸ while a few years later another writer put the issue thus:

'Are all Dark Skins to perish, like the unhappy Tasmanians, before Europeans? Have we not often been, in our civilising processes, more savage than the Savages?

If the Natural Law of Selection necessitates the destruction of inferior races, as History has illustrated thus far, is there not in

1. North America, II, 62.

2. The West Indies, p. 139.

3. Australia (Joyce & Edwards edition) p. 564.

4. Letter XVIII in The Tireless Traveller (ed. B.A. Booth, California 1941) p. 199.

5. Australia (Joyce & Edwards edition) p. 744.

6. II, 44; also I, 16, 28, 38, 184.

7. II, 332.

8. In the Sunday Magazine, February 1867; quoted in W. Thompson, Thanksgiving for Peace ... Cape Town, 1878, p. 34.

Humanity a Higher Law, happily better recognised in our day, which should and could be employed, by moral force, to resist this fearfully selfish struggle for existence?"¹

The question of the coloured races' survival or extermination still provided the ultimate context for discussing the kind of native policy to be adopted. Although Bishop Colenso very much doubted that the disappearance of the native races was "an absolutely necessary law of nature, as some seem to suppose," he nevertheless felt constrained to point out that it was highly desirable for the best aspects of civilisation, represented by Christian missions, to be spread among them in case this were so.²

Indeed the work of civilising the African in the colony as beyond had been largely left to the missions. "Even now," wrote William Ayliff in 1878, "all educational establishments are in the hands of the Missionary, and without him the Government could do but little for the people ... the Missionary is the cheapest servant the Government have."³ It seemed to many, missionaries and public officials alike, that the best security of the Colony lay in improving the condition of the native tribes within and beyond its borders, and that the best way of doing that was by Christianising them. In this way a community of interest would be established, so that the two races would progress or suffer together.⁴ "Nothing would do more," wrote Sir Bartle Frere, "to prevent future ^{Kafir} wars than a multiplication of such institutions as Lovedale and Blythswood."⁵

-
1. Bonwick, J.: Preface to The Lost Tasmanian Race, London 1884.
 2. Colenso, Bishop: "On Missions to the Zulus in Natal and Zululand", lecture to Marylebone Institute, 23.v.1865. MS p. 35, Cubbins Library, Wits.
 3. W. Ayliff to R. Godlonton, 22.x.1878, letter 42. W. Ayliff Papers, Killie Campbell Library, Durban.
 4. For early statements of their viewpoint see Cassidy, L., The Kafir and the Christian, Cape Town 1856, pp. 29-31; Calderwood, Rev. H., Caffres and Caffre Missions, London, 1858, p. 20; Sir Geo. Grey to his namesake of the Colonial Office, quoted in Brookes, E., A History of Native Policy (Pretoria, 1927) p. 90.
 5. Dispatch quoted in Stewart, J., "Lovedale", in Proceedings of the General Conference on Foreign Missions. 1879, p. 76 : see also Frere, Sir B. : On the Laws Affecting the Relations Between Civilised and Savage Life ..., 1882, p. 37.

There were, however, obsolescent institutions in the Cape that did much to damage the missionary cause in the eyes of the colonists. Trollope visited two of them, Zuurbrak and Pacaltsdorp, and was not impressed. The Coloured smallholder had "land assigned to him just sufficient to enable him to live, - with the assistance of a little stealing."¹ A common accusation,² it brought back to Trollope's mind that Carlylean creation Quashee the nigger idling his time away under the breadfruit tree;³ the novelist concluded, as he had done in The West Indies nearly twenty years before, that "the sole effect of the Missionary's work has too often been that of saving the Native from working for the white man."⁴ Having already visited Kimberley and seen the nascent native proletariat of the mines, Trollope was predisposed to judge these settlements harshly.

But as he himself indicated,⁵ his diatribe was all but gratuitous as they were about to be closed. The London Missionary Society had deemed them obsolete nearly ten years before,⁶ while the Cape Parliament had passed a Missionary Institutions Act in 1875 to enable the settlements to be broken up into individual holdings.⁷ Thus the process of their dissolution was well advanced by the time of Trollope's visit, and the smallholdings he attacked were as much the result of parliamentary enactment as of mission policy. Both Pacaltsdorp and Zuurbrak were not stations in the strict sense of the word but survivals of older Hottentot captaincies: consequently they had always been regarded by the government as 'belonging' in some sense to the Coloured inhabitants.⁸ Hence Trollope's inclination to regard them as the missionary norm was profoundly misleading, particularly as there were clergymen who looked at them

1. I. 113.

2. See Cape Times editorial of 3.vi.1877.

3. Carlyle, Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question (1849).

4. I. 153; c.f. The West Indies (1860) esp. p.64.

5. "As the Caledon Institution [Zuurbrak] is about to be brought to an end, I may say this with the less chance of giving offence." I, 150.

6. Statement Respecting the Estates Termed 'Institutions' in the Cape Colony under the London Missionary Society, 1860, G.H.9/12, Cape Archives.

7. Macmillan. W.M.: The Cape Colour Question (1968) p. 284.

8. ibid. p. 28.

critically and saw in their withering away a promise that all organised missionary settlements would become superfluous.¹

Moreover, there were many missionaries who were as concerned as he to give native instruction a practical bent. Although they discouraged the view advanced by Trollope amongst others² that the native must be made to work or become civilised before he could be Christianised, they did concede that conversion and education should proceed hand in hand.³ Native education had never, as in India, meant the production of black Englishmen; it had always centred on the question of industrial training. It was argued that such training at carefully sited schools would not only guarantee the peace of the colony, but also provide many manufactures which still had to be imported.⁴ An attempt had been made by Sir George Grey to establish five industrial schools attached to missions, but because of lack of money,⁵ erratic government subsidy and a premature insistence on teaching European trades rather than developing native handicrafts, all but one of them, Lovedale, had languished by the time Trollope made his tour.⁶ In the late 'seventies, however, prophecies of extermination had been replaced by fears of native combination, and the necessity for widespread native education once more became apparent.⁷ Industrial training became the most highly commended form: it was clear that for many years to come the bulk of the natives would always be employed as labourers.⁸ The annual missionary conference at

1. Merriman, N.J.: Are the Missionaries Mischief-Makers? (Grahamstown 1876) p. 7; Thompson, W., Thanksgiving for the Peace ..., Cape Town, 1878, p. 42.
2. esp. II: 187; Empire, item on Missionary Conference, 12.x.1876: view also described in Holden, W.C.: Brief History of Methodism: p. 325.
3. Colenso, J.W.: Ten Weeks in Natal (Cambridge, 1855) p. 23.
4. Cape Argus, editorial, 25.x.1876: Dale, Langham; Technical Instruction and Industrial Training ..., Cape Town, 1875, p. 8. "There is scarcely an article of attire, from the hat to the boots, which does not come to us ready made".
5. In establishing his location system in Natal, Shepstone in 1846 had also envisaged the establishment of "model mechanical schools", but owing to lack of funds the scheme had to be abandoned. A similar recommendation of the Natal Native Commission of 1852-53 came to naught for the same reason. Brookes, Native Policy, pp. 53-54; Guest, W.R.: Natal and Confederation (M.A. thesis, Natal, 1965) p. 15.
6. Dodd, A.O.: Native Vocational Training (Lovedale, 1938) pp. 7-9. Heald Town had also survived, but purely as a Methodist school and theological training centre.
7. Their apparent decrease in number had been an argument for not spending money on native education. Dale, L.: Technical Instruction and Industrial Training ..., p. 21.
8. Thompson, W.: Thanksgiving for the Peace ..., p. 29.

King Williams Town, having already expressed the desirability of compulsory native education in 1873, endorsed the adoption of industrial education in its session of 1877¹. Thus the Heald Town Institution, attacked by Trollope for its Methodist hymnody, re-established its trade school the following year.²

Lovedale, established near Alice by the Free Church of Scotland in 1841, was the most striking example of a successful mission station. Presided over by Dr. James Stewart, it had not only kept up and regularised its trade school with an apprenticeship system, but was now spoken of as a potential Native University.³ "It may have its defects," wrote the Cape Inspector of Schools and Colleges, "but the scheme is at present the most complete, the largest, and the most successful of its kind ... the institution as a whole is probably the greatest educational establishment in South Africa".⁴ As one of its newspapers proclaimed,^{5a} pupils resolved themselves into three classes: those capable of becoming preachers, teachers and trainers, a middle group who became tradesmen, mechanics and artisans, and finally the labourers. "One part, and that not the least difficult of the missionary's work, is to give shape to these three classes."⁵ Having discovered the inappropriateness of bestowing a classical education upon all Africans, Dr. Stewart came to believe that Lovedale should aim at developing "a capacity for work and practical usefulness", so that its goals were "not different from those demanded by the colony generally."⁶ Colonists who came and saw for themselves generally went away impressed,⁷ as did Trollope. "I do not say that

1. King Williams Town Gazette, 14.vii.1873 (Lovedale Collection P R 1575, Cory Library); Cape Argus, 2.viii.1877.

2. I, 214-15; Heald Town Records, Cory Library M S. 15,082.

3. Dodd, Native Vocational Training, pp. 9-10; Langham Dale to Stewart, 11.x.1878, Lovedale Collection P R 1360, Cory Library. In due course this came to fruition, Fort Hare being an off-shoot of Lovedale.

4. D. Ross, Preliminary Report on the State of Education in the Cape of Good Hope. G 12-1883, p. 53.

5a. At the time of Trollope's visit there were three: the Kafir Express and its Xhosa counterpart, Insigidemi Amaxosa, as well as the house journal the Lovedale News, the only one of the three Trollope mentions. (I, 219). All were monthlies.

5. Kafir Express. April 1 1872: article, 'Hints to Our Friends.'

6. Stewart, J.: The Experiment of Native Education, Lovedale 1884, p.3.

7. e.g. an account of a visit to Lovedale, in Somerset and Bedford Courant, quoted Holden, W.C.: A Brief History of Methodism and Methodist Missions in South Africa, pp. 360-62; also Ross, D.: Preliminary Report on the State of Education, p.53: "A visit to Lovedale would convert the greatest sceptic regarding the value of native education."

religion is neglected," wrote the novelist in a commendatory tone, "but religious teaching does not strike the visitors as the one great object of the Institution."¹ But the truth of the matter was that the Home Committee of the Glasgow Missionary Society did not recognise the trade departments of the Institution, which had to be self-supporting,² and when Dr. Stewart returned to England a few months after Trollope's book appeared, he found it expedient to emphasise that the "essential aim of Lovedale is to Christianise, not merely to civilise."³

In many respects Lovedale was a voice crying in the wilderness. When not actually hostile,⁴ the colonists were on the whole indifferent to missionary efforts;⁵ they remained largely financed by Britons who had but an imperfect understanding of the conditions involved.⁶ At the same time, results were often disappointing. Lovedale was the powerhouse of native education in the Eastern Province and beyond, and when in 1883 Donald Ross came to look at the 420 native schools in the Transkei, Basutoland and the Colony proper, he ruefully concluded that "a large number of these, certainly the majority, are in the charge of incompetent persons ... If one half of these schools were closed to-morrow the Colony would lose nothing by their collapse." Less than one-fifth of the native children who should be at school, he estimated, actually attended.⁷

Much of the ineffectiveness of these schools was due to the phenomenon of the educated African "falling off", or gradually losing his learning as he took his tribal wife and relapsed into traditional ways of life.⁸ It was a problem, Trollope noted, that was raised by the

1. I. 216.

2. Stewart, J.: "Lovedale, South Africa," in Proceedings of the Conference on Foreign Missions, London 1879, p.72. A consequence was that the much needed agricultural training scheme was delayed by at least two years. (Kafir Express, 1.vii.1871).

3. Stewart, ibid, p. 69. Trollope's comments may have been borne in mind, for the novelist is quoted in another context on p.76.

4. During the Ngqika-Gcaleka War the Eastern Star wrote of Lovedale that "an institution which is supplying educated recruits to the ranks of the enemy should be closed for the present." (17.vi.1878: Lovedale Collection, P R 1609, Cory Library).

5. Christian Express, 1.ix.1877; Thompson, W.: Christian Missions: the place they should have in the Cherished Sympathies and Practical Arrangements of the Colonial Churches, Cape Town, 1880.

6. Greswell, W.: Our South African Empire (1885) II, 224.

7. Ross, D.: Preliminary Report on the State of Education ... p.47.

8. See Report of Res. Magistrate (C.H.Bell) Leribe, Basutoland, 30.xii.1875 Cape Native Affairs Blue Book, 1876, p.6.

missionaries themselves.¹ But complete relapse was rare.² Dr. James Stewart, a man of exacting standards, was rather more disheartened by a "want of trustworthiness, and even of common honesty, frequently of ordinary industry" among some of those educated at Lovedale.³ It was the common complaint of the colonist; but it was chiefly as servants that the natives were being judged by such critics.⁴ As Trollope remarked, "The kafir who can argue a question with his master has already become an objectionable animal."⁵

Yet for all his sympathy for the problems encountered, Trollope remained basically hostile to missionary endeavour. He soaked up the common prejudice that mission stations were haunts of idleness,⁶ and ignored the plea that the colonist came into contact with their worst products as the best became preachers, teachers, interpreters and clerks.⁷ He approved of Lovedale and the Rheinisch Mission at Worcester because they could be construed into secular agencies for civilisation;⁸ others were lumped together with the doomed Coloured settlements of the Western Cape and attached as monuments to misguided philanthropy and idle psalm-singing. For at the core of Trollope's dislike of missions was a belief that religion was essentially a matter between man and his Maker, and that 'enthusiasm' was both vulgar and impertinent. Had he ever possessed a missionary impulse, it had long since been stifled through observing the antics of low-born evangelicals: Mr. Slope of Barchester Towers is but

1. I, 209-210.

2. Brownlee, C., An Address ... to the Missionary Conference At King Williams Town, 1887, (Lovedale, 1887) pp. 12-13. Of the 1600 lads who had passed through Lovedale, the author knew of only one who had been convicted of horsetheft. There were also only 15 cases of relapse into heathenism among the 2500 students, boys and girls, who had passed through the Institution.

3. Stewart, J.: The Experiment of Native Education, p.22. The text was originally an address to the Lovedale Literary Society.

4. Frere, Sir Bartle : On the Laws Affecting the Relations Between Civilised and Savage Life ..., p.31.

5. I, 209.

6. The Rev. W. Greenstock comments on this view, encountered throughout his journey through Natal and the Republics in 1875. Greenstock M.S., p. 16, Killie Campbell Library.

7. Merriman, N.J. : Are the Missionaries Trouble Makers? p. 6. See also Mason, G.H.: Zululand, p.34.

8. Trollope's estimation of Lovedale has already been quoted; of Worcester he remarked that "The children are kept only till they are fifteen and are then sent out to the work of the world without any pretence of classical scholarship or ecstatic Christianity." I, 136.

the most famous of a tribe bearing such names as Prong, Stumfold and Smirkie.¹ At bottom, Trollope was a materialist. Throughout the novels money is seen as the stimulant to action; "it should be sought for with honour," he wrote, "won with a clear conscience, and used with a free hand. Provided it be so guided, the love of money is no ignoble passion." Where this love did not exist, or had disappeared, civilisation would regress as it had done on the Spanish Main.² Work alone would civilise the savage,³ and in Australia and New Zealand he warned that an "ill-conducted enthusiasm" might not only put an end to the labour traffic sorely needed by Queensland, "but debar also these poor savages from their best and nearest civilization."⁴

When on his tour of South Africa he reached Kimberley, Trollope waxed ecstatic; he could think of no other place where the civilising process was being carried out with such marked success. Civilisation, he felt, must come slowly. Simple teaching of religious principles would never achieve much, but "I have no doubt that European habits will bring about religion. The black man when he lives with the white man and works under the white man's guidance will learn to believe really what the white man really believes himself." Hence in looking down the Kimberley mine, Trollope rejoiced to see "three or four thousand growing Christians", despite their present disposition to filch diamonds.⁵ This passage is remarkable in that it is shortly followed by another quite at cross-purposes, indicating the way in which diamonds degrade the outlook of the European.⁶ It is also noteworthy that Trollope considered emulation the best means of self-improvement by the African, whereas at home he never failed to pour scorn on the lower orders' attempts at aping their betters.⁷ However, in the confusion of practised religion with respectability, his sentiments were those of the age: Lord John Russell once declared that "the best way to spread Christianity and advance morality was to let commerce take its own course."⁸

1. From Rachel Ray (1863), Miss Mackenzie (1865) and John Caldigate (1879) respectively. The last mentioned was completed on the way out to South Africa. Sadleir, Trollope: A Commentary, p. 412.

2. The West Indies (1860) p. 190.

3. I, 9.

4. Australia and New Zealand (1873) I, 134.

5. II, 188.

6. II, 201-204.

7. e.g. Neefit the tailor in Ralph the Heir (1871).

8. quoted in W.L. Burn, The Age of Equipose, London 1964, p. 70.

Yet perhaps this very confusion of values enabled Trollope to appreciate the significance of Kimberley in a way that few of the many visitors¹ who were equally impressed by the scale of operations there were able to do. Kimberley, he argued, was settling the Native Question by rendering both the traditional missionary approach and the location system obsolete; the Big Hole was drawing labour from all over the country to become the crucible in which a new multi-racial, industrial South Africa was being forged. In its wake would arise other Kimberleys "in various parts of the continent."² It was indeed a symbol of the future. In 1881 it was estimated that some 640,000 natives had come to the Diamond Fields in the last seven years,³ and with their return to their tribesmen British influence was slowly but steadily penetrating the interior. Notions of British law, manners and customs were making their way among the native peoples,⁴ together with syphilis, spirit drinking,⁵ the tunes of Trial By Jury⁶ - and guns.

Guns could be had via Delagoa Bay,⁷ Port St. Johns,⁸ and formerly through Natal, where even officials had dealt in them⁹; but the acknowledged centre of the trade was Kimberley. The gun trade was in fact the magnet drawing the African labourer to the mines: for as little as three months' wages he could return to his tribe armed with a good Enfield rifle.¹⁰

At the time of Trollope's visit he rarely stayed longer;¹¹

1. e.g. J.J. Winter, Gigantic Inhumanity ..., London 1877, p.54; article, "The Diamond Mines," observer of South African Affairs, 16.viii.1877; item, 'The Rev. Mr. Perks' visit to South Africa,' Empire, 21.xii.1876.
2. II, 185-190.
3. R.W. Murray, "The Diamond Fields of South Africa," in Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, 18.iii.1878, vol. XXIX, No 1478, p. 380.
4. Currey, J.B.: "The Diamond Fields of Griqualand West and their Probable Influence on the Native Races of South Africa", Journal of the Society of Arts, vol. XXIV, 17.iii.1876, p. 378.
5. Frere, Sir. B.: On the Laws Affecting the Relations Between Civilised and Savage Life ..., p. 29.
6. "I heard four niggers on last Saturday night whistling 'The Bridesmaid's Chorus', in parts most melodiously and accurately, and when they had finished that ... another whistled the Judge's song which Mr. Paulton sang with great success. This is civilising the natives properly. Mr. Harvey the impressario is backing British rule in extending civilisation in this territory and a long way beyond it." (Diamond Fields Correspondent, Cape Times, 31.viii.1877.) Trial by Jury, the first extant Gilbert and Sullivan opera, had its London premiere only two years before.
7. Colley, Confidential Report on the ... Transvaal, 1875, p.38; Memoranda for Sir Garnet Wolseley, C.H. 1634-36, Natal Archives.
8. Diamond News, 23.x.1877.
9. Colenso MS., "Langulibalele and Matchana", p.5, File P. Killie Campbell Library.
10. Letter of J.Viljoen reprinted from Times of Natal in Cape Argus, 10.x.1876.
11. Rev. T.D. Philip, Some Aspects of Civilisation and Christianity, Port Elizabeth, 1879, p.6.

there was as yet no question of his settling down and acquiring the habit of industry, as the novelist believed.¹ Meanwhile the administration in Griqualand West, despite repeated requests from the Republic and from Natal to regulate the trade, steadfastly refused to do so. The government found it a useful source of revenue,² while the mining industry needed it to guarantee the labour supply; it was also argued that as the traffic in guns could never be stamped out, it was better that it should take place under some kind of supervision in a British Colony than under none at all. J.B. Currey, the Colonial Secretary, drew consolation from the fact that three-quarters of the rifles sold became next to useless in no time.³ Nevertheless, it was estimated that some 200,000 rifles were now in the possession of the natives;⁴ whether they were in good condition or not, the effect was that the natives felt "more equal to the white man."⁵ Trollope, however, could not quite make up his mind whether the trade should be suppressed or not.⁶ This procrastination may have stemmed from his observation that the scale of the gun traffic was much reduced, and from a hope that it would remain so; but it was only a temporary lull, the result of a depression caused by a slump in diamond prices⁷ and the interruption by the Sekhukhune war of regular labour supplies.⁸

1. II, 185.

2. Griqualand West received no share of the Cape customs receipts. In 1873, £8500 was raised in taxation from the sale of 13,200 guns. Pretorius, J. St.E.: Die Beloid van die Suid Afrikaanse Geweste teenoor die handel in Vuursapens en ammunisie met die Inboorlinge 1806-1881, p.61

3. The same point was made by the Cape Argus, in its editorial of 12.vii.1877.

4. Currey, J.B., "The Diamond Fields of Griqualand West", Journal of the Society of Arts, XXIV, 17.iii.1876, p.378; also Diamond News, 11.viii.1877. This paper estimated that some 160,000 rifles had entered the Cape Colony alone in the five years ending December 1876.

5. Lanyon, quoted in despatch of Frere to Carnarvon, 28.xii.1878, Pretorius, Die Handel in Vuursapens, p. 97.

6. II, 198-99.

7. Schumann, C.G.W.: Structural Changes and Business Cycles in South Africa 1806-1936 (London, 1936) p.83; Lanyon to his father, 15.vii and 25.vii.1877, Lanyon Papers, vol. 11, Transvaal Archives.

8. The Cape Argus, in an editorial of 12.vii.1877, pointed out that the peaks of the Gun Trade corresponded with those of Kimberley: in 1873 47,837 guns were imported, in 1876 only 21,654.

Kimberley's dependence on labour from beyond the borders of British South Africa provided a constant pressure for involvement in the affairs of the interior. Judge Barry, writing to Sir Bartle Frere listed it first among the reasons for establishing agencies among the native tribes should it be deemed inexpedient to annexe them. "The existence of a sort of slavery among tribes so near to us as the Batlapins," he wrote, "accounts to a great extent for the fact that our Native neighbours do not supply us with much labour." Were those in bondage free to choose their own masters there was no doubt that the more industrious would come to the Fields.¹ At the same time, the area was subject to incursions from land-hungry Boers. The Reverend John Mackenzie, writing to the High Commissioner first from Shoshong and then from Kuruman, kept him informed of these depredations; he pointed out that it was highly desirable to appoint Special Commissioners all the way to the Zambesi, both to suppress native forms of slavery and to circumvent the Boers. For should the latter succeed in establishing themselves in Mashonaland, then all hopes of a South Africa united under British auspices would be gone.² There were also expansionist pressures from the press. At the Cape, the Argus spoke of England's "mission" to the African, and of a "manifest destiny ... to spread perpetually over the face of the Continent, until its flag is supreme from Alexandria to Cape Town."³ Requests for British protection had come from the Batlapins, the Baralongs and the Tswana,⁴ while disorders in Damaraland were such that the Cape Government despatched a Special Commissioner to the district. In due course he too recommended further extension of territory.⁵ "A good deal of British annexation," mused Trollope, "goes on in different parts of the world of which but little mention is made in the British Parliament and but little notice taken even by the British press."⁶

1. J.D. Barry to Frere, 19.v.1877, Lanyon Papers, vol. 2., Transvaal Archives.

2. Mackenzie to Barkly, 2.v.1876, Mackenzie Papers, A75/2, Cubbins Library, Wits.

3. Cape Argus, editorials of 18.ix.1877, 3.x.1877, 11.i.1877, and particularly that of 27.ii.1877.

4. Barkly to Carnarvon, 4.xii.1876, C1745/189; Carnarvon to Barkly, 20.ii.1877, C1776/44; Cruickshank Memo. to Shepstone, 31.viii.1877, Shepstone Papers Box 14.

5. For a discussion of the issues raised by the Palgrave Mission see Davies, J.: "Palgrave and Damaraland", A.Y.B. 1942, II.

6. I, 54.

So much was true; but the Colonial Office, ever mindful of the cost both in money and manpower, assiduously resisted such expansionist pressures. When Sir Richard Southey had attempted in 1874 to counter Boer encroachment in the Keste Aard area by writing to the chief Montsion and saying that he hoped Britain would accept the proffered territory, he was censured for his pains.¹ Henceforth Southey restricted himself to arming prospectors and explorers with letters to native chiefs,² hoping thereby to extend British influence all the same. Even when positive steps were countenanced, as in Bechuanaland in 1878, the vicissitudes of English politics could occasionally stop a particular course of action in its tracks. In that case, five Special Agents had been installed, but the proclamation intended to establish a special territorial government was never issued,³ having been overtaken by the doubts that paralysed imperial policy immediately after the Zulu War.

For there was a lurking fear that the empire might be extended beyond the bounds of discretion. Trollope first confessed it in a letter to Shepstone,⁴ and whereas in the South Africa he had accepted that Britain had a responsibility to extend protection over the tribes to the north so that she could educate them and defend them from ill-usage,⁵ the extra Zululand chapter written for the fifth edition of the book in 1879 returned to these earlier doubts with a new pungency:

"Have we not stretched our arms far enough? Do not we already feel that the efforts demanded from us are so excessive as to produce a sense of fear lest our means should be inadequate? If it be our duty to civilise the world at large, should we not pause a little as we do it? Having absorbed the Transvaal in 1877, and Cyprus in 1878, should we now in 1879 add Zululand to Afghanistan [sic]? The task grows to such an extent that a new acquisition will be required to satisfy the ambition of each three months."⁶

1. Campbell, W.B.: "The South African Frontier, 1865-1885", A.Y.B. 1959, I. p. 195.
2. Barrington Diaries, 17.xi.1874, II, 39; Gold Fields Mercury, 22.xi.1877.
3. John Mackenzie to Sir H. Robinson, 6.iv.1881, Mackenzie Papers, Wits; Warren, Charles: The Military Occupation of South Bechuanaland, 1878-79, esp. p. 9.
4. See Appendix A.
5. II, 334.
6. 1879 edition, p. 182.

Such doubts were not uncommonly expressed in England,¹ and from time to time they were shared in South Africa even by such votaries of expansion as The Cape Argus. That paper spoke of extending "our territories beyond our governing power", and pointed out that the "almost epidemic" desire of the natives to come under British rule "may become a troublesome compliment."²

The most troublesome aspect of the compliment was the thorny problem of the status of the Africans now brought within the bounds of the colony. "Until very recently", remarked the Graaff-Reinet Herald, "the bulk of the colonists distant from the Frontier knew little and cared less about the social condition or welfare of the natives."³ For in the Western Cape there were practically no Africans,⁴ and the attitude towards the Coloureds was on the whole indulgent. Sir Henry Barkly had written that "the population, white and black and coloured, is intercessed in every locality, and connected by ties so close that a [discriminatory law, even if Parliament could be persuaded to enact it, would remain almost a dead letter."^{4a} But with increasing turbulence on the Frontier culminating in the outbreak of the Ngqika - Gcaleka War, the implications of expansion were discussed more fully in the capital. The Cape Argus noted that the proportion of natives to Europeans was steadily increasing with each outward thrust of the frontier,⁵ while some Afrikaners saw that ultimately more was at stake than the validity of the colour-blind franchise.⁶

1. e.g. W.E.G. Gladstone, "Kin Beyond Sea", in North American Review, CCLIV, Sep-Oct. 1878, p. 120; remarks of N.S. Maskelyne, concluding J.B. Curragh's "The Diamond Fields of Griqualand", Journal of the Society of Arts, 17.iii.1876, vol. XXIV, 1217, p. 361; remarks of H. Eggard, in Transvaal Independence Committee: Deputation to Lord Kimberley and Mr. Grant Duff, London 1881, p. 10.
2. Cape Argus, editorial, 30.vi.1877.
3. Graaff-Reinet Herald, editorial, 2.iii.1878.
4. In 1875 there were 202 Africans in Greater Cape Town, amounting to 0.5% of the total population. Wilson, M., and Mafeje, A.: Langa: A Study of Social Groups in an African Township, Cape Town, 1963, p.2.
- 4a. Barkly, Memorandum c. 1875, quoted in Pretorius, Die Handel in Vuurwapens, p. 82; c.f. Cape Times editorial, 13.iv.1877.
5. Cape Argus, 24.vii.1877, editorial.
6. Eustace, T.J.: A Reply to the Electoral Address of the Aborigines' Protection Society, Cape Town 1880, p.4.

"If the interior of Africa", ran an editorial in Het Volksblad, "is colonised in such a manner and with such vigour as to secure a lasting preponderance of the white race, our position at the Southern extremity of our Continent will be a far more splendid one than our most ardent well-wishers ever dreamt of. If, on the contrary, the interests of colonisation in the true sense of the word will be neglected in favour of the purely civilising tendencies ... the old Africander will have ultimately to give way to the ever increasing masses of Aborigines."¹

There were, Trollope indicated, a number of solutions to the native question then being proounded. There was the location system, as practised in Natal; the mission approach, with its misguided protectionism; that of the 'iron-rodgers,' who in their hearts yearned for slavery; and finally those who would uplift the native by immediately extending the franchise to him.^{1a} None of these approaches met with the novelist's approval, for he put his faith in the civilising power of the gospel of work as expounded at Kimberley. But if he correctly saw the seminal importance of the mining industry, he was less than fair to the other four 'schools'. The location system had been devised by Sir Theophilus Shepstone in Natal as the best way of governing an African population outnumbering the whites by more than tenfold, and of protecting the natives from exploitation; the main complaint in the colony was that it succeeded in doing so only too well. Again, Trollope's view of the missions was a caricature, compounded from an inherited distaste for evangelism,² a heady draught of Carlyle, some vignettes from a tour of the West Indies made nearly twenty years before, and a hasty inspection of the doomed mission settlements of the Western Cape. His description of the 'iron-rod' school in the Eastern Province also missed the point: for only a few weeks after he left the area, the frontier erupted into the war he refused to believe would break out.^{2b}

The real debate was between the fourth school, those who would extend the franchise to the African, and those others who would not. It

1. Het Volksblad, 11.1.1877, editorial.

1a. II, 334; also II, 189.

2. inherited from his mother, Frances Trollope, who created The Vicar of Wrexhill (1837).

2b. It was assumed in the manuscript that there would be no new Frontier War, and alterations had therefore to be made in the earlier chapters. Even after it had broken out, Trollope refused to believe that the Ngqikas would join the Gcalekas. For examples of both attitudes, see

I, 192, text and footnote.

was a debate between those who accepted a multi-racial future for South Africa and those who, in the words of a Grahamstown newspaper, felt that with each annexation the whites were more and more becoming "sentinels as well as colonists";¹ it was a debate between those who believed that white civilisation would inevitably triumph as it steadily marched into the interior, and those who feared assimilation in reverse and so shrank from 'barbarism'.

"The white man", Trollope wrote, "does I fear in his heart generally despise and dislike the Native."² As he observed when he took his meal at Lovedale, segregation existed even in the dining halls of missionary institutions.³ "The blacks", pronounced The Empire, "have no place in the home or social life of the Colonists, other than that which domestic service gives them."⁴ For most whites shrank from contact with the natives, especially in Natal, where a newspaper warned against "gratification of the overbearing contempt, so naturally felt, and recklessly expressed towards a supposed inferior class of human animals"...⁵ For there a fear existed that the location system preserved the natives in barbarism, and that if they were not civilised speedily - at bayonet point if necessary⁶ - then the whites would "degenerate, and those who come into more immediate and familiar contact with savage and brutal life will themselves become savage and brutal ..."⁷ For there were many who were arguing that this was precisely what had happened to the Transvaal Boer, so that the question arose whether it was not more dangerous in the long run to tolerate customs such as polygamy rather than stamp them out immediately.⁸

In Natal a system of native law existed side by side with Roman-Dutch, and the officials administering it, thought one missionary,

1. Eastern Star, 16.vi.1876.

2. I, 272.

3. I, 217.

4. Empire, editorial 16.xi.1876.

5. Natal Witness, 31.i.1871, quoted in W.R. Guest, "Natal and Confederation", (M.A., UND. 1966) p.14.

6. Natal Witness, 8.ii.1879, quoted in Ritchie, Imperialism in South Africa (London, 1879), p. 27.

7. Polygamy and Woman Slavery in Natal: Report of the Special Committee of the Natal Evangelical Alliance, Durban, 1861, p.2.

8. This was a recurring theme in the Cape Argus; see, in particular, the editorial of 7.ix.1876.

were likely to become the Brigham Youngs of a black community.¹ The colonists also eagerly attacked the location system, because it epitomised all that was most alien and intransigent in the African. Their demand for more labour and for an end to tribal tenure were not made in the spirit of wishing to integrate the African into colonial society, but of making Natal function more effectively as a plantation colony, preferably without 'Coolie' labour. When the missionary fulminated against lobola and polygamy, it was with righteous indignation; when the colonists did so, it was with the aim of smashing tribalism and sometimes with the half-articulated hope that the abolition of these customs might lead to the gradual "fading out" of the Bantu peoples.² Certainly they were not helped to improve themselves: in 1878 the natives of the colony paid £60,350 in direct taxation, the Europeans naught.³

More significantly, the whites in Natal and elsewhere were beginning to accept job reservation as the norm in labour relations.^{3a}

Trollope had been struck by the two navvies he had met near George, who preferred to work for 1/7s a day by themselves than for 4/6d alongside Coloureds;⁴ but he did not see that the strength of this conviction would eventually express itself in law and thereby negate much of the civilising impact of the gospel of work.⁵ Indeed the term 'civilised labour' came to be applied to whites, not to blacks;⁶ but when Trollope toured South Africa it was already apparent that for all the talk of barbarism the African posed a potential threat to the European. Farmers in Natal were urged to apply the technical knowledge at their command, or else witness the natives pass them by.⁷ In the Cape, the boerevolk of Beaufort West were berated for their sluggishness and parsimony, and warned that in educational matters,

1. Mason, G.H.: Zululand (1862) p.47.

2. Natal Mercury, 7.x.1875, editorial.

3. Wolfson, F.: "Some Aspects of Native Administration in Natal under Theophilus Shepstone", (M.A. Wits, 1946) pp. 77-79.

3a. Shepstone felt that it was unprincipled to obstruct the progress of the natives by tacitly reserving skilled labour for whites, but held that, given the conditions of the colony no other policy was expedient. (Wolfson, op. cit.)

4. I, 102.

5. S. van der Horst: Native Labour in South Africa, (Cape Town, 1942), p. 225. It was not until the Mines and Works Amendment Act of 1926 that the colour bar was sanctioned by statute in Natal and the Cape.

6. ibid, p. 250.

7. Times of Natal editorial, 13.xi.1875.

as in others, the coloured classes would overtake them.¹ "There are many coloured men", ran a letter in The Cape Argus, "richer, and, I am sorry to add, steadier than the lower class of Europeans."² The native problem was no longer one of frontiers alone, if it ever had been; in eliminating that the colonists had brought the enemy within the gates. And already stray voices were heard suggesting that he should be sent out again, home to the locations from whence he came.³

In the Cape, however, the traditional approach had been that of integrating the African into the body politic.⁴ In practice, as the Barry Commission discovered, there were large areas in the east of the colony proper where none other than native law was being applied, however informally.⁵ Yet these natives, so long as they occupied land worth £25 or earned £50 a year,⁶ would have become eligible for the franchise, as any other. In the Western Province, noted the Cape Times, the natives were the political if not the social equal of the whites; but in the east they retained something of an "independence and nationality of their own."⁷ Frontier scares and fears of a general native combination against the white man cast doubts on the wisdom of the colour-blind franchise, particularly as that franchise was a major obstacle obstructing a closer white unity in the form of confederation.⁸ But how could it be limited?

1. By the Inspector of Schools, Graaff Reinet Herald, 29.ix.1877; see also discussion of Native Affairs Blue Book for 1876 in the Cape Argus, 7.ix.1876. The editorial, noting the prodigious increase in African farming, asked of the white farming population, "Can they keep up the pace?"
2. Letter, signed 'Colonist', Cape Argus, 17.iii.1877.
3. A.F. Caldecott, in his prize-winning essay The Government and Civilisation of the Native Races of South Africa (Cape Town, 1884) pointed out that the white races would remain the aristocracy of South Africa for the foreseeable future and perhaps forever, and that African ambitions would always be constrained accordingly. "To some degree" he suggested, "the proposed system of locations would obviate this difficulty." (p.37). Some years before, J.C. Gawler in his paper "On the History, Progress, Trade and Prospects of South Africa", Journal of the Society of Arts XXII. No. 1119 p.553 (1874), had argued that on completion of his period of employment under a white master the native should return to his location.
4. Cape Argus, 14.ix.1876, editorial.
5. Barry Report, G4-1883, § 23-24.
6. McCracken, J.L.: The Cape Parliament, p.69.
7. Cape Times, 20.iii.1877, editorial.
8. Die Volkstem, in an editorial of 6.v.1877, claimed that much of the Boer opposition to British rule in the Transvaal stemmed from the fear that the Africans would at once be placed on an equal footing with themselves.

The Cape Argus took the Trollopean view that no-one could be debarred by their colour alone, while it was also pointed out that such sifting out of the population would in fact be quite impossible.¹ Yet an 'educated' franchise, subjecting the prospective voter to a literacy test, might give the missionaries undue political influence;² it therefore seemed that raising the means test was at once the best and most straightforward solution.³

This was also Trollope's view: he had scant sympathy for those who advocated extension of the franchise to the natives of Basutoland⁴ or indirect representation for those of the Transkei.⁵ "There may be those," he wrote, "who think that a Kafir Parliament and a Kafir Governor would be very good for a Kafir country. I own that I am not one of them."⁶ The natives of South Africa required tutelage, not the vote: the one was inimical to the other. For once they mastered the art of political combination, they might readily vote the white man into the sea. "If not, there would always be European demagogues who would willingly activate them for their own nefarious ends."⁷ Civilised government must be safeguarded by adjusting the franchise in such a way that the native population was effectively excluded without having been debarred on racial grounds.⁸

Trollope's fears of the consequences of black enfranchisement were unnecessarily alarmist. For at the time he toured South Africa, the native not only accepted the vote but accepted tutelage along with it.

-
1. Cape Argus, 4.iv.1877; Northern Post (Aliwal North), 10.ii.1877, editorial.
 2. Mason, G.: Zululand (1862) p. 204.
 3. Het Volksblad editorial, 1.v.1877; R. Campbell - Johnston, in discussing the paper delivered by R. Richards, "The Social State and Progress of the South African Communities", Journal of the Society of Arts, 13.iv.1877, XXV, no 1273 p. 488.
 4. Glanville, T.B., in the discussion following Richards, ibid, p. 486.
 5. J.M. Orpen to Saul Solomon, 31.xii.1880, Solomon Papers.
 6. I, 60.
 7. I, 64, I, 93-94, I, 261, II, 159. For echo of fear of demagogues see Het Volksblad editorial, 1.v.1877.
 8. I, 88, I, 261, c.f. South African Mail editorial, 31.vii.1877.

"It is my opinion," said Sprigg at East London in 1877, "that the black man here distinctly recognizes the superiority of the white man, and that for a long time to come, perhaps for ever, the recognition will prevail to such an extent as to leave the representation in the hands of men of European descent."¹

Indeed J.T. Jabavu, although asked to stand for Parliament by prominent members of the Dutch and Native communities of Victoria East in 1883, declined to do so on the grounds that he would have little influence in a parliament composed of whites.² He preferred to work through sympathetic Europeans. But in his main contention Trollope was right: the colonists would not be prepared to trust to native restraint and reticence. When, in 1892, the non-European voters had crept up to 21,960 and amounted to 24% of the electorate, a Franchise and Ballot Act was passed which raised the qualifications and imposed a literacy test: thereafter the non-European voters did not comprise more than 16% of the Cape electorate.³

Although warming their hearts in the matter of the franchise, in most other respects Trollope parted company with the conservatives. Like Sir Bartle Frere, he believed in complete equality before the law for Europeans and Africans alike.⁴ This meant that there could be no apprenticeship,^{4a} for the African must be free to negotiate his own contract.⁵ It also meant that the gun trade could not be arbitrarily suppressed, for in his own mind Trollope could not reconcile the opposing principles of "equality of treatment"⁶ with the need to maintain civilised rule.⁷

The colonists, who had to live with the problem, were more

1. quoted in D.D.T. Jabavu: The Life of John Tengo Jabavu, Lovedale 1927, p.32. See also Dr. J. Stewart's views on the inexpediency of African representation in Parliament. The Educated Kafir: An Apology, 1880, pp. 9-11.

2. McCracken, J.L.: The Cape Parliament, p.78.

3. Ibid, p. 80.

4. Frere, On the Laws Affecting the Relations Between Civilised and Savage Life, p. 34.

4a. Apprenticeship was widely urged at the time both in South Africa and in England whereat Froude's insistence the London Conference of 1876 passed a resolution calling on South African governments to persuade African parents to apprentice their children to whites. Goodfellow, op. cit., p. 106; as a fair sample of contemporary opinion see Sampson, V.: The Relations and Responsibilities of the Civilised Communities of South Africa to the Native Races (1878) p.65; Eustace, T.J.: Letters Addressed to the Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society (Cape Town, 1880), p.9; Dean Green (of Maritzburg): "A Paper on the Native Question," G.H. 1634 Natal Archives.

5. I,9; II,338.

6. II,338.

7. II,199.

decisive. The Cape government passed a Peace Preservation Act in 1878 to disarm the Africans, and the sequel justified Trollope's procrastination. The Fingos, till then the most loyal of tribes and of considerable use as auxiliaries, refused to serve in the war against the Korannas, while in Basutoland the implementation of the act provoked war and eventually necessitated the transfer of the territory from the Cape to the Imperial Government.¹

The longer Trollope stayed in South Africa the more he became convinced that such imperial involvement in its affairs was a necessity. Initially he had merely thought the Cape Colour-blind franchise inexpedient, but on encountering the British troops stationed at King Williamstown, he was driven to consider whether the colony was entitled to self-government, as it was palpably not self-sufficient.² He observed that the Wolsley reforms had in effect reduced Natal to the status of a Crown colony, which was as well in view of its overwhelming black majority.³ The Transvaal was already a Crown Colony, so there the problem did not arise: but later, after discussing the implications of extending the Cape franchise to Griqualand West on its incorporation, he added to his manuscript the recommendation that the territory would best be governed as a Crown Colony.⁴ For Trollope had come to see that the Africans were "the people" of South Africa,⁵ and that its position differed from the other settlement colonies accordingly. Ultimately, the future of the country must be determined by their interests.

In propounding this doctrine Trollope changed the whole tenor of his colonial thought. South Africa would never be a field of emigration for the English labourer as other colonies were; it could not be easily federated (and here Trollope returned to the early chapters of the

1. Theal, G. McC., A History of South Africa, 1873-1884, II Chapter XVIII.

2. I, 196.

3. I, 260, 262.

4. "Considering the nature of the task it may be doubted whether the country of the diamonds would not be best ruled as a Crown Colony." II, 180.

5. The phrase "a million and a half warlike hostile Natives" on I, 95, originally read "warlike hostile people".

manuscript to amend them accordingly);¹ ideas of colonial separatism there were completely out of the question in view of England's mission to educate the African and defend him from ill-usage.² As he blurted out when travelling, in the last analysis the Cape was ruled by a handful of white men.³ It was an imperial responsibility to see that their ascendancy "be not too complete."⁴

Such a doctrine was anathema to the colonists. Even an inveterate fighter for native rights such as J.M. Orpen was torn between advocating for the imperial government "some judicial function between us and those we have to govern"⁵ and resisting the idea that the Imperial parliament had a special interest in the native question.⁶ But this was a doctrine as much in vogue in official circles as in the philanthropic lobbies of the House of Commons. R.W. Herbert, commenting at the beginning of 1878 on the dismissal of the Molteno ministry, held that

"In the Cape Responsible Government is specifically limited in regard to Native Affairs by the appointment of the Governor to be also 'High Commissioner' for the territories of South Africa adjacent to the Cape ... On the successful repression of the present outbreak depend great interests altogether beyond the jurisdiction as they are beyond the intelligence of a Colonial Ministry, and I think Sir Bartle will be justified in maintaining the Queen's prerogative to an extent which would not be advisable to an ordinary Colony under Responsible Government."

Beyond such a statement of principle the imperial government was rarely prepared to go. The High Commissioner was afforded no special facilities or finances for the extra - Cape Colonial duties Herbert wrote

1. See below, Chapter VI.

2. II, 334.

3. Report of brief interview at Queenstown in the Friend, Bloemfontein, 22.xi.1877.

4. I, 8.

5. Orpen to Saul Solomon, 28.x.1880, Solomon Papers.

6. But as it was impossible to persuade them of this, Orpen argued that it was all the more important for colonists to be represented in the Imperial chamber. (Our Relations with the Imperial Government Considered as a Whole ... Cape Town, 1879, p. 14). Orpen's pamphlet is a singularly sane contribution to the debate on Imperial Federation.

7. C.O. 48/485: Frere to Carnarvon, Confidential, 5.ii.1878. Herbert's minute, 12.iii.1878, quoted in Benyon, "The Development of the High Commission ...", p. 179.

of so fulsomely,¹ while far from insisting on African representation in the central legislation of the proposed Confederation, the first draught of the Permissive Bill effectively denied it to them.² Even in Natal, with its limited self-government, the Colonial Office had to reconcile its policy with the wishes of the colonists, with the result that some discriminatory legislation reached the Statute books.³

For imperial policy was buffeted by a number of conflicting considerations. There was the native interest to superintend, which led some influential voices to proclaim that South Africa should be governed as India was, absolutely;⁴ there were others who advocated withdrawal from the whole country except the Cape Peninsula.⁵ There was the self-governing but not self-sustaining colony of the Cape, weak enough to require extensive imperial aid in its frontier wars⁶ yet strong enough to obstruct the imperial design of confederation. And there was the policy of confederation itself, partly conceived to limit Britain's liabilities in South Africa, yet already linked by colonists with heady talk of expansion to the Zambesi and beyond.⁷ Colonial Office policy had traditionally resisted such pressure; but to do so in the 1870's would either invite other European powers to claim territory⁸ or else inflame a nascent

1. Warren, C.: On the Veldt in the Seventies (1902) p.375.

2. Goodfellow, op.cit., p. 121.

3. Wolfson, "...Native Administration in Natal under Shepstone," p.53. Most notable of these was the Franchise Law of 1865.

4. Froude to Shepstone, 17.ii.1878, Shepstone Papers Box 15: Earl Grey, "Past and Future Policy in South Africa", Nineteenth Century, April 1879, p. 590.

5. Froude was the most persistent exponent of this view, as an alternative to Indian government. See his Two Lectures on South Africa (1880) pp. 52-53. Carnarvon, despondent with the South African situation in mid-1877, entertained the idea as a last resort. Carnarvon to Froude, 17.iv.1877, quoted in Goodfellow, op. cit., p. 134.

6. In January 1878 there were three regiments stationed in the colony, and with the rising of the Ngqika two more were sent out. Theal, G.McC., History of South Africa, 1873-1884, passim; Empire, 25.iv.1878.

7. Cape Argus, editorials of 11.i.1877, 18.ix.1877, 3.x.1877 and 27.ii.1877.

8. For fears in this regard see Carnarvon to Frere, 12.vii.1876, quoted in Goodfellow, op. cit., p.117.

Afrikaner nationalism.¹ The one absolute in South Africa was military power: command of the Cape route was as vital to the survival of the British Empire² as the British soldier was the indispensable adjunct in the waging of colonial wars. Such a bond ultimately negated both "agitation from abroad"³ and Molteno's intransigence; an imposed policy of confederation on the one hand was quite as impossible in this context as a premature insistence on independence on the other.⁴ The contrary tendencies in the South African polity had already determined that, in the words of Mr. Gladstone, the country was "the one great unsolved, perhaps unsolvable, problem of our colonial system."⁵

Then, as later, extensive migration was urged as an antidote to the country's distemper. But unlike other colonies, South Africa had little land to offer as an inducement: the Boers had taken up most of it, while in Natal it had been sold carelessly and with little increase to the white population.⁶ At the same time, the unskilled labourer who emigrated had to contend with a degree of competition from the natives unmatched in any other settlement colony. Hence while 60,000 emigrants were reported to be leaving Liverpool for America every month,⁷ a mere 5000 came to South Africa in the course of a year.⁸ Natal, having

-
1. Following the annexation of the Transvaal the editorials of Die Afrikaanse Patriot would often remind Great Britain that she would need to conciliate Afrikaners if she valued her hold on the strategic Cape.
 2. Gallagher, J., Robinson, R. and Denny, A.: Africa and the Victorians (1961) p. 52.
 3. The phrase is Merriman's, referring to Froude, quoted in the Cambridge History of the British Empire, VIII, p. 460.
 4. Froude wrote to Carnarvon (10.i.1876) that the Molteno Ministry at the Cape regarded "the connection with Great Britain as no closer than that which once existed between Great Britain and Hanover - a connection in and through the Crown alone." Newton, Select Documents, p. 30.
 5. Hansard, CCLXIII, col. 1857; 25.vii.1881.
 6. W.F. Butler, in his Immigration Report, wrote of "the vicious system of land grants" that existed in 1857-60, when land was sold at nominal prices. In all some 1,361,334 acres were sold from Crown Lands, while the white population in the same period grew by only 279 immigrants. In 1875 1,000,000 acres were still in the hands of the Natal Land and Colonisation Company. Government Gazette (Natal), XXVII no. 1539, pp. 219-220, July 13 1875.
 7. quoted by W. Hartley in the course of a debate in the Natal Legislative Council on immigration. Natal Witness, 30.xi.1875.
 8. Empire editorial, 5.x.1876.

received only 45 settlers in a little over six months,¹ installed an emigration agent in London; but among the artisans he despatched or assisted passages were a brassfitter and a bellhanger, who on arrival were dismayed to find that Natal possessed few brass fittings and fewer bells.² The one emigrant it did seem to attract, remarked the Colonial Secretary, were "poor gentlemen" eking a living off the land.³ For the more vital spirits often left Natal for the Overberg. The Cape, on the other hand, fared rather better. In the four years following the creation of the appointment in 1873, the Emigration Agent sent out 5553 men, together with 629 women and 969 children. Most of them stayed, although some of the men returned to England on expiration of their contracts.⁴

A few people believed that as the Cape would never be popular with emigrants, the country had better turn to its native population and set about uplifting them.⁵ Potentially they comprised "an army of producers and consumers", who had the advantage of being already "on the soil and not waiting to be carried to it."⁶ But such an idea never became popular because of its integrationist implications. The sting in the tail to Napier Broome's Immigration Report, that "the Kaffir ... after all, may prove the true immigrant of Natal"⁷ only increased the colonists' sense of insecurity. The squire of Portland at Knysna, Henry Barrington, accepted the fact that one day "the landholder must fall to the level of the blacks ... whatever level these may have reached."⁸ But he could not quite make up his mind whether he should continue building his mansion or sell out and return to England.⁹

-
1. Butler, Immigration Report, Natal Government Gazette, XXVII, no 1539, p. 220.
 2. Natal Witness, 25.viii.1876, editorial.
 3. Napier Broome, Report of Crown Lands and European Immigration, (Natal) 1876, p. 3.
 4. Theal, G. McC., History of South Africa 1873-1884, I, 51.
 5. J.X. Merriman to Saul Solomon, 3.vi.1880. Solomon Papers.
 6. Empire editorial, 22.ii.1876; also Natal Mercury 21.i.1878, for letter "Native Affairs", signed W. Adams.
 7. Napier Broome, Report of Crown Lands and European Immigration, (Natal) 1876, p. 11.
 8. Barrington Diaries. II, 44: entry for 5 May 1875. (Knysna).
 9. ibid., passim : esp. II, 35 (5.ix.1874) and II, 43 (17.iv.1875).

In South Africa, despite Trollope's protestations to the contrary,¹ Disraeli's epithet that colonists were a 'fluctuating' population, out to find nuggets and fleece flocks before returning 'home' to enjoy the fruits of their wealth² contained a germ of truth. As The Northern Post explained:

"A man chooses to exile himself for a few years with the object of accumulating a competency, but he is not therefore bound to extend his exile for the rest of his natural life. That life in a Colony as South Africa is little better than exile hardly needs proof."³

At a time when the English in Canada had long adopted the name Canadians, and when the Australians, as Trollope observed in 1872, referred to their colonial-born as 'natives',⁴ the English in South Africa dubbed themselves Anglo-Africans, at once pairing themselves with that transitory tribe the Anglo-Indians. By way of contrast the Afrikaner's identity with the country was complete: so complete that one newspaper had fallen into the habit of referring to the "European" part of the population in contradistinction to the Dutch.⁵ Hence the English in South Africa became determined to keep the country British. Whatever might be the case in Australia or Canada, remarked the Grahamstown Journal, in South Africa the imperial connection would survive.⁶ When in 1884 a monument for consolidation of the empire began, one of the first Imperial Federation Leagues to be established was that in Cape Town.

Yet even among the whites the English were a minority group in South Africa, and Trollope saw that they were likely to remain so.

-
1. at the Maritzburg banquet. See above, p. 17.
 2. Hansard, CCXXVIII, col. 1726. The remark was made in the course of the debate on the Royal Titles Bill.
 3. Northern Post (Albion North) editorial, 15.ix.1877; see also J.E. Ritchie, Imperialism in South Africa (1879) p.6; Natal Witness, 4.ix.1877 and Times of Natal, 5.ix.1877.
 4. Australia (edited Joyce & Edwards), p. 101. This usage has led to the ironical situation where the highly conservative Australian Natives' Association remains one of the last bastions of a White Australia. (A similar inversion occurred at the time of the Boer War, when contingents arrived on these shores bearing such names as the Tasmanian Imperial Bushmen.)
 5. Gold Fields Mercury, Pilgrim's Rest, Transvaal - e.g. editorial, 12.vii.1877. I seem to remember other examples of this usage but cannot now locate them.
 6. Journal, 10.viii.1877.

Although he would never have described them as "pulpy endogens", as Froude had done,¹ he did draw the conclusion that the Cape and South Africa generally was not, in the strict sense of the word, an English colony.² Hence it must be governed, if not as India, then at least in the interests of its black majority. It was, he declared, "a country of black men, - and not of white men. It has been so; it is so; it will continue to be so."³ Had the English not been outnumbered by the Afrikaners his conclusion might have been different.

1. "America was colonised before the aloe had blossomed. The grain of the old oak is in New England. The English in South Africa are pulpy endogens. They may make a nation some day, but they have a long journey to travel first." "Leaves from a South African Journal", in Short Studies in Great Subjects (1900 edition) III, 518.

2. I, 57-58 in particular.

3. II, 332.

VI. CONCLUSION

Any assessment of Anthony Trollope's South Africa must bear in mind that it was possibly the most widely read book on the country since the appearance of Livingstone's Missionary Travels and Researches in 1857. In England, it ran through four editions in the course of 1878, and another highly abridged one volume edition was published shortly after the outbreak of the Zulu War. It provided polemicists with their materials, parliamentarians with facts, and was quoted approvingly at public meetings. In South Africa, some twenty newspapers published notices of the book, republished English reviews, or reprinted the travel letters in whole or in part. It was used as the point of departure for editorials, most notably on the occasion of the dismissal of Molteno, and commended to readers at home by such people as Sir Bartle Frere and Dr. James Stewart.¹ Thus the book has an undoubted historic importance, for it remained a standard work of reference throughout the crisis years beginning with the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877 and ending with Majuba.

It is not the least of the merits of the South Africa that to some considerable extent these troubles were anticipated in its pages. For Trollope drew attention to the indecisive nature of contemporary imperial policy, torn as it was between the desire to keep imperial interests uppermost while the actual expansion of the Empire was more often the work of the colonists themselves.

"We do not yet know," he wrote, "whether it is our intention to limit or to extend our colonial empire; we do not yet know whether we propose to occupy other lands or to protect in their occupation those that now hold them; we do not yet know whether as a nation we wish our colonial dependents to remain always loyal to the British Crown or whether we desire to see them start for themselves as independent realms. All we do know," he added reassuringly, "is that with that general philanthropy and honesty without which a British Cabinet cannot now exist, we want to do good and to avoid doing evil."²

-
1. See above, pp. 46 - 52.
 2. II, 210 - 211.

In South Africa, Trollope's dilemma of imperial policy made itself apparent in the desire to shed the responsibility for a financial liability such as Griqualand West, while at the same time recognising the attractiveness of a 'Monroe Doctrine' that would discourage all other powers from attempting to penetrate Central and East Africa.¹ The formation of a South African Confederation would perhaps reconcile the impulse towards economy with the impulse towards expansion; for such a Confederation, Froude wrote to Saul Solomon, could annexe territory up to the Equator if it wished.² But without confederation, there could be no significant annexation: either by the Cape, which must not be allowed to indulge in aggrandisement at the expense of the imperial plan to order the affairs of Southern Africa as a whole;³ nor by Britain herself, for there was a lurking fear that the Empire might be extended beyond the bounds of discretion.⁴ Much was therefore expected from Carnarvon's Confederation policy.

As it happened, Trollope's was the first book of importance on South Africa to appear after its formulation; it was also the first to question its wisdom. Having advocated confederation in the West Indies, in Canada and in Australia,⁵ he had hoped to do the same in South Africa; indeed in the fourth Travel Letter he had done so unequivocally. "I believe thoroughly", he then wrote, "that it should and might be effected, and believe thoroughly that it will be effected".⁶ In a compressed form, this sentence was carried across to the manuscript. But there it was struck out, and replaced by the "doubt whether a Confederation of

-
1. P.R.O. 30/6/4 No.67, Carnarvon to Frere, 12.xii.1876, quoted Goodfellow, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
 2. Froude to Solomon, 19. xi. [1877?] Solomon Papers.
 3. C. W. de Kiewiet, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
 4. see Appendix A; also W.E.Gladstone, "Kin Beyond Sea," *North American Review*, CCLIV, Sept. - Oct. 1878, p.190.
 5. II, 343.
 6. T. L. 4, *Cape Times*, 15. xii. 1877.

the South African States can be carried in the manner proposed"

by Lord Carnarvon.¹ For as Trollope travelled around the country, he came to see that the difficulties to be overcome were such as to render confederation beyond the bounds of practical politics.

There was, he discerned, no real community of interest linking the different states, while the differences in native policy, and more particularly in franchise qualifications, could not be easily reconciled within the framework of a single political unit.² Unfortunately his views were given scantier consideration than they deserved. Both in England and South Africa the tone of the earlier travel books was remembered, so that his caution was construed into crypto-separation.³

Trollope had probably taken out his manuscript and altered it shortly after meeting President Brand in Bloemfontein, for his sympathy with the Free State was as rare as it was profound. Whereas some English reviewers spoke of "squeezing" the territory into a Confederation,⁴ Trollope saw neither the necessity nor the justification for doing so. Nor did he anticipate, as did so many in South Africa at this time, that it would eventually accept the consequences of its encirclement and come to embrace Confederation. Instead, Trollope saw a pastoral state ruled soberly and paternally by an able outsider, President Brand. Thus was born the myth of the "model republic", later developed by James Bryce.⁵

Few travellers to South Africa, however, matched Trollope in the glowing account given of the backveld Boers. This is all the more remarkable as the novelist admitted that before he encountered them on the platteland he had imagined that they were

1. I, 64.

2. II, 342 - 345.

3. Academy, 6.iv.1878, and Journal (Grahamstown), 15.iv.1878.

4. The sentiment was general, but the phrase is the Saturday's. (23.ii.1878).

5. Bryce, Impressions of South Africa, 1897, esp. pp. 314 - 315.

"savage, barbarous and unkindly".¹ The manuscript shows that he took this view with him at least as far as Natal;² but in the Transvaal he saw that their way of life, although backward and dirty, was simple, dignified and Christian. Realising that he was skirting the bounds of civilization, Trollope took their rough exterior for granted, and so did not fall into the common mistake of under-estimating the Boer because of the inferior cut of his cloth. The real question, he realised, was whether their way of life was capable of being improved. He noted with satisfaction the progress of itinerant schoolmasters among them, together with that of the trader: the old self-sufficiency of the Boer farmer was breaking down, and with it their isolation.³ Also spreading among them was the English language, and Trollope speculated with less chauvinism than most that the Dutch language would eventually disappear from South Africa.⁴ This was a viewpoint widely held even among Afrikaners;⁵ for at this time few people took the aspirations of the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners seriously, or were aware that Dutch was now more widely read and written in the

1. II, 327.
2. The first paragraph on I, 255 originally continued: "But on looking further into it, the traveller is forced to acknowledge that these people having become what they are in South Africa, so unlike the commercial Dutchman of Amsterdam or the political Dutchman of the Hague, - being now a nomad jealous ungregarious race, - are not fitted for the making of a prosperous Republic."
3. II, esp. 12 - 13.
4. II, 264 - 65. "I say this rather in a desire to tell the truth than in a spirit of boasting. I do not know why I should wish that the use of my own tongue should supersede that of the native language in a foreign country."
5. see J. H. de Villiers, "The Future Language of South Africa", Cape Monthly Magazine, XII, 1876, pp. 359 - 368.

Cape than it had been twenty years before.¹

These impressions were noted by many reviewers in England, and one journal thought that in presenting the Boers so favourably the novelist had done less than justice to the colonists and the natives.² Although the English South Africans do not figure as prominently in the book as could be expected, this was probably because Trollope was writing for an English audience and in essence found the colonists little different from people at home; full of their own excellencies, perhaps, as at Grahamstown,³ or inclined to be condescending towards Afrikaners and arbitrary towards Africans, but otherwise unremarkable. As for the Africans, Trollope found the gulf between their state of civilisation and his own too wide to allow of anything better than an amused indulgence; but all policy in South Africa, he maintained, should ultimately be directed towards bridging that gap. As a necessary preliminary, Trollope made some attempt to understand the complexities of native customs. Sometimes he did so with perspicacity: his exposition of the effective restraints placed upon the absolute power of the chiefs anticipated the relevant section of the Barry Report.⁴ Generally, however, he paraphrased portions of Maclean's Compendium of Kafir Life and Customs, not always scrupulously. In writing of lobola, for example, he maintained that "Wives are bought, but

-
1. Het Volksblad, editorial, 30. 1. 1877. (English translation)
 2. British Quarterly Review, CXXXIV, p. 556, April 1878.
 3. "The people of Grahamstown are very full of their own excellencies." I. 168.
 4. c.f. II, 282-3 with §31 of the Barry Report on Native Law and Customs (Cape 64-1883, p. 20): "It appears that although the Chiefs have at times exercised despotic power to such an extent as to induce some witnesses to come to the conclusion that the will of the Chief is law to his tribe, the power of making law does not in reality vest absolutely, in the Chief... If the Chief who attempted a change did so without consulting his councillors, and without allowing the proposed change to be publicly and thoroughly canvassed before it was adopted, the probability would be that, if the law were at all objectionable, the disaffected would withdraw their allegiance from the Chief and transfer it to another."

never sold,"¹ and hence polygamy was not a form of slavery, as some polemicists claimed; but he found the practice "abominable" and did not understand that the contractual element in Xhosa marriages was between two lineages rather than between two individuals.² It is more than likely that some of his departures from Maclean were the result of long conversations with Jonathan Ayliff, with whom he spent a week in Grahamstown. Ayliff's was the one dissenting voice from the findings of the Barry Commission, and he duly submitted a highly conservative Minority Report.³

It must be conceded that despite its many virtues, Trollope's South Africa is not without defects. The book was hastily written, and bears the marks of it. There are mistakes, serious mistakes, together with repetitious passages, while many of its judgments are obscured by a tendency to temporise, as in the case of the gun trade, the Transvaal annexation, and the development of the Kowie.⁴ But even when evasive, the book is lively, and the integrity of its author is never in doubt. He is clearly an upper class Liberal Englishman responding to a new environment, rushing away to jot down his latest impressions while they are still fresh in his mind. He wants his readers to be under no illusions on his account, and so he divulges his writing methods, explains that he is writing the last chapter as the ship takes him homewards across the Bay of Biscay, and frankly admits that his book is superficial.⁵

1. II, 300.
2. When cattle changed hands, two sets of rights were transferred from the woman's people to the man's people: the rights over the woman herself, and the rights over the children ensuing from the union. The rights over the woman were vested in the husband alone; but the rights over the children were vested in his lineage. Thus in the event of his death without heir, the levirate would come into operation and one of his brothers would have intercourse with the widow to produce a child who would be regarded as both son and heir of the deceased husband. (Prof. W. D. Hammond-Tooke).
3. Barry Report on Native Law and Customs (Cape G4-1883).
4. II, 199; II, ch.III; I, 179-80 respectively.
5. II, 325 - 330.

Yet the very fact which accounts for most of its weaknesses, its hasty composition, is also the source of its great and abiding merit: its immediacy. The book was begun the day after Trollope arrived in Cape Town and was nearly complete when he left the country five months later;¹ with the notable exception of the chapters on the Western Cape, it follows the order in which it was written, and therefore has something of the character of a diary. In any final assessment, this must be borne in mind; and in diaries absolute accuracy is less important than absolute honesty. Honesty in this case means not only the ability to assess a situation impartially, but also the capacity to modify formulated opinions in the light of subsequent experience. This Trollope certainly did: if he had not, the book would have advocated Eastern Province separatism, upheld Confederation, and supported the popular view in England that the Boers were sleazy primitives. Thus the very inconsistencies in the South Africa are not without a merit of their own, for they often indicate stages in the development of Trollope's thought.

South Africans, noting the inconsistencies and factual blemishes, have tended to cast the book aside. Until recently, it was scarce in this country, and had gone into limbo with the accounts of other travellers who came to these shores in the wake of Barrow and Durnell. Yet in Trollope will be found a fair-minded account of the country and all its peoples;² one of the first recognitions of Kimberley as the cradle of the new South Africa, its prosperity based on minerals and its towns swelling with a black proletariat;³

-
1. Working diary in Trollope Papers, f.44, MS. Don C.10 Bodleian Library.
 2. Both the Zulus and the Boers received the accolade: intrinsically they were gentlemen. "The Dutch Boer," Trollope wrote (II, 328), "with all his roughness, is a gentleman in his manners from his head to his heels." On I, 27, he declared that "the Zulu is a gentleman and will only work as it suits him."
 3. II, 190.

and a recognition of the fact that any attempt by the British Government to extend the franchise to the black majority would be fiercely resisted by the colonists, even to the point of rebellion.¹ While it is true that Trollope's South Africa does not deserve to become the standard nineteenth century account of the country as his work on Australia has become, it is time that it were recognised as a neglected classic, and neglected no longer.

1. I, 33.

A P P E N D I X A

LETTER OF TROLLOPE TO SIR THEOPHILUS SHEPSTONE

(Shepstone Papers, Natal Archives, Box 21.)

Govt. House, Pretoria

30 September 1877.

My dear Sir,

I have just received your most kind letter of the 24th. Col. Brooke, with Mr. Henderson, Mr. Osborn and Dr. Lyle have done everything for me, and have enabled me to enjoy your hospitality with the only drawback of your absence. You were the one person whom I was most anxious to see in South Africa, and it is a matter of great regret to me that I shall be obliged to leave the Transvaal without doing so.

I most heartily congratulate you on the manner in which you have performed one of the most difficult services that have fallen to the lot of a British subject in later days, and also, - though the matter is one which probably comes home to you less keenly, - on the way that service has been received in England. It has been by your own courage and skill that it has been so well done, - That it should have satisfied both the Government and the opposition has to be ascribed partly to Good Fortune, - partly perhaps to the fairness of the Liberals with whom are always my own political sympathies.

I am of course endeavouring to form an opinion as to justification of a measure which was certainly not in accord with our colonial theories at home. That the thing done has been infinitely to the advantages of the country, - Dutch, English, and natives, - there can I think be no doubt. The difficult question is this. If it be our duty to save this or another country from ruin by our money, by our arms, and by our energy, when is that duty to stop? One is tempted to say of every annexation: - that is good; but now let us stop. But when the

next case comes up we do not stop, and it may be that at last we shall stretch our hands too far.

Again thanking you for your great kindness, and with the hope that I may still some day make your personal acquaintance, dear sir, I remain,

Most faithfully yours

Anthony Trollope

His Excellency

Sir T. Shepstone.

(The only other Trollope letter I have found is addressed to Molteno and dated 1 . viii. 1877, declining an invitation [to dinner?]
Molteno Papers, S.A.L.)

A P P E N D I X B

T R O L L O P E ' S I T I N E R A R Y

TOGETHER WITH CONTEMPORARY EVENTS OF IMPORTANCE

1877

- July 21 Arrives at CAPE TOWN by S.S. Caldera (Cape Times, 23.vii);
visits Parliament, July 23 (Cape Argus, 26.vii);
visits Mr. Holladay Brown, July 29 (Lantern, 4.viii);
visits Sir Thomas Maclear August 1 (Journal of Miss
Mary Maclear, Maclear Papers, Cape Archives).
- [August 3: the Fingo marriage feast which sets in motion the events
leading to the Ngqika - Gcaleka War.]
- August 4 Leaves CAPE TOWN per R.M.S. Natal for PORT ELIZABETH
(Cape Times, 6.viii).
- August 5 Calls at MOSSEL BAY (M.B. Advertiser, 8.viii).
- August 6 Arrives at PORT ELIZABETH (Cape Argus, 9.viii).
- August 10 Arrives GRAHAMSTOWN (Journal, 10.viii); at Heatherton
Towers, August 11 (Cape Times, 21.viii); visits
Port Alfred, August 12 (Cape Times, 21.viii); dines
with Grahamstown Club, August 14 (Cape Times,
21.viii).
- [August 10: South Africa Act, sanctioning Confederation, receives
royal assent .]
- August 16 Passes through PORT BEAUFORT (Cape Times, 24.viii).
- August 20 At KING WILLIAMS TOWN (Kaffrarian Watchman, 20.viii);
dines with King Williams Town Club, (Watchman,
22.viii).
- August 24 Arrives EAST LONDON (Dispatch, 27.viii).
- August 27 Leaves EAST LONDON per R.M.S. Stettin for DURBAN
(Dispatch, 27.viii).
- August 29 Arrives DURBAN (Natal Colonist, 31.viii); is taken by
the Mayor, Mr. Arbuckle, on a short trip into
Victoria County, where he visits the Cornubia and
Blackburn Estates as well as Verulam. (Journal, 17.ix).
- September 1 Arrives PIETERMARITZBURG from DURBAN (Friend, 13.ix); hears
Colenso preach, September 2 (text, I, 284); at
Bishopstowe, September 4 and 5 (letter of Colenso to
Frank Colenso, 'Monday morning', Colenso Papers Folio
12L) Mayoral banquet, September 6 (Times of Natal,
8.ix).
- September 8-11 Accompanies Bulwer on Vice-regal tour of NATAL MIDLANDS
(Friend, 20.ix); Bulwer to Shepstone, 11.ix).
- September 13 Leaves PIETERMARITZBURG for PRETORIA (Volksstem, 26.ix).

- September 15-17 At NEWCASTLE (text, I, 350:)
- September 18-24 En route to PRETORIA.
- September 24 Arrives at PRETORIA (Volksstem, 26.ix); visits army camp, September 25 (Natal Witness, 16.x); visits Salt Pan, September 29-30 (Cape Times, 17.x).
- [September 26: Ngqika-Gcaleka War - battle of Gwandana.]
- [September 30: Battle of Ibeka.]
- October 1 Leaves PRETORIA for KIMBERLEY (Cape Times, 17.x).
- October 3-4 At POTCHEFSTROOM (Cape Times, 30.x).
- [October 9: Ngqika - Gcaleka War - Sarili's great place burnt.]
- October 12 Arrives at KIMBERLEY (Eastern Star, 19.x); sells his equipage, October 14 (Booth, p.363).
- October 22 Leaves KIMBERLEY for BLOEMFONTEIN (Friend, 25.x).
- October 23 Arrives BLOEMFONTEIN (Friend, 25.x).
- October 29-30 Visits THABA 'NCHU (Friend, 1.xi).
- November 2-6[?] Travels from BLOEMFONTEIN to GRAHAMSTOWN by coach (Friend, 1.xi). Night of the 5th at QUEENSTOWN (Standard and Mail 17.xi).
- November 8 Leaves PORT ELIZABETH per R.M.S. Kafir (inferred from below).
- November 9 Arrives MOSSEL BAY per Kafir (M.B. Advertiser, 14.xi).
- November 9-17 Visits GEORGE, KNYSNA and OUDTSHOORN.
- November 17 Leaves MOSSEL BAY for CAPE TOWN, per R.M.S. Dublin Castle (M.B. Advertiser, 21.xi).
- November 18 Arrives at CAPE TOWN and stays at RATHFELDER'S, Diep River.
- [November 19: Burgher forces in the Transkei start to disband.]
- November 29 Leaves for PAARL, WORCESTER, and SWELLENDAM with T.E. Fuller (Cape Argus, 29.xi).
- [December 4: Commandant Griffith calls for reinforcements.]
- December 7 Returns to CAPE TOWN; guest of Fuller at Boll-Hope, Mowbray (Cape Argus, 11.xii; Trollope Papers, f44, Bodleian Library).
- [December 10: All soldiers in Cape Town sent eastwards.]
- December 11 Leaves CAPE TOWN for England per R.M.S. Nubian (Cape Times, 12.xii).

SOUTH AFRICAN ELEMENTS IN TROLLOPE'S FICTION

Anthony Trollope rarely failed to turn his travels to literary advantage. There are two 'Australian' novels, another five set in Ireland, and numerous short stories encompassing the globe from Nuremburg to New Zealand; moreover, errant Americans or Continentals frequently stray into the pages of the more famous novels. Hence it would be somewhat surprising if Trollope had made no use at all of his South African travels; and although we cannot point to a 'South African' novel to match the 'Australian' Harry Heathcote of Gangoil and John Caldigate, there are two which contain important elements of South African interest.

There is in addition a short sketch published in the Pall Mall Gazette on May 10, 1865 entitled 'The Zulu in London'. Writing in the first person, 'the Zulu' describes his reaction on being taken to a May meeting in Exeter Hall, the haunt of the evangelicals. He is struck by the magnificence of the building, and by the large number of women in the congregation; and he is somewhat amazed to learn that his Bishop, Colenso, would probably be torn from limb to limb by these good Christian folk. Indeed he becomes fearful for his own safety:

'What will they do to the Zulu', I asked, 'if such be their treatment of the Zulu's friend and pupil? For my heart swelled within me as I remembered certain passages in our religious conferences at home, wherein the bishop had learned, perhaps, more than he had taught.'

But nothing untoward happens until he is espied by a canon, who launches into an attack on Colensoite doctrines and their pernicious undermining of the old biblical certainties. The Zulu wishes to contest these points, but is told that he must not, whereupon 'I simply resolved that I would not pass another morning within the Hall of Exeter during my sojourn in this city'. These sentiments were Trollope's own, induced by boredom; they are reproduced in a letter to the publisher of the Pall Mall Gazette, in which the novelist categorically refused to go on with a proposed series of articles.¹

1. Letter to Geo. Smith 5.v.1865. Booth, Letters of Anthony Trollope. pp. 162-63.

It was a wise decision, for the sketch is dull and unmemorable save for the satirical device of casting an urbane Zulu among an assembly of fundamentalists to suggest the inadequacy of their beliefs in the face of the new theology of Colenso.

Trollope's most vivid use of South African materials did not occur until 1892, when he penned his last completed manuscript, the novel An Old Man's Love. The 'old man' is one William Whittlestaff, who decides to take in Mary Larrie, the twenty-five years old daughter of a former friend, when she is left without family and without independent means. Living together in a menage à trois with an assertive housekeeper, Mr. Whittlestaff slowly discovers that he is falling in love with his young charge. He duly proposes to her, and after some misgivings on Mary's part - the misgivings concern a young man named John Gordon whom she has not seen for three years - she accepts him. But on that very day there is a knock on the door and Gordon enters, a wealthy man just returned from Kimberley. He has come to claim Mary for his own; but her engagement, together with the fact that he had not hitherto declared his love for her, presents an apparently insuperable difficulty.

However we are made to feel that these difficulties are but nothing compared with Gordon's new-found wealth. For Trollope makes it quite clear that in grubbing around for diamonds he has lost caste. Previously, he had gentility but no money; now he has money, but scant gentility. Both the housekeeper and Gordon's easy-going clergyman friend, Montagu Blake, are suspicious of his new-found wealth, the taint of which is compared with the honest dirt of coal; meanwhile Mr. Whittlestaff is able to imagine that he is marrying Mary partly to save her from Gordon's unworthiness. As he explains at the end of the novel,

'I should have been inclined to say at first sight that a man groping in the dirt for diamonds couldn't love any-one ... These things stick to the very soul of a man. They are a poison of which he cannot rid himself. They are like gambling. They make everything cheap that should be dear, and everything dear that should be cheap. I trust them not, at all, - and I do not trust you, because you deal in them.'

1. An Old Man's Love. World Classics edition. Oxford 1946. pp. 230, 234.

Trollope does his best to show us that Mr. Whittlestaff's misgivings are soundly based; Gordon's loose-living partner Tooke materialises towards the end of the narrative and comes close to threatening blackmail should he not sell his share of the claim.

So great is the taint attached to diamonds that it becomes part of the plot mechanism of the novel, which seems to advance the following proposition; if it is unnatural for a gentleman to go out digging for diamonds, (which it is) then it is no more unnatural for another gentleman of fifty to wed a girl of twenty-five. However the resultant impasse is resolved by Whittlestaff himself, who with great generosity sees that he must not allow Mary's sense of duty to stand in the way of her happiness, and so surrenders her to Gordon and - diamonds be damned! - grotesquely toys with the idea of going out to Kimberley himself. It is a notion greeted with horror by all around him. He is, after all, a gentleman; and the proper place for a gentleman is home in England.

Thus it can be argued that although none of its scenes are actually set there, Kimberley comes to haunt the book. In a very real sense An Old Man's Love is the sequel to the Griqualand West chapters of South Africa; Trollope's own distaste for diamonds is now writ large for all the world to see. Indeed his impressions of Kimberley, distilled with the passage of time, are even more pungent in the novel than in the travel book.¹ Yet it must be noted that An Old Man's Love is very much the inferior to John Caldigate, which treats with a similar situation in that the hero returns with the idea of top-dressing his English acres 'with a little Australian gold'.²

It was possibly because John Caldigate was completed on the way out to South Africa³ that Trollope did not turn to the country for inspiration earlier: being interested mainly in the interaction between colonies and Mother Country, he may have felt that he had exhausted the theme for the moment. For he certainly retained an interest in South

1. op. cit. p.68.

2. John Caldigate. World Classics edition. Oxford 1946. p.217.

3. Sadleir, M.: Trollope : A Commentary. Oxford 1961. p.412.

Africa long after his return: he invested money there,¹ read material of South African interest for his publishers,² and delivered public lectures on the country well into 1879.³ But it was not until the following year, when he wrote the novel The Fixed Period, that he put the recollections of his recent tour to literary purposes.

The Fixed Period (1882) is a strange tale. Advanced to the year 1980, the plot concerns the affairs of Brittanula, a former settlement colony now an island republic in the South Seas. Its president, the narrator, has conceived a scheme whereby the old are to voluntarily place themselves in a Necropolis at the age of 67, where on the expiration of the Fixed Period (their sixty-eighth birthday) they are to be consigned to oblivion. After some debate the legislature gives its approval, won over by the argument that the aging will be spared an unpleasant senescence. An old friend of the President is the first to become eligible for removal, and although scarcely enamoured of the idea is prepared to see it through because he gave his word. However, dissidents have appealed to England, and a British gunboat duly arrives in time to stop proceedings and to end the Republic. The novel ends with the president writing these memoirs on board ship as he is being taken back to England.

The first point to note about this novel is that it was begun on 17 December 1880, and completed on 28 February 1881;⁴ the Transvaal War broke out on 16 December 1880, and lasted until an armistice was arranged on 6 March 1881. Although Trollope may have begun it without any immediate purpose in mind, events in the Transvaal might therefore be expected to influence the work as it progressed. Such would appear to be the case on examination of detail in the novel. Quite early in the piece, there is a dialogue between President Neverbend and an English lord,

1. In 1879 Trollope purchased shares in the Standard Bank of South Africa, which he still held at the time of his death. See 'Akanthos': "Trollope, Man of Business", in South African Banker's Journal, XLIX, 1952-53; Booth, Letters of Anthony Trollope, p. 446.
2. Trollope read My Chief and I, a novel by Atherton Wylde (Miss Frances Colenso) for Chapman and Hall, somewhat disapprovingly. Booth, Letters of Anthony Trollope, pp. 424-25, 427.
3. Nottingham and Midland Counties Daily Express. 24.x.1879. carries a report of a lecture entitled "The Zulus and Zululand".
4. Sadleir. Trollope: A Commentary. p. 413.

the latter advancing Trollope's own theory that wherever the English language is spoken there are Englishmen. The president rejects this, and with it the suggestion that the Republic should then set about minting its own coins. His own portrait would presumably appear on them, and 'I have never pushed the question much, lest I should seem, as have done some presidents, over anxious to exhibit myself'. Clearly Trollope was thinking of President Burgers, who in South Africa is chided for his pretensions.¹ These, the novelist knew, had come to naught; immediately before the annexation Burgers had been reported as saying that he would rather be a policeman in a well-run state than President of the Transvaal.²

Neverbend, considering the possibility of a mob preventing the first deposition, has similar sentiments. It is in the narrative of the annexation of Brittanula, however, that the resemblance with the Transvaal is most striking. Although Neverbend points out that the Fixed Period was approved by the sovereign legislature, he is no more effective than the resolutions of the Transvaal Volksraad were in staying annexation by Britain.³ All he can do is to give way: 'Your power is so superior to any that I can advance, as to make us here feel that there is no disgrace in yielding to it. Therefore we can be courteous while we submit'. In essence this had been the position of Burgers of the Transvaal. His personal authority eroded, effective resistance was impossible; while to march Sir Theophilus Shepstone and his twenty-five policemen back across the border would have been to wage war with Great Britain. The course he adopted, and the one Trollope approved, was to yield to power while he remonstrated against injustice. Neverbend does the same, and is clearly the only man in his country to protest against the annexation. In South Africa, ex-President Burgers was the only man Trollope met who questioned the propriety of what had been done in the Transvaal.⁴ Again, President Neverbend reflects that although 'many were pleased to see a warship arrive to end the Fixed Period, hardly any-one was pleased to lose his independence'; of the Transvaal Boers Trollope wrote that although the rise in

-
1. Compare The Fixed Period (Tauchnitz undated edition, Leipzig) p.104, and South Africa, II, 42.
 2. This statement is discounted by Uys, In the Era of Shepstone, p.362, as being a later fabrication; but it was reported in the Natal Mercury of 17.iii.1877.
 3. Compare The Fixed Period, pp. 73, 202. with II, 51.
 4. Compare The Fixed Period, pp. 200, 271. with II, 56-57.

land values would mean that they would gain most, it was 'almost cruel' to ask them to consent to their own annexation. But it would have been 'more cruel' not to annexe them.¹

Beyond these similarities between the two annexations, The Fixed Period may also be read as a parable, as an oblique apologia for the annexations of the Transvaal. In doing so, it must be remembered that for Trollope, to write a good novel was to write a didactic one; while a passage in the Cicero, published the year before, states that 'the man of letters is ... ever writing his own biography. What is there in his mind, is being declared to the world at large by himself'.² From The Fixed Period it is apparent that Trollope conceives Britain acting as policeman of the world for many years to come: the novel postulates a situation in which she acts, as the embodiment of civilised opinion, against an Anglo-Saxon buttee, sour fruit of colonial radicalism. As far as Trollope was concerned, there could be no Higher Provincialism: hence the Boers of the Free State are described as being 'too wise to look among themselves' for men to take high office.³ In the last analysis, even the post-colonial situation requires imperious British action against an English people for their own good when a sufficient number appeals for intervention. This is close to the position in the Transvaal in 1877, as Trollope understood it; the British government and press, fearful of the consequences for Southern Africa as a whole, were eager for the annexation in view of the incompetence of its government; Shepstone's commission, however, stated the necessity of procuring the support of a sufficient number of the inhabitants. Mounting Boer dissension showed how freely these instructions had been interpreted, until in 1881 the issue was whether Britain would be justified in re-conquering the territory or whether she should gracefully withdraw. Trollope's disillusionment with both political parties made him incapable of taking an active part in the debate then raging. But in writing The Fixed Period instead, he extrapolated features from the Transvaal annexation to ascertain the kind of situation in which British intervention was justifiable.

1. Compare The Fixed Period, p.226, with II, 63.

2. Cicero (2 vols. London 1881) I, 12.

3. II, 265.

The South African elements in Trollope's fiction are therefore somewhat slight, although of considerable structural importance in the two novels in which they appear. Perhaps the most curious aspect is the impact that the proto-Neverbend, President Burgers, seems to have made on Trollope; for it can be said that that ill-starred leader of a frontier republic not only talked with Darwin and corresponded with Froude, but also inspired a novel from the hand of one of the great English writers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. THE 'SOUTH AFRICA'

II. TROILLOE

III. SOUTH AFRICA

I. THE 'SOUTH AFRICA'

A. TEXT.

1. The Manuscript (MS 1331 on microfilm from the Henry E. Huntington Library, Pasadena, California).

2. The Travel Letters (published in The Cape Times on the following dates:

- | | | |
|-------|---|------------------------------|
| I. | South Africa as a Dutch Possession | 20. xi. 1877 |
| II. | South Africa as a British Possession | 27. xi. 1877 |
| III. | Present Political Condition | 12. xii. 1877 |
| IV. | Present Political Condition | 15. xii. 1877 |
| V. | South Africa as a Dutch Possession -
Cape Town | 22. i. 1878 |
| VI. | South Africa as a Dutch Possession -
Legislature and Executive | 28. xii. 1877 |
| VII. | Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown | 3. i. 1878 |
| VIII. | British Kaffraria and the Lovedale
Mission | 9. i. 1878 |
| IX. | The Zuluo | 15. i. 1878 |
| X. | Natal | (25. i. 1878
28. i. 1878) |
| XI. | [Griqualand West] | 1. ii. 1878 |
| XII. | Kimberley | 6. ii. 1878 |
| XIII. | The Transvaal | 11. ii. 1878 |
| XIV. | The Orange Free State | 18. ii. 1878 |
| XV. | Kroli and His Kafir | 4. iii. 1878) |

3. Article, "Kafir Land", Fortnightly Review, vol. XXIII. New Series, 1 February 1878.

4. South Africa, two vols., Chapman and Hall, London 1878. Four 'editions'; more correctly printings, as the only changes are corrections of spelling mistakes.

5. South Africa, one volume, "Abridged by the author from the Fourth Edition", Chapman and Hall 1879. Contains additional chapter, "Zululand".

B. REVIEWS AND EXTENDED COMMENTARIES ON THE BOOK.

I. ENGLISH.

The Times (April 18, 1878)

Saturday Review (February 23, 1878)

Athenaeum (February 16, 1878)

Academy (April 6, 1878)

The Empire (March 7, 1878; a South African weekly published in London, incorporating in its own notice of the book a review that appeared in the London Examiner).

The Examiner, (March 2, 1878) p. 272.

The Illustrated London News (March 23, 1878)

The Graphic (February 23, 1878)

The Mirror of Literature (March 2, 1878)

The Pall Mall Budget: reviewing the article "Kafir Land" in the Fortnightly Review; (February 6, 1878); reprinted, The Eastern Star, Grahamstown, March 26, 1878.

Edinburgh Review (CXLIX, April 1879 pp. 534-563). Reviewing Trollope among a batch of recent publications.

Blackwood's Magazine (CCXXIV, July 1878). Article "The South African Question", pp. 97 - 118.

British Quarterly Review (CXXXIV, April 1878).

The World (reproduced in the Queenstown Representative, 23. iv. 1878).

London Society, (vol. XXXIII, 1878, pp. 369 - 378.)

The Spectator, (April 6, 1878, p. 445.)

Colonies and India (May 18, 1878, p. 9.)

II. SOUTH AFRICAN.

The Cape Times (Cape Town: leading articles, Nov. 22, 1877; Nov. 27, 1877; Jan. 8, 1878; Jan. 21, 1878; review articles, March 20, 1878; March 21, 1878; April 1, 1878; and April 23, 1878).

The Cape Argus (Cape Town; March 16 and March 21, 1878).

The Standard and Mail (Cape Town, March 21, 1878) leading article.

Het Volksblad (Cape Town, March 23, 1878).

The Journal (Grahamstown, April 10, April 12, and April 15, 1878) - leading articles.

Times of Natal (Pietermaritzburg, May 8, 1878) - leading article.

Natal Witness (Pietermaritzburg, April 9, 1878) - leading article.

Natal Mercury (Durban, February 7, March 28, and May 10, 1878) - leading articles.

The Lantern (weekly, Cape Town: particularly January 26, 1878)

Eastern Province Herald (Port Elizabeth 22. iii. 1878).

Diamond News (Kimberley, Jan. 12, Feb. 12, and Feb. 16, 1878) - leading articles.

Cape Monthly Magazine (XVI, June 1878, pp. 362 - 74.) Review by S. R. M.

St. Andrew's College Magazine (Vol. IV, no. 2, May 1882). Article, "Popular Errors about South Africa."

Aylward, A.: The Transvaal of To-Day (Edinburgh, 1878). Chapter XIII, 'Blundering', is a sustained attack on Trollope.

III. OTHER.

Revue des Deux Mondes (Paris; art. by E. Montegut: "Les Colonies de l'Afrique Australe", Tome 32, 1879, pp. 914-935; Tome 34, 1879, pp. 154-180.

II. TROLLOPE

A. WORKS: THE NOVELS, AND OTHER FICTION.

The Macdermots of Ballycloran [1848] Fifth undated edition, Chapman and Hall, London.

The Kellys and the O'Kellys [1848] Oxford World Classics, 1951.

La Vendée [1850]. A rarity; the edition used was the Chapman and Hall reprint of 1874, the copy having been presented by Trollope to G. W. Rusden. In the library of Trinity College, University of Melbourne.

The Warden [1855] Zodiac Press, London, 1960.

Barchester Towers [1857] Zodiac Press, London, 1963.

The Three Clerks [1858] Oxford World Classics, 1959.

Doctor Thorne [1858] Zodiac Press, London, 1962.

The Bertrams [1859]

Castle Richmond [1860] Ninth undated edition. Chapman and Hall, London.

Tales of All Countries [First series, 1861] Fourth undated edition, Chapman and Hall; combined with the Second Series listed below.

Framley Parsonage [1861]. Zodiac Press, London, 1955.

Orley Farm [1862] Oxford World Classics, 2 vols. 1935

Tales of All Countries [second series, 1863]. Fourth undated edition, Chapman and Hall, London.

Rachel Ray [1863] Oxford World Classics, 1951

The Small House at Allington [1864] Zodiac Press, London, 1950.

Can You Forgive Her? [1864] Oxford Illustrated Trollope, 2 vols. 1948.

Miss Mackenzie [1865]

The Belton Estate [1866] Oxford World Classics, 1958

Nina Balatka [1867] Oxford World Classics, 1951

The Last Chronicle of Barset [1867] Zodiac Press, London, 1961

The Claverings [1867] Oxford World Classics.

Lotta Schmidt: And Other Stories [1867] 'New' undated edition, Ward Lock and Company, London.

Linda Tressel [1868] Oxford World Classics, 1946.

Phineas Finn [1869] Oxford Illustrated Trollope, 2 vols., 1949.

He Knew He Was Right [1869] Oxford World Classics, 1951

Did He Steal It? [play, 1869] Princeton, 1952

The Vicar of Bullhampton [1870] Oxford World Classics, 1963

An Editor's Tales [1870]

The Struggles of Brown, Jones and Robinson: By One of the Firm. [1870] Could be had only in the original, serialised form. The Cornhill Magazine, vols. IV and V, 1861 - 62.

Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite [1871] Williams and Norgate, London, 1948.

Ralph the Heir [1871] Oxford World Classics, 1951.

- The Golden Lion of Granpere [1872] Oxford World Classics, 1947.
The Eustace Diamonds [1873] Oxford Illustrated Trollope, 1951
Lady Anna [1874] Oxford World Classics, 1950.
Phineas Redux [1874] Oxford Illustrated Trollope, 1951
Harry Heathcote of Gangoil: A Tale of Australian Bush Life
 [1874] Lansdowne, Melbourne, 1963.
The Way We Live Now [1875] Oxford World Classics, 1962
The Prime Minister [1876] Oxford Illustrated Trollope, 1952.
The American Senator [1877] Oxford World Classics, 1951.
Is He Popenjoy? [1878] Oxford World Classics, 1951.
An Eye For An Eye [1879] the new edition in one volume of
 that year, published by Chapman and Hall.
John Caldigate [1879] Oxford World Classics, 1952.
Cousin Henry [1879] Oxford World Classics, 1929.
The Duke's Children [1880] Oxford Illustrated Trollope 1954.
Dr. Wortle's School [1881] Oxford World Classics, 1951.
Avala's Angel [1881] Oxford World Classics.
Why Frau Frohmann Raised Her Prices and Other Stories [1882]
 Chatto and Windus, London, 1892.
The Fixed Period [1882] Tauchnitz undated edition, Leipzig.
Marion Fay [1882] Chatto and Windus, London, 1885.
Kept in the Dark [1882].
Mr. Scarborough's Family [1883] Oxford World Classics, 1947.
The Landleaguers [1883] Chatto and Windus, 1884.
An Old Man's Love [1883] Oxford World Classics, 1951.
The Noble Jilt [1850] Play; first published by Constable,
 London, 1923.
The Two Heroines of Plumplington [1883] First published by Deutsch,
 1953.

WORKS : NON-FICTION

- The West Indies and the Spanish Main [1859] Chapman and Hall,
 1860
North America [1862] 2 vols., Chapman and Hall.
Hunting Sketches [1865].
Travelling Sketches (Chapman and Hall, 1866).
Clergymen of the Church of England (Chapman and Hall, 1866)
Australia and New Zealand (2 vols., Chapman and Hall, 1873)
Australia, edited by P. D. Edwards and R. B. Joyce, (Brisbane,
 1968).
How the 'Mastiffs' Went to Iceland (privately printed, 1878).
Thackeray [1879] Macmillan, London, 1909.
The Life of Cicero (2 vols., Chapman and Hall, 1880).
Lord Palmerston (Isbister, 1882).
An Autobiography [1883] Fontana paperback, London 1962.

London Tradesmen (edited by M. Sadleir; Elkin, Mathew and Marriot, London, 1928). Sketches from the Pall Mall Gazette, 1880.

Four Lectures (edited and published by M. Parrish, 1928).

The Tireless Traveller (edited by B. A. Booth; California, 1941). Letters contributed to The Liverpool Mercury, 1875.

Letters (edited by B. A. Booth; Oxford, 1951).

WORKS : OCCASIONAL JOURNALISM

Article, "A Zulu at a May Meeting", Pall Mall Gazette, 10. v. 1865.

B. SECONDARY MATERIAL

GUIDES

Irwin, M. L.: Anthony Trollope : A Bibliography, (New York, 1926).

Sadleir, M.: Trollope : A Bibliography (Oxford, 1928); together with the Supplement of 1934

STUDIES

Harrison, F.: Studies in Early Victorian Literature (London, 1895).

Escott, T. H. S.: Anthony Trollope: His Work, Associates and Literary Originals (London, 1913).

Sadleir, M.: Trollope: A Commentary 1927 Oxford Paperback 1961.

Walpole, H.: Anthony Trollope (London, 1929).

Cecil, Lord David: Early Victorian Novelists (London, 1934)

Stebbins, L.P. and A.P.: The Trollopes: the Chronicle of a Writing Family (London, 1947)

Brown, B.C.: Anthony Trollope (London, 1950).

Cookshut, A.O.J.: Anthony Trollope: A Critical Study (London, 1955).

Booth, B.A.: Anthony Trollope: Aspects of His Life and Work (1958)

Davies, H.S.: Trollope (London, 1960).

ARTICLES AND ISOLATED REFERENCES OF IMPORTANCE

Briggs, Asa: "Trollope, Bagehot, and the English Constitution", in his Victorian People (Penguin, 1965).

Tingay, L.O.: "Trollope's Popularity: A Statistical Approach", Victorian Studies XI, 3; December 1956.

Edwards, P.B.: "Anthony Trollope's Australian Novels", Southerly, No. 3 of 1965, Sydney.

Joyce, R. B.: "Editorial Problems in Presenting Trollope's Views on Australia", Queensland Heritage, No. 1, Brisbane, 1964.

"Akanthos" [Henry, Jas.] : "Trollope, Man of Business", in South African Banker's Journal, XLIX, 1952-1953

III. SOUTH AFRICA.

A. REFERENCE: BIBLIOGRAPHIES, INDEXES, GUIDES.

- Goodfellow, C.F.: Great Britain and South African Confederation, 1870 - 1881 (Cape Town, 1966)
- Mendelssohn, S.: South African Bibliography (2 vols., London, 1910.)
- Muller, C.F.J., van Wijk, T., and van Jaarsveld, F.A.: A Select Bibliography of South African History (Pretoria, 1966).
- Theal, G.H.C.: Catalogue of Books and Pamphlets Relating to Africa South of the Zambesi (1912; reprinted Cape Town, 1963).
- Drake, H.: A Bibliography of African Education (Aberdeen, 1942).
- Schapera, I.: A Select Bibliography of South African Native Life and Problems (Oxford, 1941).
- Long, Una: An Index to Authors of Unofficial, Privately-owned Manuscripts Relating to the History of South Africa, 1812 - 1920. (London, 1947).
- South African Public Library: Union List of South African Newspapers (Cape Town, 1950).
- de Wet, L.J.: Pictures of South African Interest in the Illustrated London News, 1842 - 1949 (Johannesburg, 1956).
- Webb, C.deB.: A Guide to the Official Records of the Colony of Natal (Pietermaritzburg, 1965).
- Dictionary of National Biography.
- Dictionary of South African Biography (I, Cape Town, 1968).
- Rosenthal, E.: Southern African Dictionary of National Biography (London, 1966).
- Wills, W.H. (ed): The Anglo-African Who's Who (London, 1907)
- Silver, S.W. (publishers): Handbook to South Africa (London, 1879).
- General Directory and Guide to the Cape of Good Hope and Dependencies (Cape Town, 1877)
- Commercial Directory and Guide to the Eastern Province of the Cape of Good Hope (Grahamstown, 1880)
- Jeppe, F.: Transvaal Almanac, 1877 (Pietermaritzburg, 1877)

B. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

(i) OFFICIAL:

Cape Archives -

- G.H. 9/11-12 Lieutenant-Governor of Natal to High Commissioner, 1876 - 77.
- G.H. 11/3 Administrator of Transvaal to High Commissioner, 1877.
- G.H. 1/73-74 Secretary of State: Despatches General to High Commissioner, 1876-77.
- G.H. 4/1 Secretary of State: Despatches to High Commissioner - Confidential 1876 - 77

Natal Archives, Pietermaritzburg -

- G.H. 1220 Lieutenant-Governor to Secretary of State, 1877
 G.H. 1300 Lieutenant-Governor to Secretary of State -
 Confidential, 1877.
 G.H. 1634-36 Memoranda for Sir Garnet Wolseley, 1876.

Orange Free State Archives, Bloemfontein -

- G.S. 1516 Government Secretary's Letter Book.
 P. 4 State President's Papers: Private Letters and
 Addresses to J.H. Brand.

(11) UNOFFICIAL:

Bodleian Library, Oxford -

Trollope Papers, MS Don. C10, f 42-44.

Cory Library, Rhodes University, Grahamstown -

W. G. Atherstone Papers; Sprigg Papers; Lovedale Collection;
 Methodist Archive Collection

Killic Campbell Library, Durban -

Colenso Papers; W. Ayliff Papers; Cato Papers; Greenstock
 Papers; Shepstone Papers.

Gubbins Library, Witwatersrand University, Johannesburg. -

John Mackenzie Papers; Robert Godlonton Papers; deVilliers
 letter; Atherstone letter; Jenkins Papers; John Bird
 papers; Frewen Journal and Appended Kaffrarian letters.

Johannesburg Public Library -

Saul Solomon Papers; Charles Read Papers; Charles Read's
 Narrative of the Sekukuni War; Port Alfred Harbourmaster's
 Letter Book, 1871-1913.

Kimberley Public Library -

Boet MS., The Grand Old Days of the Diamond Fields : P. Orpen,
 Letter book 1876-77.

South African Library, Cape Town -

Milteno Papers; Merriman Papers.

Cape Archives -

Maclear Papers; Southey Papers.

Transvaal Archives, Pretoria -

Burgers Papers; Lanyon Collection.

Natal Archives, Pietermaritzburg -

Sir Theophilus Shepstone Papers; J. W. Shepstone Papers;
 Offy Shepstone Papers; Sutton Papers.

In possession of Mr. S. Thesen, Knysna -

The Diaries of Henry Barrington, vol. II, 1872-1882,

C. OFFICIAL PRINTED SOURCES(1) BRITISH:

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series, 1876 - 1877.

Parliamentary Papers: C1748, Correspondence re: Transvaal,
Native Affairs, (1877)
C1776, C1814/15. Papers re: Annexation
of Transvaal. (1877).

(ii) CAPE:

Blue Books for the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, 1876-1878.

Native Affairs Blue Books, 1875-1877.

Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly, 1875-1877.

Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Council, 1875-1877.

Report of a Commission to... inquire into... Colonial Defence,
G1 - 1877.

Report... of the Government Commission on Native Laws and
Customs, G4 - 1883.

Preliminary Report on the State of Education in the Cape of Good
Hope, by Donald Ross... Inspector General of Colleges and
Schools. G12-1883.

(iii) NATAL:

Blue Books for the Colony of Natal, 1876-1878.

Report on Crown Lands and European Immigration, 1876.

Report of Land and Immigration Board, 1876.

Report of the Protector of [Indian] Immigrants for 1877 (1878).

Report of the Expedition Sent by the Government of Natal to
Install Cetewayo as King of the Zulus... August 1873.

Report of the Natal Native Commission, 1881 - 1882.

Papers Relating to the Supply, by Native Chiefs, of Native Labour
in Connection with the Public Works of the Colony, 1880.

D. PRINTED COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS

Eybers, G.W. (ed): Select Constitutional Documents Illustrating
South African History, 1795 - 1910 (London,
1918).

Lewsen, P. (ed): Selections from the Correspondence of J. X.
Merriman, 1870 - 1890. Van Riebeeck Society,
Cape Town, 1960.

Newton, A.P. (ed): Select Documents Relating to the Unification
of South Africa (2 vols, London, 1924).

Rees, W. (ed): Colenso Letters from Natal (Pietermaritzburg,
1958).

Transvaal Independence Committee: Deputation to Lord Kimberley...
and Mr. Grant Duff (London, 1881)

E. CONTEMPORARY WRITINGS(1) NEWSPAPERS:

The Times (London) 1876 - 1878.

The Empire (London) 1876 - 1878.

The Illustrated London News 1877.
Colonies and India (London) 1877.
South African Mail (London) 1871.
Journal of the Society of Arts, 1872-1885.
The Cape Argus, 1876 - 1877.
The Cape Times, 1876 - 1877.
The Christian Express (Lovedale) 1871 - 1877.
Die Afrikaanse Patriot (Paarl) 1876 - 1877.
The Transvaal Advocate (Pretoria) 1876 - 1877.
The Transvaal Argus (Pretoria) 1876 - 1877.
Die Volksstem (Pretoria) 1876 - 1877.
The Gold Fields Mercury (Pretoria) 1876 - 1878.
Quarterly Paper of the Bloemfontein Mission, 1875 - 1878.
The Natal Witness (Pietermaritzburg) 1876 - 1877.
The Natal Mercury (Durban) 1875 - 1877.
The Times of Natal (Pietermaritzburg) 1876 - 1877.

with occasional references to:

The Alice Times; The Cape Mercury (King Williams Town); The Cape Town Daily News; The Daily News (London); The Diamond News (Kimberley); The Dispatch (East London); The Eastern Province Herald (Port Elizabeth); The Eastern Star (Grahamstown); The Fort Beaufort Advocate; The Friend (Bloemfontein); The Graaff-Reinet Herald; Grocott's Penny Mail (Grahamstown); The Guide (King Williams Town); The Independent (Kimberley); The Journal (Grahamstown); The Kaffrarian Watchman (King Williams Town); The Lantern (Cape Town); The Lovedale News; The Mossel Bay Advertiser; The Northern Post (Aliwal North); The Observer (Port Elizabeth); The Port Elizabeth Telegraph; The Queenstown Representative; The Standard and Mail (Cape Town); The Uitenhage Times; Het Volksblad (Cape Town); Die Zuid Afrikaan (Cape Town.)

(ii) PERIODICALS:

Blackwood's Magazine; Contemporary Review; Edinburgh Review; Fortnightly Review; Macmillan's Magazine; Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute; Quarterly Review.

Cape Monthly Magazine; St. Andrew's College Magazine (Grahamstown).

(iii) BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS: (including Trollope's own sources).

Aylward, A.: The Transvaal of Today (Edinburgh, 1878).
 Baines, T.: The Gold Regions of South-Eastern Africa (London, 1877).
 Bamang-Wato [Albert Brodrick]: To Ophir Direct... (London, 1868).
 Bird, J.: The Form of Constitutional Government existing in the Colony of Natal considered... (Pietermaritzburg, 1869).
 Bond, T.: Remarks on the Policy pursued in the Government of the Native Population in Natal, from 1843 to 1874. (Durban, 1875).
 [Boon, M.J.]: How to Colonise South Africa (Grahamstown, 1883).
 Brooks, H., ed. R.J. Mann: Natal (London, 1876).

- Brownlee, C.: An Address... to the King Williamstown Missionary Conference, 1887 (Lovedale, 1887)
- Caldecott, A.F.: The Government and the Civilisation of the Native Races of South Africa (Cape Town, 1884)
- Calderwood, H.: Caffres and Caffre Missions (London, 1858)
- Campbell-Johnston, A.R.: South Africa: Its Difficulties and Present State (London, 1877)
- Carlyle, J.E.: Natal and the Aborigines' Protection Society (Pietermaritzburg, 1876); South Africa and Its Mission Fields (London, 1878).
- Cassidy, L.: The Kaffir and the Christian (Cape Town, 1856)
- Chalmers, J.A.: The Native Question (Grahamstown, 1878).
- Chesson, W.W.: The Dutch Republics of South Africa (London, 1871)
- Cloete, Henry (ed, W. Brodrick-Cloete): The History of the Great Boer Trek (London, 1899).
- Coleman, J.W.: A Letter to... the Archbishop of Canterbury upon... Polygamy (Pietermaritzburg, 1861); Ten Weeks in Natal (Cambridge, 1855)
- Cunninghame, Sir A.T.: My Command in South Africa (London, 1879)
- Dale, L.: Technical Instruction and Industrial Training (Cape Town, 1875)
- D.M.D. D.M.Dumbar : The Transvaal in 1876 (Grahamstown, 1881)
- Douglass, A.: Ostrich Farming in South Africa (London, 1881)
- Eustace, T.J.: Letters Addressed to the Secretary of the Aborigines' Protection Society (Cape Town, 1880); A Reply to the Electoral Address of the Aborigines' Protection Society (Cape Town, 1880)
- E.V.C.: The Promised Land; or, Nine Years... in the Transvaal (London, 1884).
- Fowle, J.H.: Polygamy Considered with Reference to the Church in her Missionary Character (Cape Town, 1856).
- Frere, Sir H.B.E.: On the Laws Affecting the Relations Between Civilized and Savage Life. As Bearing on the Dealings of Colonists with Aborigines (London, 1882).
- Froude, J.A.: Oceana (London, 1886); "Leaves From a South African Journal", in Short Studies on Great Subjects (4 vols., London, 1900). Two lectures on South Africa (Edinburgh, 1880)
- Gibson, A.S.: Some Thoughts on Missionary Work and Life (London, 1893)
- Glanville, T.B.: Abroad and At Home (Port Elizabeth, 1878)
- Green, J.: An Inquiry into the Proper Method of dealing with Cases of Polygamy... (London, 1888).
- Greswell, W.H.P.: Our South African Empire (2 vols., London, 1885)
- Haggard, H.R.: Cetewayo and His White Neighbours (London, 1882)
- Hartley, W.: Natal, Transvaal and Zululand (Leeds, 1879).
- Holden, W. C.: A Brief History of Methodism and of Methodist Missions in South Africa (London, 1877).
- Holub, E.: A Few Words on the Native Question (Kimberley, 1877)
- Johnston, R.: The Kafirs and Our Christian Religion (Grahamstown, 1872).
- Kinloch, C.W.: The Cape of Good Hope and the Kafir Question (Cape Town, 1856).
- Lambart, F.D.H.: A Few Hints, Facts, &c., gathered from Life Among the Boers (Pietermaritzburg, 1881).

- Leslie, D.: Among the Zulus and Amatongas (London, 1875)
- Luona, T.J.: The Zulus and the British Frontiers (London, 1879)
- Maclean, J.: A Compendium of Kafir Laws and Customs (Cape Town, 1866).
- Malan, C.H.: Rides in the Mission Fields of South Africa (London, 1878).
- Mann, R.J.: "Kaffir Promise and Capability", in the Intellectual Observer, London, January, 1867; bound as pamphlet in S.A.L. The Zulus and Boers of South Africa (London, 1879)
- Mason, G.H.: Zululand: A Mission Tour in South Africa (London, 1862).
- Matthews, J.W.: Inowadi Yami (New York, 1887)
- "M. E.": Life on the Diamond Fields (London, 1875)
- Merriman, J.X.: Intellectual Life in the Colonies (Cape Town, 1887)
- Merriman, N.J.: Are the Missionaries Mischief-Makers? (Grahamstown, 1876).
- Moodie, G.P.: The Annexation of the Transvaal (London, 1881)
- Morton, W.J.: The South African Diamond Fields and a Journey to the Mines (New York, 1877).
- Natal Evangelical Alliance : Polygamy and Woman Slavery in Natal : A Report... (Durban, 1861).
- Noble, J.: South Africa, Past and Present (Cape Town, 1877)
- Orpen, J.M.: Our Relations with the Imperial Government Considered... (Cape Town, 1879); Some Principles of Native Government Illustrated (Cape Town, 1880).
- Philip, T.D.: Some Aspects of Colonization and Christianity (Port Elizabeth, 1879)
- Riccards, Dr. J.D.: The Catholic Church and the Kaffir (London, n.d.)
- Ritchie, J.E.: Imperialism in South Africa (London, 1879)
- Sampson, V.: The Relations and Responsibilities of the Civilized Communities of South Africa Towards the Native Races (Cape Town, 1878).
- Shooter, J.: The Kafirs of Natal (London, 1857)
- Stewart, J.: "Lovedale, South Africa", in Proceedings of the General Conference on Foreign Missions, 1878 (London, 1879) The Educated Kafir, an Apology: and Industrial Education, A Sequel (Lovedale, 1880); The Experiment of Native Education (Lovedale, 1884).
- Theal, G. Mc C.: Compendium of the History and Geography of South Africa (Lovedale, 1876).
- Thompson, W.: Three Discourses on the Claims of the Native Races of this Country, and of Christian Missions Among Them (Cape Town, 1880).
- Watermeyer, E.B.: Three Lectures on the Cape of Good Hope under the Government of the Dutch East India Company (Cape Town, 1857).
- Wilmot, A., and Chase, J.C.: A History of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope (Cape Town, 1869).

Winter, J.W.: Gigantic Inhumanity : South African Notes on Ukulabola... Confederation and Annexation... (London, 1877).

F. LATER WORKS

(1) BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS AND MEMOIRS:

- Broome, Lady: Colonial Memories (London, 1904).
- Brownlee, C.: Reminiscences of Kafir Life and History (Lovedale, 1896).
- Butler, W.F.: Sir William Butler: An Autobiography (London, 1911).
- Cohen, L.: Reminiscences of Kimberley (London, 1901)
- Cohen, M.: Rider Haggard: His Life and Works (London, 1960).
- Dunn, W.H.: James Anthony Froude - vol.II, 1857-1894 (Oxford, 1963).
- Engelbrecht, S.P.: Thomas Francois Burgers (Pretoria, 1945).
- ffolliot, P., and Croft, E.L.M.: One Titan at a Time, the Story of John Paterson of Port Elizabeth and His Times (Cape Town, 1960).
- Gordon, R.: The Shepstones (Cape Town, 1968).
- Haggard, H.R.: The Days of My Life (London, 1926).
- Haggard, L.R.: The Cloak that I Left: A Biography of H. Rider Haggard (London, 1951).
- Hardinge, A.H.: The Life of Henry Howard Molyneux Herbert, Fourth Earl of Carnarvon (3 vols., London, 1925).
- Hinchliffe, P.: John William Colenso (London, 1964).
- Jabavu, D.D.T.: The Life of John Tengo Jabavu (Lovedale, 1927).
- Kotze, Sir J.: Memoirs and Reminiscences (2 vols., n.d.)
- Meintjes, J.: Olive Schreiner: Portrait of a South African Woman (Johannesburg, 1965).
- Molema, S.S.M.: Montshiwa, 1815-1896: Barolong Chief and Patriot (Cape Town, 1966).
- Molteno, P.A.: The Life and Times of Sir John Charles Molteno (2 vols., London, 1900).
- Monypenny, W.F., and Buckle, G.E.: Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield (6 vols., London 1919-1920).
- O'Haire, J.: Recollections of Twelve Years' Residence as a Missionary Priest... in South Africa (Dublin, 1877).
- Solomon, W.E.G.: Saul Solomon, the Member for Cape Town (Cape Town, 1948).
- Walker, E.A.: Lord de Villiers and His Times (London, 1925).
- Warren, C.: On the Veldt in the Seventies (London, 1902).
- Wilmot, Count A.: The Life and Times of Sir Richard Southey (London, 1904).

(11) BOOKS DEALING WITH BRITAIN AND THE EMPIRE GENERALLY:

- Burn, A.L.: The Age of Equipoise (London, 1964)
- Bodelsen, C.A.: Studies in Mid-Victorial Imperialism (Copenhagen, 1924).
- Ensor, R.C.K.: England, 1870 - 1914 (Oxford, 1936).

- Faber, G.: The Vision and the Need: Late Victorian Imperialist Aims. (London, 1966).
- Gallagher, J., Robinson, R., and Denny, A.: Africa and the Victorians (London, 1963).
- Koebner, R., and Schmidt, D.: Imperialism (Cambridge, 1964).
- Macintyre, W.D.: The Imperial Frontier in the Tropics, 1865 - 1875. (London, 1967).
- Stokes, E.: The Political Ideas of English Imperialism (Oxford, 1960).
- Thornton, A.P.: Doctrines of Imperialism (New York, 1965).
The Habit of Authority (London, 1966). The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies (London, 1963).

(iii) BOOKS DEALING WITH SOUTHERN AFRICA:

- Agar-Hamilton, J.A.I.: The Native Policy of the Voortrekkers (Cape Town, 1928).
- Ayliff, J., and Whiteside, J.: A History of the Abambo, Generally known as Fingos (Butterworth, 1912).
- Brookes, E.H.: A History of Native Policy in South Africa (Pretoria, 1927).
- Brookes, E.H., and Webb, C. de B.: A History of Natal (Natal, 1965)
- Cambridge History of the British Empire, vol. VIII. (1936)
- Currey, R. F.: St. Andrew's College, Grahamstown (Oxford; 1955)
- de Kiewiet, C.W.: British Colonial Policy and the South African Republics, 1848 - 1872 (London, 1929) The Imperial Factor in South Africa (London, 1965).
- Dodd, A.O.: Native Vocational Training: A Study of Conditions in South Africa, 1652 - 1936 (Lovedale, 1938)
- Doughty, O.: Early Diamond Days (London, 1963).
- du Plessis, J.: A History of Christian Missions in South Africa (London, 1911).
- Goodfellow, C.F.: Great Britain and South African Confederation 1870 - 1881 (Cape Town, 1966).
- Gould, C.: Grahamstown Cathedral: A Guide and Short History (Grahamstown, 1924).
- Kilpin, R.: The Romance of a Colonial Parliament (London, 1930)
- Leyds, W.J.: The First Annexation of the Transvaal (London, 1906).
- McCracken, J.L.: The Cape Parliament (Oxford, 1967).
- Macmillan, W.M.: Bantu, Boer and Briton (Oxford, 1963); The Cape Colour Question (Cape Town, 1963).
- Malherbe, E.G.: Education in South Africa 1652 - 1922 (Cape Town, 1925)
- Marais, J.B.: The Cape Coloured People, 1652 - 1937 (Johannesburg, 1957).
- Monnig, H.O.: The Pedi (Pretoria, 1967).
- Omer-Cooper, J.D.: The Zulu Aftermath (London, 1966).
- Schapera, I., (ed): Western Civilization and the Natives of South Africa: Studies in Culture Contact (London, 1934).

- Schumann, C. G. W.: Structural Changes and Business Cycles in South Africa 1806 - 1936 (London, 1938).
- Sullivan, J.R.: The Native Policy of Sir Theophilus Shepstone (Johannesburg, 1928).
- Tabler, E.C.: The Far Interior (Cape Town, 1955)
- Theal, G. Mc C.: A History of South Africa, 1873 - 1884 (2 vols, London, 1919).
- Uys, C.J.: In the Era of Shepstone (Lovedale, 1933)
- van der Horst, S.: Native Labour in South Africa (Cape Town, 1942)
- van Jaarsveld, F.A.: The Awakening of Afrikaner Nationalism (Cape Town, 1961)
- Walker, E.A.: A History of Southern Africa (London, 1962)
- Wilmot, Count A.: The History of Our Own Times in South Africa, (3 vols., London, 1897 - 99).

(iv) ARTICLES:

- Campbell, W.B.: "The South African Frontier, 1865 - 1885", Archives Year Book I, 1959.
- du Toit, A.E.: "The Cape Frontier, 1847 - 1866", A. Y. B. I, 1954.
- Kistner, W.: "The Anti-Slavery Agitation Against the Transvaal Republic, 1852 - 1868", A. Y. B. II, 1952.
- Lewsen, P.: "The First Crisis in Responsible Government", A. Y. B. II, 1942.
- Thompson, L.M.: "Constitutionalism in the South African Republics" Butterworth's South African Law Review, Durban, 1954, No. 1.
"Indian Immigration into Natal, 1860 - 1872", A. Y. B. II, 1952.
- Africana Notes and News (Johannesburg), passim.
- Quarterly Bulletin of the South African Library (Cape Town) passim.

(v) UNPUBLISHED THESES:

- Bosch, D.W.: The Wilgefontein Settlement (M.A., Natal, 1949).
- Guest, W.R.: Natal and the Confederation Issue in the 1870's (M.A., Natal, 1966).
- Pretorius, E. St. J.: Die Beleid van die Suid-Afrikaanse Geweste tenoor die Handel in Vuurwapens en Ammunisie met die inboorlinge 1806 - 1881 (M.A., O. F. S., 1955).
- Wolfson, F.: Some Aspects of Native Administration in Natal Under Sir Theophilus Shepstone (M.A., Wits., 1946).

in draft form only:

- Benyon, J.A.: The Development of the High Commission in South Africa, with particular reference to Basutoland. (subsequently submitted to Oxford for the degree of D.Phil.)

