History of Intellectual Culture

www.ucalgary.ca/hic/ · ISSN 1492-7810
2004 · Vol. 4, No. 1

Burying The Union Jack: British Loyalists In The Transvaal During The First Anglo-Boer War, 1880-1881

John Laband

Abstract

English-speaking South Africans are marked by multiple identities, but until recently they were united by strong feelings of Britishness and loyalty to the Crown, symbolized by the fervent flying of the Union Jack. This study analyzes the nature of the "English" community which settled in the Transvaal after Britain annexed the Boer Republic in 1877, and investigates its response when the British government restored Transvaal independence after the Boer uprising (the First Anglo-Boer War) of 1880-1. Since the security and prosperity of the Transvaal English depended upon maintenance of British rule, the alternative to fashioning a new colonial identity was to assert Britishness through an exaggerated loyalty to Crown and flag. "Loyal" inhabitants either fled the Transvaal during the Boer rebellion or took refuge in beleaguered towns. During the subsequent negotiations, the loyalists concluded that the Gladstone administration was sacrificing their interests, and organized to protest their allegiance and to claim compensation for losses. When the Pretoria Convention was nevertheless signed in August 1881, loyalists publicly buried the Union Jack — the very symbol of their British identity — to express their sense of outraged betrayal.

In the last days of 1880, a young H. Rider Haggard, his wife, and their servants landed in South Africa to visit his farm "Hilldrop," bought in 1879, near the little town of Newcastle in the northern apex of the British colony of Natal. It was an unfortunate moment. Not only did Haggard's arrival coincide with the beginning of the Boer uprising in the Transvaal Territory against British rule, but his destination was uncomfortably close to the theatre of operations. A force headed by the High Commissioner for South-East Africa, Major-General Sir George Pomeroy Colley, was preparing to batter its way through Boer-held passes in northern Natal into the rebellious colony to relieve the besieged small and scattered garrisons of British troops. Sheltering behind makeshift fortified positions were loyalist civilians — those, that is, who were not already making their way out of the Transvaal towards the security of Natal, or the sympathetically-neutral Boer republic of the Orange Free State.

Haggard had a particular interest in the Transvaal. He had first entered the territory in April 1877 on the staff of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, whom Lord Carnarvon, the British Secretary of State for the Colonies in Disraeli's second administration, had appointed Special Commissioner with the task of annexing the South African Republic to the Crown. The annexation of the Boer

republic was as a key element in implementing the Conservative government's policy of confederating all the white-ruled states of southern Africa under British rule. The Conservatives held that the imperial consolidation of the sub-continent would better enable it to fulfill its imperial strategic role, at the same time providing a settled environment for greater economic integration and progress.[1] On 24 May 1877, Haggard himself had run up the Union Jack in Pretoria, the capital of what was henceforth to be called the Transvaal Territory. He later described this action as "one of the proudest moments" of his life. However, as he later ruefully admitted, if he had known that on 2 August 1881 the same flag would be "shamefully and dishonourably torn down and buried" by a large crowd of British loyalists enraged at the terms of the Convention which effectively restored Pretoria to Boer rule, "it would have been one of the most miserable."[2]

Haggard was one of those who had absolutely no doubts as to the benefits of British annexation accruing to the bankrupt South African Republic, and would write in 1882 of its "perfectly magical" effects: "Credit and commerce were at once restored; the railway bonds that were down to nothing in Holland rose with one bound to par, and the value of landed property nearly doubled."[3] But it was not merely the act of annexation which effected the conjuring trick, but its influence in attracting hard-working and enterprising emigrants, mainly of British stock, to invest, live, and prosper in the new Transvaal Colony. Haggard insisted these people were not mere adventurers, but were intensely conscious of being British:

> People in England seem to fancy that when men go to the colonies they lose all sense of pride in their country, and think of nothing but their own advantage. I do not think this is the case; indeed, I believe that, individual for individual, there exists a greater sense of loyalty, and a deeper pride in their nationality, and in the proud name of England, among colonists, than among Englishmen proper. Certainly, the humiliation of the Transvaal surrender was more keenly felt in South Africa than it was at home.[4]

Echoing Haggard over a century later, in 1999, Marjory Harper drew attention to the way in which late nineteenth-century dismissive views of the overriding self-interest of British migrants jostled with portrayals of settlers' "umbilical attachment to their flag."[5] Such dichotomous perceptions feed into current examinations of the cultures of imperialism. In particular, they are relevant to the way in which colonizers attempted to construct new cultures through which they defined themselves and others.[6] "Culture," Andrew Porter has usefully suggested, means for historians of empire "the ideas, values, social habits and institutions which were felt to distinguish the British and their colonial subjects from each other, and which gave to both their sense of identity, purpose and achievement."[7] Certainly for John Mackenzie, the possession of empire helped forge a sense of distinct "Britishness" and a popular imperial culture which was a "potent mixture," among other ingredients, of patriotism, the military virtues, reverence for the monarchy and "a self-referencing approach to other peoples."[8] Naturally, the latter led to a sense of racial superiority and concomitant belief in the right to rule

which, from the mid-nineteenth century, was taken increasingly for granted across the British Empire, and endowed it with its distinct identity.[9]

Until very recently, little historiographical attention has been paid to the evolution of an English-speaking identity in South Africa comparable to the work being undertaken in other Commonwealth countries, notably in Britain and Australia. What pioneering research has been undertaken, by John Lambert and others, shows that English-speaking South Africans have always been marked by multiple identities but, until the advent of the Republic in 1961, they were united by strong feelings of Britishness and loyalty to the Crown, symbolized by the fervent flying of the Union Jack.[10] This is not to deny that in the South African colonies of the Cape and Natal, in common with other British colonies of white settlement in Australasia and North America, passionate Britishness was combined by the 1870s (without much acknowledgment of contradiction) with an increasing desire for greater constitutional and economic independence.[11] Yet, British settlers in South Africa were akin to the mid-nineteenth century Tories of Upper Canada: their sense of attachment to the Empire was still primarily expressed in terms of loyalty to the parent, or projection of Britain, rather than to a specific place; the loyalist tradition embodied the preservation and continuation of British cultural norms and practices in an alien environment. The basic settler assumption was that in return for such loyalty, they could always depend upon Britain to protect them against those who would overthrow the British way of life in the colonies.[12]

It was no easy task for the British in the Transvaal Territory between 1877 and 1881 even to begin to create a new colonial identity. As J.R. Seeley recognized in his famous series of lectures (published in 1883) lauding the "extension of the English race into other lands" and the unifying ties with the mother-land of "nationality, language and religion," in South Africa there were "abatements which must be made to the general proposition that Greater Britain was homogeneous in nationality."[13] He was referring specifically to the situation of the English in the Cape Colony, where Dutch settlers were numerically and politically in the ascendant, but he could just as well have been describing the relationship between the British and Boers in the Transvaal on the eve of the First Anglo-Boer War.

In James Morris's memorable phrase, the Transvaal was "the high retreat of everything most doggedly Boer."[14] British emigrants constituted a minority of white settlers who, as a racial group, were in a distinct minority in the Transvaal compared to the Africans. No proper census was ever taken of the Transvaal under British rule, but the general assumption was that the Dutch population was at least 36,000 (with estimates as high as 45,000), and that of the "Non-Dutch" Europeans somewhere around 5,000, of whom two-thirds lived in the towns. The majority of these "Outsiders" were of British stock, though there were other "foreign adventurers" — Irish, Jews, Americans, Hollanders, Germans, Belgians, and Portuguese — whom the British liked to deprecate as "rarely men of high character and disinterested aims."[15] Scots, noted for their clannishness, had concentrated in the little town of Heidelberg, where (noted the special commissioner of the *Natal Mercury*) they had made friends with Boers and English alike "no less by their geniality than by their independence of character."[16] Africans were estimated at between 700,000 and 800,000.[17] This meant that while whites made up a mere

five per cent of the total population, the "Non-Dutch" constituted less than fourteen per cent of that tiny minority.

Nevertheless, this small "English" segment of the settler population remained disproportionately influential. In the towns, in the mining districts of Lydenburg and Zoutpansberg, in the inns along the roads, in the country trading stores, and wherever there was a field for enterprise, the British predominated commercially. Although the rural settler population was mainly Dutch, scattered over some 10,500 farms (large tracts of land, especially in the northern Transvaal, remained unsurveyed), even there individual British farmers were beginning to gain ground. In the fertile Lydenburg District in particular, which bordered on Swaziland and encompassed the Gold Fields around Pilgrims Rest that opened in 1871, farmers from the Cape Colony were buying up land, their farms distinguishable from those of the Boers by their "general air of neatness & cleanliness."[18] Commercial companies acquired hundreds of square miles of farms in the same district as investments.[19] The Glasgow Company, for example, held 100 farms of 6,000 acres each.[20]

The influence of the British in the civil establishment was making itself increasingly felt, not only at the higher levels of the heads of department, judicial officials, *landdrosts* and commissioners, but also postal officials, field cornets, clerks, native commissioners, and schoolmasters. These officials divided themselves by nationality into 80 Dutch Afrikanders, 41 English Afrikanders (natives of South Africa, mainly the Cape Colony), 68 Englishmen, 35 Hollanders, 28 Germans, 1 Dane, and 1 Swede.[21] The Hollanders, Germans, and other Europeans had entered the administration of the South African Republic [SAR] to aid in the executive work of the republic prior to British annexation, but the influx of English-speakers had ensued with it, providing the administration with a preponderance of officials upon which it believed it could rely, and alienating the existing officials who saw their previous political power being whittled away.[22] In the Legislative Assembly, which came into operation in 1880, a considerable programme of legislation was enacted in its opening sessions despite its business being conducted in both Dutch and English, which doubled the work[23] — and highlighted the deep differences between many of its elected and appointed members.

Inevitably, the bedrock of the British administration was the garrison of British troops with their headquarters in Pretoria. In November 1880, the 1,800 regulars under the command of Colonel William Bellairs were distributed across the Transvaal. The Pretoria garrison consisted of five companies and a mounted troop of the 2nd Battalion, Royal Scots Fusiliers, a battery of artillery, and a detachment of Royal Engineers. Two further companies of the Fusiliers were deployed in Rustenburg. Two companies of the 94th Regiment were stationed in Lydenburg, with two more companies of the same regiment in Marabastad, a company at Standerton, and another company and a mounted troop in Wakkerstroom.[24] Famed author Anthony Trollope, who journeyed to South Africa in 1877 to write a travel book for Chapman & Hall,[25] commented that when entertained in the officers' mess in Pretoria surrounded by officers in their uniforms, "it seemed as though a little block of England had been cut out and transported to the centre of South Africa."[26]

These garrisons had considerable economic and social effects on the little towns where they were stationed — each soldier purchasing as much as a whole Boer family.[27] These scattered

settlements normally ranged (with the exceptions of Pretoria and Potchefstroom, the two largest towns) from a hundred dwellings to less than ten. They always included a court house, church, and a central market place, for towns had begun under the Boers as administrative centres for the management of the land and *entrepots* for the sale of its produce, and as conveniently central situations where farmers could drive in to attend *Nachtmaal* [Communion], or send their children to the school (if the place had one). At first, there were no hotels because the idea of paying for food or entertainment was preposterous to the Boers.[28] Only very recently had traders and speculators moved in, and shops and public hotels, inns, and private houses of accommodations sprung up to cater for such customers as British bureaucrats, soldiers, and (in the Gold Fields) prospectors.[29]

Travellers like Trollope found accommodation in establishments kept by Englishmen decent, clean, and up to their standards, not only in the larger towns like Potchefstroom, but even in tiny places like Klerksdorp, which had but half-a-dozen houses.[30] Yet even Lydenburg, considered a lively place since the working of the Gold Fields began in 1867, and where property values were rising considerably, was described by Mrs. Mary Long, the wife of the Old Etonian Lt Walter Long of the garrison, as lacking "buildings of any consequence and unable to boast of a hospital, much less of a town-hall."[31] A few places like Pretoria, the seat of the administration, began to develop in tandem as commercial centres, and by 1880 were predominantly English-speaking. Yet Pretoria, the fastest growing town in the Transvaal, catering to British administrative, military, and commercial interests with its barracks, officers' quarters, court-house, hospital, schools, government offices, banks and insurance companies, general stores, churches, and rows of new houses, had a civil population of only 2,250.[32]

The identity of the British settlers in the Transvaal at the time of the First Anglo-Boer War was consequently an ambivalent and vulnerable one. They were simultaneously the mainstay of the British administration and the economy, yet distrusted "Outsiders" among the Boer settler majority. In such precarious circumstances, the obvious alternative to fashioning an unlikely new colonial identity for themselves was to assert their Britishness and to cling to the tried and secure alternative of an exaggerated loyalty to the Crown and flag, for their future security and prosperity depended upon the maintenance of British rule.

Their insecurity induced the British in the Transvaal to participate in cultural and social activities which class differences and social habits would have constrained in Britain itself, and to submerge often antagonist British regional identities in a show of solidarity.[33] In contrast to more successfully assimilated British expatriates in South America, for example, cultural aloofness was encouraged by the failure to transmit ideas, customs, fashions, and games to a suspicious and unreceptive Boer host society.[34] Those hallmarks of British male and commercial solidarity in the colonies, Friendly Societies, were thoroughly established by 1880 in the more markedly British towns of the Transvaal, with four Masonic and five Good Templar Lodges distributed between Pretoria, Potchefstroom, and Rustenburg.[35] Confessional affiliation was a significant identifier, and Protestantism (especially of the evangelical variety) a crucial marker of Britishness.[36] The Boer population belonged overwhelmingly to the Dutch Reformed Church; the British and other foreigners belonged to Anglican, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan, and Lutheran churches with a combined membership in 1879 of 3,299, with 914 communicants. Significantly,

Anglicans formed the largest of these congregations, with a bishop in Pretoria and vicars at Potchefstroom, Rustenburg, Heidelberg, Standerton, Wakkerstroom, Marico, and Lydenburg.[37] Trollope noted that the resident Anglican clergyman in Pretoria was "a University man" who, now that the Transvaal was "an English colony," would soon become the "'clergyman of the place'," for "such is the nature of Englishmen."[38]

Two classes of schools in the Transvaal were Government and Aided (or private). Government were over 70 per cent Dutch Reformed, and received instruction in both Dutch and English. The British preferred that their children not be subjected to this regimen, and this accounted for the trebling between 1878 and 1879 of Aided Schools, where the children of non-Boers could be educated in English and in their own religion.[39]

The Transvaal boasted no lunatic asylum, that ubiquitous symbol of settled civic responsibility, but the British possessed a vital organ of public opinion and free speech, an English newspaper. *The Transvaal Argus* was brought out three times a week in Pretoria, while *De Volksstem* appeared in English on Fridays and in Dutch on Tuesdays. Two further English-medium newspapers, the *Transvaal Advocate in Potchesfstroom* and the *Gold Fields Mercury* of Pilgrim's Rest, ceased publication during 1878.[40] Public facilities for adult education, such as the public reading room in the newly laid out town of Zeerust (which went with an English church and school), attested to the desire — even in the remote Marico District — for the British to establish "the comforts of civilized life," as they understood them.[41]

In terms of landscape and architecture, the British were determined to create an environment in which they felt at home. For Mary Long in Lydenberg, the square houses of the Boers were built "on the bare veldt," with the "only thing approaching a garden" a vegetable plot nearly half a mile away. Her choice of dwelling was a "pretty little cottage" in the town, "buried" under the spreading branches of trees, and her deepest approbation was reserved for the "charming" English parsonage bordered by hedges and surrounded by "a perfect wilderness of roses."[42] General Sir Garnet Wolseley, Governor of the Transvaal in 1879–1880, compared the Lydenburg rose hedges to those which proliferated around the houses of the English in Pretoria, every street "like a grassy English lane."[43] Trollope reported exactly the same of Potchefstroom,[44] testifying to the English talent for creating their preferred landscape wherever they settled. There was an exception, however: Standerton, with its stone and corrugated iron single-story houses, was unusual in its general absence of trees, fruit gardens, and hedges.[45]

Wolseley noted in his Journal the extent to which exotic British sports, entertainments, and social occasions were fostered. He mentioned playing lawn tennis, attending cricket matches in Pretoria with cocoanut matting spread between the wickets over the bare ground,[46] and enjoying the regular concerts of the military band at Government House and the Town Square — which angered many Boers when they gathered to attend *Nachtmaal* the following day.[47] A ball was given in his honour at the Masonic Hall, with supper laid out in a tent, and he held a levée and several receptions at Government House, where kilted Highland pipers "astonished the Afrikanders." Wolseley did not enjoy these occasions — "an hour or so on a lively treadmill" would have been preferable — but saw them as an essential assertion of official British presence.[48]

Nor did Wolseley find the colonial women of Pretoria in the least attractive. He privately sniggered at their social airs and "meretricious finery" when he knew that shortly before they had been busy with menial domestic chores, since African domestic servants — though much cheaper than servants in England — were untrained, migratory, and to English eyes often alarming in dress and habits.[49] He genuinely pitied what "the woman brought up as a lady in England must undergo here," where the social graces and aspirations of "home" collided with the rougher "hardness of their position."[50]

Trollope, however, believed that if a family were prepared to conform to the more relaxed social customs of the colonial world, it could live comfortably on considerably less than in England. Pretoria, like any colonial city struggling into birth, struck the visitor with its untidiness — brandy bottles, sardine boxes, old boots, paper collars, and other rubbish everywhere among the small houses which produced an "air of meanness." But on being entertained in a number of these lowly cottages, Trollope "found internal prettiness" and recorded that his English hosts had "managed to gather round them within a very small space all the comforts of civilized life."[51]

C.E. Carrington has written that prominent among the pioneers of the nineteenth century were the traders, prospectors, and missionaries[52] who blazed the trail for colonization.[53] Such indeed were the British who first settled in the SAR before annexation, but those who followed during the period of British rule were predominantly artisans and working men (carpenters, blacksmiths, bricklayers, bakers, tailors, saddlers, and so on), who could demand good wages due to the shortage of skilled labour.[54] Clerical workers found far better salaries in offices or stores than in government employ because the professional or mercantile communities increasingly dominated the Transvaal economy.[55] Such people were not truly pioneers opening up a wilderness, but immigrants bringing modern skills, urban habits, and commercial practices to a society dominated by Boer farmers, still resolutely pre-industrial in outlook and preference.

This large influx of "English" capital and immigrants into the Transvaal, and their claims to own a third of the saleable property in the state, to pay more than half the land-tax, and to control almost all mercantile and commercial business,[56] only exacerbated relations with the Boers. As Trollope pointed out, "Let an Englishman be where he may be about the surface of the globe, he always thinks himself superior to other men around him... He expects to be 'boss'."[57] This instinctive feeling of ascendancy naturally produced something akin to contempt for the rustic Boers, particularly among the more cosmopolitan town-dwellers who, secure in their belief in the protection of the British garrison, scoffed at the rising Boer discontent with British rule.[58] Trollope, however, queried why the British taxpayer should be obliged to go on financing a large military force in the Transvaal to procure the safety of "the English who have settled themselves among the Boers?"[59]

The Transvaal British were confident that British military protection would continue. Sir Garnet Wolseley explicitly reiterated in his proclamations and public speeches that the Queen's sovereignty would never be withdrawn. It might have been supposed that once Gladstone formed his second Liberal administration in April 1880, British policy towards the Transvaal would change. No supporter of the Tory confederation policy, nor even of the annexation of the Transvaal, Gladstone nevertheless reaffirmed in June 1880 his government's intention not to

relinquish British rule.[60] These unequivocal and repeated assurances encouraged many Englishmen to settle in the Transvaal, and persuaded those already there to invest fully in the country, confident they would not lose their property to the Boers. But it was Wolseley who saw most clearly the implications for the British settlers in the Transvaal should the British withdraw:

> [A]lmost all the trade and commerce of the country is in the hands of Englishmen who welcomed the advent of British Government with rejoicing, and who have incurred much ill-will by the open and patriotic avowal of their support of our policy...[T]he position of insecurity in which we should leave this loyal and important section of the community by exposing them to the certain retaliation of the Boers, would constitute, in my opinion, an insuperable obstacle to retrogression.[61]

Wolseley's fears for the English community were to prove all too well-founded when the Boer rebellion finally broke out in December 1880. Sir Own Lanyon, the Administrator of the Transvaal, published Boer warnings that there could now be only two sorts of men in the Transvaal, "those who were for, and those who were against, the Boers, in their opposition to the Government," and that "civil war was now being carried on."[62] But Lanyon had already recognized that it would be difficult in many cases for "people well-disposed towards the Government" to rally effectively to its support, since they were so "mixed up with and dependent on the Boers in trade and other pursuits."[63]

Boer strategy, as became apparent once hostilities broke out with the Bronkhorstspruit engagement on 20 December 1880, was — as Colley explained to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Kimberley — to be one of "surprising and attacking in detail our troops while spread in peace garrisons."[64] In these circumstances, the active role of loyal inhabitants could only be a limited one. Colley ordered all *landdrosts* and field cornets to call public meetings, prepare lists of all persons in their districts whose loyalty could be relied upon, and enroll loyalists as volunteers to defend their homes and government *laagers*. Volunteers were to help garrison troops with supplies and transport, and to act as scouts. While troop reinforcements were being concentrated at Newcastle, they were to hold out as best they could until relieved, but were not to resist if the odds against them seemed irresistible.[65]

In Pretoria, Potchefstroom, Standerton, and Wakkerstroom, loyalist civilians took refuge from besieging Boers with the British garrisons in their forts, or behind hastily-erected defences, and the men duly helped the troops in their defence, organizing themselves into volunteer units. Elsewhere, in Rustenburg, Lydenburg, and Marabastad, where forts were rudimentary and garrisons small, the civilians prudently remained neutral. In the towns under siege, the defenders saw incessant military action and suffered considerable privations. The Boers captured none of these defended positions, but Colley's failure to break through from Natal with a relieving force, and his defeat and death on Majuba on 27 February 1881 meant the beleaguered towns could but hang on until another attempt at relief was made, or hostilities brought to an end through negotiation.[66]

On 6 March 1881, Colley's successor, Major-General Sir Evelyn Wood, signed an armistice with the Boer leaders. This was extended to permit further negotiations, and on 21 March, Wood acknowledged the right of the Transvaal people to complete independence subject to British suzerain rights. The Boers suggested that a Royal Commission should work out the details.[67] After prolonged bargaining, a Convention was agreed upon and signed on 3 August 1881.[68] The Republican flag was hoisted at Pretoria on 8 August 1881 as the transfer of power ceremonially took place.

The Convention was a complex document, and the issue of suzerainty would bedevil future British-Boer relations. But the prime objective of Gladstone and his Colonial Secretary Lord Kimberley had been achieved, namely, the reassurance of the South African Dutch. At the very outset of the conflict, Colley had warned Kimberley that his "greatest anxiety" was that "the rising should turn into a war between the two white races in South Africa" because "there was undoubtedly strong sympathy with the Boers throughout the Dutch population" of the sub-continent.[69] During the course of the war, increasingly strong public reaction among the Dutch seemed to bear out Colley's anxieties. Kimberley came increasingly to fear a pan-Afrikaner uprising throughout southern Africa which might be the signal for a general African revolt, and ultimately create another version of the intractable Irish problem bedevilling the Liberal administration. By placating the Transvaal Boers and conciliating the Cape and Free State Dutch, the Convention defused the grim possibility of a united Afrikaner front challenging British dominance in South Africa. It also heralded a new approach to solving the South African problem. The Tory policy of formal confederation was to be replaced with the idea of informal paramountcy, the making of friends and the winning of influence — which meant courting the Boers and creating stronger and more amiable ties for the future. What this amounted to in practical terms was that English colonists, who formed the settler minority, were to be sacrificed on the altar of improved Anglo-Boer relations.[70]

When Kimberley wrote on 31 March 1881 to Sir Hercules Robinson, appointing him, Sir Evelyn Wood, and Sir H. de Villiers to be the Royal Commissioners for the settlement of the Transvaal, he declared that "Her Majesty's Government are bound to take care that those who have been faithful to the British cause during the late war shall not suffer any detriment in consequence of their loyalty." It was to be the Commissioners' duty to lay down conditions securing for loyalists "full liberty to reside in the country, with enjoyment of all civil rights and protection for their persons and property."[71]

Such noble sentiments did nothing to dissuade the Transvaal English from their conclusion that Gladstone had betrayed them. On 7 April, representatives of the Central Committee of the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal, which had been formed in Pretoria on 29 March with branches in Wakkerstroom, Newcastle, and elsewhere to coordinate the protests of loyal subjects across South Africa,[72] approached General Wood in Heidelberg, requesting him to forward their petition to the Home Government. The petition, signed by the committee's chairman, C.K. White (a former member of the Transvaal Legislative Assembly), and its secretary, Martin J. Farrell (a surveyor engaged in working on the proposed Delagoa Railway), warned Gladstone that the repeated promises of the Imperial Government indicating that the Transvaal would ever remain British had induced large investments in land and property

which were now jeopardized. "The banks are leaving, capitalists are endeavouring to withdraw, and all enterprise...is paralysed." Valuable property had become unsaleable and "extremely depreciated in value." Beyond this, active collaboration with the British forces during the war had placed the loyalists in a position where it would be unsafe to remain in the Transvaal under Boer rule. As it was, since the armistice, many had suffered "in person and in property" from the Boers. The petitioners declared themselves "cruelly deceived by the mother country," and claimed the right "for the fullest material compensation" from the Imperial Government for their losses.[73]

The Central Committee of the Loyal Inhabitants also printed a Humble Petition to the House of Commons, expanding on the points made in the letter to Gladstone. This reported that many working-class Englishmen in the Transvaal (150 from Pretoria alone, during a single week of April) had already left the country with their families for Natal and the Diamond Fields, because there was no employment on account of the "universal stagnation."[74] A deputation under White, with funds raised by public subscription, prepared to leave for England on 10 May to present the petition to the Commons.[75] Not to be outdone by the Loyal Inhabitants, on 4 May the Transvaal Refugee Committee also petitioned Kimberley. In their appeal, James Murray and 34 others repeated the point that, believing that the annexation of the Transvaal to be irrevocable, much capital had been invested, "including the introduction of machinery." Much of this investment would be lost under restored Boer rule, "as loyal subjects of England cannot submit to Boer rule, and will have no option but to renounce their allegiance to England or abandon their property."[76]

The prime concern among the English in the Transvaal seemingly was not so much their imperilled allegiance to the Crown, nor even the plight of the Africans abandoned to harsh republican rule — this latter a ploy adopted by the petitioners to prick the conscience of a Liberal administration.[77] Rather, it was material loss. Compensation was problematical because the great bulk of the loss was indirect, a matter (as Haggard recognized) of the imponderable depreciation of the value of property under renewed Boer rule.[78] Not that direct losses had not been damaging enough. During the war, English farmers and townspeople (especially storekeepers) had abandoned their property to take refuge with the British garrisons, or to trek for safety out of the Transvaal altogether, whereupon it was looted or commandeered.[79] When these depredations did not cease with the armistice, many more of the English packed up what they could carry, and left.[80] Haggard saw them pouring through Newcastle in their hundreds: "There were people of all classes, officials, gentlefolk, work-people, and loyal Boers, but they had a connecting link; they had all been loyal, and they were all ruined."[81]

When the Royal Commissioners met on 29 April 1881 at Newcastle in northern Natal to discuss the settlement of the Transvaal, it took evidence from various interested parties. Very much to the fore were the organized groups of loyalist petitioners, who made sure that the grievances of the despoiled Transvaal British were given considerable prominence. On 16 May 1881, a Deputation for the Protection of the Loyals of the Transvaal (members of the Committee of the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal) laid a bundle of affidavits before the Commission detailing their sufferings at Boer hands.[82] John Nixon followed up his deputation's presentation to the Commission on 20 May with a long minute arguing compensation for both direct and

indirect claims. He concluded by loyally assuring the Commissioners that many of the claimants "would willingly sacrifice every penny of compensation, provided they could see British rule still maintained in the country."[83] Their long-term prospects might conceivably have been more secure under the Crown, though whether most claimants were really willing to give up the short-term prospect of compensation cannot be known. In any case the alternative was not feasible; the Commission was sitting with explicit instruction to end British rule in the Transvaal.

The Loyal Inhabitants Committee continued to press the commissioners. On 27 and 28 May 1881, they had two more long meetings, and presented another sheaf of affidavits.[84] Petitions and affidavits continued to flood to the Commissioners from a variety of sources: from Transvaal émigrés, investors, and sympathizers in the Cape mining town of Kimberley, organized as the Transvaal Sufferers' Protection Association;[85] from the Cape Commercial Bank and the Standard Bank;[86] and from numbers of other individuals and loosely-organized groups in Pretoria, Cape Town, and elsewhere.[87] Nor did protests against the "humiliation and shame" of the Transvaal peace end with genteel petitions and resolutions by orderly — if excited — public meetings in the English-speaking Cape Colony towns of Cape Town and King William's Town on 8 April, Port Elizabeth on 12 April, and East London on 14 April.[88] Popular anger against Gladstone and his administration took on the time-hallowed form of the "authorised transgression" of carnivalesque rites, expressed in this case as an immediately recognizable inversion of the patriotic songs, representations of public personalities, and nationalistic flag waving of the distinctive British music hall culture of the time.[89]

On 26 March, a flag-staff was set up in the middle of the Market Square, flying the British Ensign reversed with the Transvaal Vierkleur flag above it. The Saturday market crowd reportedly relished the symbolism, and when the insulted Ensign was ripped down by an indignant "Jingo," the anti-government mob dragged it through the mud and trod it under foot.[90] Another even more satisfying act of symbolism was already establishing the pattern of protest, one that projected familiar and easily recognizable cultural resonances that went back to the seventeenth century: the ritual burning in a bonfire each fifth of November of the effigy of Guy Fawkes, the arch-traitor and foe of British liberty and established religion who in 1605 plotted to blow up Parliament.

On 3 April, a large cartoon of the British lion being led blindfolded by Gladstone was paraded on a cart around Cape Town accompanied by a loud band. That evening a crowd estimated to be nearly 6,000 strong gathered on the Grand Parade to burn Gladstone's effigy in a huge bonfire.[91] This satisfying immolation was emulated in Newcastle on 28 March by the loyal townspeople and refugees (with the prudent exception of a few merchants in the "Boer trade"). In the Market Square, the Union Jack, draped in mourning, was hoisted at half-mast. An effigy of Gladstone was tried and found guilty of high treason, and then hanged and burnt by the tumultuous crowd.[92] In Kimberley, Gladstone's effigy met a similar fate on the Market Square, to the jeers of a large crowd and the appropriate accompanying strains of the "Dead March" from *Saul* and raucous Jingo songs. The serious intent of the carnival was emphasized by newspapers at pains to report the crowd as "well conducted" and not out simply for a "lark."[93]

Nor was this the end of the public burnings. In Wakkerstroom, where loyalists had suffered severely from Boer depredations, Gladstone's effigy was burned on 5 April "in the presence of the whole town."[94] On Saturday 9 April, in Pietermaritzburg, a well-advertised demonstration paraded another effigy of Gladstone — this time in full evening-dress with a rope around his neck —through the streets on a funeral car accompanied by a coffin labelled "Liberal Ministry" and an inverted Ensign with a mourning fringe. It was then hanged and burnt on the Market Square, to the sound of many speeches.[95] The last of this rash of public burnings, whose implications Gladstone could not have failed to miss, took place in Pretoria on 17 April.[96]

None of these protests nor wide-ranging pleas for comprehensive restitution or compensation would have any effect if the Liberal government refused to entertain them. Queen Victoria might fret that "the interests of our loyal friends" in the Transvaal were being sacrificed "for the sake of a few discontented Boers,"[97] but Gladstone (even though already burnt six times in effigy) was not to be deflected. It is true that the skilful petition from the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal, dispatched in April, caused Gladstone the maximum of embarrassment. Nevertheless, with Kimberley's help, he concocted what he considered a fitting response. Gladstone's letter of 1 June to White and Farrell left no doubt as to where the Transvaal British stood. After glibly justifying his termination of the war, the abandonment of the South African confederation policy, and the retrocession of the Transvaal, Gladstone turned to the situation of the English settlers. He "willingly and thankfully" acknowledged their "loyal co-operation," and assured them that in the settlement being hammered out, care would be taken to secure them "the full enjoyment of their property and of all civil rights." The sting, however, was in the tail. Gladstone declared that whilst his government

> cannot recognise any general claim for compensation in respect of depreciation of property arising from the change of policy involved in the new arrangement, the question of compensation to either side for acts committed during the late troubles, not justified buy the necessities of war, has been remitted to the Commission.[98]

This was certainly not what Loyal Inhabitants wanted to hear. From that moment, they knew Gladstone had resolved to throw them over. But before they could decide on further action, they had to learn what the Royal Commission would decide.

The Commissioners certainly had all the evidence before them necessary to make a ruling over compensation, beside the known wishes of the British government. Considerable discussion ensued; Lord Kimberley was consulted and his approval sought, as was that of the Boer leaders. In their official Report to the Queen (Wood submitted a dissenting report), Robinson and de Villiers devoted paragraphs 119 to 133 to the question of "compensation for losses through war," and paragraph 149 to "protection of trade and interest of loyals."[99] Their decisions were incorporated into the Convention signed in Pretoria with the Boer representatives on 3 August 1881. Very much in line with Gladstone's letter of 1 June, Articles 6–9 stipulated that compensation was to be paid, as appropriate, by either the Transvaal or British government for all claims approved by a sub-commission for loss or damage caused by

"(a) commandeering, seizure, confiscation, or destruction of property, or damage done to property; (b) violence done or threats used by persons in arms." Losses caused by "enforced abandonment" were also to be allowed. However, it was firmly laid down that "[n]o claims for indirect losses...will be entertained,"[100] dashing many loyalists' hopes. Nevertheless, Article 12 met one of the loyalists' greatest concerns by stipulating that they would "suffer no molestation" on account of supporting the British forces, and that "all such persons will have full liberty to reside in the country, with enjoyment of all civil rights, and protection for their persons and property."[101] Furthermore, Articles 16, 26, 27, 30, and 31 guaranteed their freedom of religion, movement, and commercial activity, residential and property rights, and protection by the courts. Article 28 made all persons who came to live in the Transvaal after British annexation exempt from compulsory military service in the Boer state, thus avoiding any conflict of loyalties.

At first glance, it would appear that the Transvaal English should have had little to complain about regarding the terms of the convention. Haggard, however, put his finger on two main items of loyalist discontent which it did not effectively address. The loyalists(and he) believed that "the great bulk of losses sustained were of an indirect nature," and that claims for compensation for these "were passed by unheeded." While many of the Transvaal British believed that, the paper guarantees notwithstanding, a Transvaal no longer under British rule was "a country that could no longer be their home."[102]

As early as 28 May, Martin Farrell, secretary to the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal, had written to the Royal Commission that his committee had succeeded thus far in exerting its influence "to prevent disturbance consequent on the dissatisfaction prevailing from the action of the Imperial Government." Perhaps Farrell did not consider the March and April burnings of Gladstone in effigy a "disturbance." He did add that unless the Commission heeded his requests for proper compensation and protection under Boer rule, "serious and grave breaches of law and order must ensue for which the Committee cannot hold themselves responsible."[103]

On August 2, when it was learned that the Convention was to be signed in Pretoria the following day in the very same room in which, four years before, Sir Theophilus Shepstone had signed the Annexation Proclamation, the threatened disturbances broke out. They were neither serious nor unruly, as Farrell had predicted, but a carefully orchestrated symbolic pantomime in the form of a ceremonious burial of the Union Jack. The flag was followed to its grave by a crowd of about 2,000 loyalists. On its coffin was written: "In loving memory of the British flag in the Transvaal, who departed this life on the 2nd August, 1881, in his fifth year. 'In other climes none knew thee but to love thee'. *Resurgam.*"[104]

An eloquent oration was delivered, in which it was lamented that "the flag we loved is dead" and had come to an untimely end "in the midst of her glory by an insidious blow from the hands of her most trusted advisors."[105] This was indeed an act of potent meaning, the ceremonial immolation of the loyalists' hitherto cherished and vaunted symbol of allegiance as British citizens, degraded by Gladstone's betrayal, but buried in the hope of resurrection (and financial compensation) under another administration.

This act of burial also represented closure. Just before leaving Pretoria on 5 August, Wood, in his final days as Administrator of the Transvaal, received an address from 60 English

inhabitants of the town. They declared themselves concerned at the animosity which the Boers held toward loyalists. Furthermore, they expressed a fear that, in the conceivable case of a war between the Transvaal and Britain, loyalists who had settled in the Transvaal before 1877 (and who were, in terms of Article 28 of the Convention, not exempt from military service) would be placed in the impossible position of having to fight against Britain. The petitioners "most solemnly" protested against any loyal British subjects "being handed over to the mercy of the Boers." Their fears were real, but the Convention was signed and the case closed, and Wood sent them a dusty reply firmly telling them so.[106] The Transvaal loyalists were left with no choice but to buckle down under Boer rule, or leave the country.

Considered dispassionately, the Transvaal British emerged relatively unscathed from the Transvaal War of 1880–1. Those who stayed suffered no ethnic cleansing or any other meaningful form of persecution; their direct material losses were recompensed to the tune of £110,000, defrayed by the Imperial Government when the Boers defaulted from paying their share.[107] Trade losses had not been as great as at first claimed; many of those who had "kept quiet and held their tongues" during the war had "done a good business."[108] As for indirect losses, any of the British who remained in the Transvaal, or continued to invest in the country, were rewarded tenfold when the discovery in 1886 of gold in huge paying quantities on the Witwatersrand heralded boom economic conditions.

Where the Transvaal British considered themselves most hurt was in their very sense of "Englishness" — their ingrained belief that, as loyal subjects, they should have been able to rely absolutely on the protection of the Crown, both politically and economically. After all, they were a vulnerable (if economically potent) minority in the small Transvaal settler community, still "Outlanders" who had not had time to securely impose cultural and political dominance on the Transvaal Territory. The perceived betrayal by Gladstone's administration rankled especially, as did the conviction that they had been cravenly and unnecessarily abandoned to the humiliation and inconvenience of rule by the despised and retrograde Boers; and that, perhaps even more crucially for some, they had not been adequately compensated for their material losses, both current and potential. Their repeated burning of Gladstone's effigy signalled disgust with the politician and his administration; but, more profoundly, their burying of the Union Jack, the very symbol of their British identity, expressed their outraged sense of betrayal and alienation. Haggard captured these sentiments with deep, personal feeling:

> Such an act of treachery to those to whom we were bound with double chains — by the strong ties of a common citizenship, and by those claims to England's protection from violence and wrong which have hitherto been wont to command it, even where there was not duty to fulfil, and not authority to vindicate — stands, I believe, without parallel in our records, and marks a new departure in our history.[109]

Notes

1. See John Benyon, *Proconsul and Paramountcy in South Africa: The High Commission, British Supremacy and the Sub-Continent, 1806–1910* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1980), 142–5. For a more recent discussion of the implications of the annexation of the Transvaal, see Richard Cope, *Ploughshare of War: The Origins of the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1999), chap. 5.
2. H. Rider Haggard, *The Last Boer War* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trübner, 1899), 88–9. The indignation of the loyalist townspeople of Pretoria, on first hearing the news that the British government was preparing to abandon them to Boer rule, is graphically described in Charles Du-Val and Charles Deeker, eds., *The News of the Camp: A Journal of Fancies, Notifications, Gossip, and General Chit Chat, Published in the Military Camp of Her Majesty's Forces Defending the Beleaguered Inhabitants of Pretoria* (30 March 1881).
3. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 88.
4. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 165-6.
5. Marjory Harper, "British Migration and the Peopling of Empire," *The Oxford History of the British Empire. Volume III: The Nineteenth Century*, ed. Andrew Porter and assoc. ed. Alaine Lowe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 75.
6. See Catherine Hall, "Introduction: Thinking the Postcolonial, Thinking the Empire" in *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: A Reader*, ed. Catherine Hall (New York: Routledge, 2000), 1–33, *passim*.
7. Andrew Porter, "Introduction," *Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume III*, ed. Andrew Porter, 19.
8. John M. Mackenzie, "Empire and Metropolitan Cultures," *Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume III*, ed. Andrew Porter, 273, 290–1.
9. In the late 1870s, the "scientific racism" of Social Darwinism had not yet fully permeated the prevalent culturally-based discourse on race.
10. John Lambert, "South African British? Or Dominion South Africans? The Evolution of An Identity in the 1910s and 1920s," *South African Historical Journal*, 43 (November 2000): 197–8, 220.
11. The Cape Colony became self-governing in 1872, but in Natal, responsible government was delayed until 1893. See C.W. de Kiewiet, "The Establishment of Responsible Government in Cape Colony, 1870–1872," *The Cambridge History of the British Empire, Volume VIII: South Africa*, ed. Eric A. Walker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 451–6, 458; and Edgar H. Brookes and Colin de B. Webb, *A History of Natal* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1965), 168–80.
12. See David Mills, *The Idea of Loyalty in Upper Canada, 1784–1850* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill/Queen's University Press, 1988), 3–4, 33; and Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 103–8.
13. Sir J.R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England. Two Courses of Lectures* (London: Macmillan, 1921 edition), 59, 343, 346.
14. James Morris, *Heaven's Command: An Imperial Progress* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979), 423.
15. Sir Bartle Frere, quoted in W.E. Garrett Fisher, *The Transvaal and the Boers* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1900), 179.
16. *The Transvaal War, 1881. Re-printed from the "Natal Mercury"* (Durban: Natal Mercury, n.d. [inferred date 1881]), 323: special commissioner, 4 April 1881.
17. See *Blue Book for the Transvaal Province 1879* (Pretoria: Government Printers, 1879), 8–9; Intelligence Branch of the Quartermaster-General's Department, Horse Guards, War Office, *Précis of Information*

Concerning South Africa: The Transvaal Territory (London: H.M. Stationary Office, 1878), 50–3. *British Parliamentary Papers* [henceforth *BPP*] (C. 2950), Appendix II: Sketch Map of the Transvaal Territory, published in March 1880 by the British Intelligence Branch of the Quartermaster-General's Department, gives the unrealistically precise population figures of 33,739 "Dutch," 5,316 "Non-Dutch," and 774,930 "Kaffirs."

18. Adrian Preston, ed., *Sir Garnet Wolseley's South African Journal 1879-1880: Zululand / Transvaal* (Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1973), 140: 20 October 1879.
19. Intelligence Branch, *Transvaal Territory*, 45, 50; *Blue Book 1879*, 15.
20. *BPP* (C. 3219), Transvaal Royal Commission Report, Part II: Report of Evidence given by Sir Morrison Barlow, Bart., and by Captain Dahl, 28 May 1881.
21. *Blue Book 1879*, 7; see 104–19 for lists of officials in the various government departments.
22. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 212: 17 January 1880.
23. *BPP* (C.2676), no. 26: Sir W. Owen Lanyon to the Earl of Kimberley, 12 June 1880.
24. Lady Bellairs, ed., *The Transvaal War, 1880-81* (Edinburgh and London, William Blackwood and Sons, 1885), 43. It is generally held that Colonel Bellairs wrote most of this book, though his official position in the Transvaal precluded his claiming authorship.
25. In Pretoria, the young Haggard found the rumbustious and opinionated Trollope "obstinate as a pig." Quoted in Victoria Glendinning, *Trollope* (London: Pimlico, 1993), 455.
26. Anthony Trollope, *South Africa*, J.H. Davidson, ed. (reprint of the 1878 edition, Cape Town: A.A. Balkema, 1973), 305.
27. Trollope, *South Africa*, 298.
28. H.J. Barrett, "Social and Domestic Life of the Dutch Boers of South Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute: Volume the First 1869* (London: Royal Commonwealth Institute, 1870), 184–5.
29. Intelligence Branch, *Transvaal Territory*, 23–6.
30. Trollope, *South Africa*, 327, 330.
31. Mrs Walter H.C. Long, *Peace and War in the Transvaal. An Account of the Defence of Fort Mary, Lydenburg* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1882), 6.
32. Arthur M. Davey, "The Siege of Pretoria 1880–1881," *Archives Year Book for South African History, Nineteenth Year* (Parow: Government Printer, 1956), 1: 271–2.
33. Keith Robbins, Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness (London and New York: Longman, 1998), 213–14.
34. Alan Knight, "Britain and Latin America," *Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume III*, ed. Andrew Porter, 136.
35. *Blue Book 1879*, 9-10, 146.
36. Mackenzie, "Empire and metropolitan cultures," 274–5.
37. *Blue Book 1879*, 10, 148–9.
38. Trollope, *South Africa*, 302.
39. *Blue Book 1879*, 11–12; Intelligence Branch, *Transvaal Territory*, 23.
40. Blue Book 1879, 13, 17.
41. Intelligence Branch, *Transvaal Territory*, 26.
42. Long, *Peace and War*, 4–7.
43. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 124, 128, 158: 27 September, 5 October, 4 November 1879.
44. Trollope, *South Africa*, 328–9.
45. Bellairs, *Transvaal War*, 327.

46. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 126, 129, 207: 1 October, 7 October 1879, 14 January 1880.
47. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 124, 128: 27 September, 4 October 1879.
48. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 129, 132–3, 197: 6 October, 10 October, 29 December 1879.
49. Trollope, *South Africa*, 299, 303-4.
50. Preston, *Wolseley's Journal*, 129–30: 7 October 1879.
51. Trollope, *South Africa*, 299–301, 304.
52. The most active missionary societies in the Transvaal were the Berlin, Hermannsburg, and Cape Dutch Reformed Church. However, the Mackenzie Anglican Mission was active in the Lydenburg District, and the Wesleyan Mission in the Potchefstroom and Marico districts. See *Blue Book 1879*, 10–11, 150–1.
53. C.E. Carrington, *The British Overseas: Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 495.
54. Intelligence Branch, *Transvaal Territory*, 47. For the average wages of such labourers, see *Blue Book 1879*, 167; Trollope, *South Africa*, 304–5.
55. *BPP* (C. 2866), enc. 2 in no. 1: D.M. Kisch, Acting Auditor-General to the Commissioner, Finance and Revenue Transvaal, 30 November 1880.
56. *BPP* (C.2950), enc. 1 in no. 49: C.K. White and Martin J. Farrell to W.E. Gladstone, n.d. (c. 7 April 1881); Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 118.
57. Trollope, *South Africa*, 263.
58. W.E. Garrett Fisher, *The Transvaal and the Boer* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1900), 92, 199.
59. Trollope, *South Africa*, 294.
60. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 111–16; *BPP* (C. 2676), enc. 2 in no. 24a: W.E. Gladstone to S.T. Kruger and T.C. Joubert, 8 June 1880.
61. *BPP* (C. 2866), Appendix: General Sir G. Wolseley to Sir Michael Hicks Beach, 29 October 1879.
62. *BPP* (C. 2866), enc. in no. 75: Memorandum by His Excellency the Administrator in Council, 1 January 1881.
63. *BPP* (C. 2740), enc. in no. 73: Lanyon to Colley, 26 November 1880.
64. *BPP* (C.2866), no. 74: Colley to Kimberley, 10 February 1881.
65. *BPP* (C. 2866), enc. 5 in no. 3: Colley to Landdrosts, Field Cornets, &c., of the Transvaal, n.d. [December 1880].
66. For general accounts of the sieges of the Transvaal towns, see *inter alia*, Bellairs, *Transvaal War*, 97–367; C.L. Norris-Newman, *With the Boers in the Transvaal and Orange Free State in 1880-1* (London: W.H. Allen, 1882), 231–52; T.F.C. Carter, *A Narrative of the Boer War: Its Causes and Result* (London: John MacQueen, 1896), 341–459; J. Lehmann, *The First Boer War* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1972),184–222. There are several studies of specific beleaguered towns. Among the best are: Long, *Defence of Fort Mary;* Davey, "Siege of Pretoria"; and Ian Bennett, *A Rain of Lead: The Siege and Surrender of the British at Potchefstroom, 1880–1881* (London: Greenhill Books, 2001).
67. *BPP* (C.2950), enc. 11 in no. 30: Heads of Conditions of an Armistice Proposed to be Agreed between the British and Boer Forces, 6 March 1881; enc. 12 in no. 30: Terms of Four days Prolongation of Armistice, 14 March 1881; enc. 13 in no. 30: Wood's Account of Meeting with Boers, 16 March 1881; enc. 1 in no. 40: Account of Meeting with Boers, 18 March 1881; enc. 2 in no. 40: Minutes of Proceedings of Meeting, 21 March 1881; Result of a Meeting, 21 March 1881.
68. *BPP* (C. 3098), enc. 1 in no, 23: Pretoria Convention, 3 August 1881. See also *BPP* (C. 3114), Appendix no. 1: Convention.

69. *BPP* (C. 2866), no. 3: Colley to Kimberley, 26 December 1880.
70. D.M Schreuder, *Gladstone and Kruger: Liberal Government and Colonial "Home Rule," 1880–85* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), 212–14, 222–4, 465–9. Despite being written over thirty years ago, this work remains the standard authority.
71. *BPP* (C. 2892), no. 1: Kimberley to Sir Hercules Robinson, 31 March 1881.
72. *Transvaal War*, 308–9: Newcastle correspondent, 30 March 1881; 344: special commissioner, Pretoria, 7 April 1881; 358: leader, 30 April 1881; 364: special correspondent, Newcastle, 1 May 1881.
73. *BPP* (C. 2950), enc. 1 in no. 49: C.K. White and Martin J. Farrell to W.E. Gladstone, n.d. (c. 7 April 1881).
74. *BPP* (C. 2950), enc. in no. 66: The Humble Petition of the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal to the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, n.d. [1 May 1881]. See *Transvaal War*, 379, 385, for reports from Pretoria on 17 and 23 April 1881 describing the flight of artisans.
75. *Transvaal War*, 363: Newcastle correspondent, 30 April 1881; p. 364: Newcastle correspondent, 1 May 1881; 383: special commissioner, Potchefstroom, 20 April 1881; *Natal Advertiser*, 6 May 1881.
76. BPP (C. 2950), enc. in no. 65: Jas. C. Murray and 34 others to Kimberley, n.d. [4 May 1881].
77. See, for example, the argument in *BPP* (C. 2950), enc. in no. 66: The Humble Petition of the Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal to the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, n.d. [1 May 1881], that the "'Natives' were without exception in favour of English rule."
78. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 178.
79. See, as one example among dozens, *BPP* (C. 2959), enc. 2 in no. 8: Memorandum of Money, Goods, &c. Commandeered and Taken Away by Force from the British Subjects Residing in the Ward Hex River, in the District of Rustenburg, 5 April 1881.
80. See, for example, *BPP* (C. 2950), enc. 2 in no. 60: Report of Captain S. Brook, 5 April 1881; *BPP* (C. 3098), no. 17: Wood to Kimberley, 17 July 1881.
81. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 167. See *Transvaal War*, 363, for report of 29 April 1881 describing loyal Europeans arriving in Newcastle.
82. *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-enc. 8 in no. 14 in Appendix: Papers Laid Before the Royal Commission by the Deputation of Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal, 16 May 1881.
83. *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-enc. 11 in no. 14 in Appendix: John Nixon to the Royal Commissioners, 20 May 1881.
84. *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-enc. 16 in no. 14 in Appendix: Papers laid before Royal Commission by Deputation of Loyal Inhabitants, 27 May 1881; sub-enc. 17 in Appendix: Interview given to Deputation of Loyal Inhabitants, 27 May 1881; sub-enc. 18 in Appendix: Interview of Deputation with the Royal Commission, 28 May 1881.
85. *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-enc. 20 in no. 14 in Appendix: Report of the Meeting of the Transvaal Sufferers' Protection Association, 1 June 1881.
86. *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-enc. 21 in no. 14 in Appendix: Fred. S. Whiting to the Royal Commissioners, 20 June 1881; sub-enc. 22 in no. 14 in Appendix: Deputation From the Standard Bank of British South Africa, 21 June 1881.
87. See *BPP* (C. 3114), sub-encs. 23–31 in no. 14 in Appendix.
88. *Transvaal War*, 299: Resolution at Public Meeting in Cape Town, 8 April 1881; p. 321: Resolution at Public Meeting in East London, 14 April 1881. *Natal Advertiser,* 13 April 1881; *Times of Natal*, 11 April 1881.
89. Joanna Burke, *An* Intimate *History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London: Granta Books, 2000), 41–2; Mackenzie, "Empire and Metropolitan Cultures," 277–8.

90. *Times of Natal*, 28 March 1881.
91. *Natal Advertiser*, 5 April 1881.
92. *Transvaal War*, 308: Newcastle correspondent, 28 March 1881.
93. *Times of Natal*, 18 April 1881.
94. *Times of Natal*, 328: Wakkerstroom correspondent, 5 April 1881.
95. *Times of Natal*, 299: Maritzburg correspondent, 10 April 1881; *Times of Natal*, 11 April 1881.
96. *Times of Natal*, 361: special commissioner in Newcastle, 24 April 1881.
97. Queen Victoria to Kimberley, 26 May 1881, quoted in Scheuder, *Gladstone and Kruger*, 196.
98. *BPP* (C. 2950), no. 57: Gladstone to White, 1 June 1881.
99. *BPP* (C.3114), Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into and Report upon All Matters Relating to the Settlement of the Transvaal Territory, n.d. [August 1881], Part I; no. 11a in Appendix: Robinson to Kimberley, 29 June 1881; no. 11b in Appendix: Kimberley to Robinson, 5 July 1881. See also *BPP* (C. 3219), Report of the Commissioners, Part II: Report of a Conference with the Boer Leaders, 19 July 1881, items 2433–6.
100. *BPP* (C. 3098), enc. 1 in no. 23: Convention, 3 August 1881: Article 8.
101. *BPP* (C. 3098), enc. 1 in no. 23: Convention, 3 August 1881: Article 12.
102. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 178–80.
103. *BPP* (C.3114), Report of the Commissioners, Part I; no. 14 in Appendix: Martin Farrell to St Leger Herbert, Secretary, Royal Commission, 28 May 1881.
104. *Resurgam* translated is "May I rise again." It was a popular inscription on Victorian tombstones.
105. *BPP* (C. 3098), no. 25: Wood to Kimberley, 17 August 1881; Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 182–3; *Times of Natal*, 3 August 1881; Lehmann, *First Boer War*, 301. During the night, the coffin was exhumed and hoisted at the post office nearby. Lt-Col G.F. Gildea rescued the flag and took it back with him to England.
106. *BPP* (C. 3098), enc. 1 in no. 25: Herbert Lewis and 59 others to Wood, n.d. [4 August 1881]; enc. 2 in no. 25: Maj T. Fraser, Private Secretary for Transvaal Affairs, to C.J. Kidwell, 4 August 1881.
107. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 178.
108. *Transvaal War*, 276: *Natal Mercury* leader, 2 April 1881.
109. Haggard, *Last Boer War*, 201.