authority been retained, and not harshly wrested from you, even at the eleventh hour initiatory steps of a reformatory nature with respect to the natives would have been taken, which it is the duty of Britain to follow while she holds her sovereignty over these parts."

"I can never forget the many kindnesses I have received from you, and how much I owe to your action when I served with you, for you made service a pleasure," writes Colonel Lanyon (August 14), using almost the same words as Sir H. Green and Sir W. Merewether in old Indian days.

The valued companion of his journey to the Transvaal, Stegmann, who had means of knowing better perhaps than any one every pulsation of opinion among his Dutch countrymen, both in the Cape Colony and in the Transvaal, writes, regretting his inability to be present to see him sail—

"September 7, 1880.

"I venture to think there is no one there whose attachment to your Excellency is greater, whose conviction that you have been wronged is stronger, or whose grief at your leaving is intenser than mine. . . . I rejoice to think how the well-nigh unanimous expression of opinion throughout the country must have cheered your Excellency; and I have no doubt the Home Government have by this time discovered how little aware they were of the confidence reposed in your Excellency by the people whom you came to unite, and who would in due time have been delighted and proud to see you at the head of the South African Union. . . . Had I been on the staff, or on the spot, . . . I might have been presumptuous enough to ask your Excellency to point out to Lord Kimberley [in reply to the despatch of recall] that unless they meant to annul the annexation the effect of the recall on the Boer mind must be sorely detrimental to the prospects of a speedy settlement of affairs in the Transvaal and of the greatly desired union."

The feeling of the old loyal Dutch families is shown in a letter written to Frere two months after he had left, when native and other troubles were gathering fast. It is

from Madame Koopmans de Wet, a lady of old family, Dutch of the Dutch, written in sore grief and trouble, public and private.

"November 16, 1880.

"It is with feelings of the deepest sorrow that I take the liberty of addressing these lines to you. Yesterday brought the startling news that that Christian soldier Commandant von Linsingen is killed, as also his noble boy of fifteen years old.

"Sir Bartle, Captain von Linsingen went to try and put down this fearful rebellion in Tembuland. Never need his precious blood have been shed had not these poor misguided savages been encouraged and almost told to revolt. What will those in England who have made it a business of their lives to proclaim to the world that the Imperial Government would not assist in any wars of ours, now say? This general rising is due to those words. Surely might they have waited till asked to refuse,—the more so as the Basutos are a legacy from them to us. And what is to be the end of all this now, and now particularly do the Cape people miss *their* Governor, for now superior qualities in everything is [are] wanted. Dear Sir Bartle, you know the material we have; it is good, but who is to guide? It is plain to every thinking mind that our position is becoming more critical every day. . . .

"But with deep sorrow let me say, England's, or rather Downing Street's treatment has not tightened the bonds between the mother country and us. You know we have a large circle of acquaintances, and I cannot say how taken aback I sometimes am to hear their words. See, in all former wars there was moral support in the thought England, our England, is watching over us; it strengthened us and kept, to a certain measure, the savage in control. Now there is but one cry, 'We will have no Imperial help.' Why is this? We have lost confidence in a Government who could play with our welfare; and among the many injuries done us, the greatest was to remove from among us a ruler such as your Excellency was."

Frere's successor was to be Sir Hercules Robinson. As he was in New Zealand and could not get to the Cape for

some months, Sir George Strahan was appointed *ad interim* Governor. But Frere was directed not to await even the latter's arrival, but to leave by the mail steamer early in September.

As the day drew near, the Capetown people were at their wit's end to express adequately their feelings on the occasion. It was suggested that on the day he was to embark, the whole city should mourn with shops closed, flags half-mast high, and in profound silence. But more cheerful counsels prevailed.

He was to leave by the *Pretoria* on the afternoon of September 15. Lady Frere had been so ill that it was doubtful whether he would not have to leave, in compliance with orders, without her. But she recovered so as to be able to go, and went on board an hour or two before him, so as to avoid the excitement of the scene which followed.

After midday all business was suspended. Special trains had brought in contingents from the country to swell the crowds in the town. The open space in front of Government House, Plein Street, Church Square, Adderley Street, the Dock Road, the front of the railway station, the wharves, the housetops, and every available place whence a view of the procession could be procured were closely packed. The carriage with the Governor, two of his daughters, and Mr. Littleton left Government House at half-past four,—Volunteer Cavalry furnishing the escort, and Volunteer Rifles, Engineers, and Cadets falling in behind,—and amid farewell words and ringing cheers moved slowly along the streets gay with flags and decorations. At the dock gates the horses were taken out and men drew the carriage to the quay, where the *Pretoria* lay alongside. Here the General, the Ministers, and other leading people, were assembled; and the 91st Regiment, which had been drawn up, presented arms, the

Band played "God save the Queen," and the Volunteer Artillery fired a salute as the Governor for the last time stepped off African soil.

There had been some delay at starting, the tide was ebbing fast, the vessel had been detained to the last safe moment, and she now moved out slowly, and with caution, past a wharf which the Malays, conspicuous in their bright-coloured clothing, had occupied; then, with a flotilla of boats rowing alongside, between a double line of yachts, steam-tugs and boats, dressed out with flags and dipping their ensigns as she passed; and lastly, under the stern of the *Boadicea* man-of-war, whose yards were manned and whose crew cheered. The guns of the castle fired the last salute from the shore, which was answered by the guns of the *Boadicea;* and in the still bright evening the smoke hung for a brief space like a curtain, hiding the shores of the bay from the vessel. A puff of air from the south-east cleared it away and showed once more in the sunset light the flat mass of Table Mountain, the "Lion's Head" to its right festooned with flags, the mountain slopes dotted over with groups thickening to a continuous broad black line of people extending along the water's edge from the central jetty to the breakwater basin. The vessel's speed increased, the light faded, and the night fell on the last, the most glorious and yet the saddest day of Frere's forty-five years' service of his Queen and country.

For intensity of feeling and unanimity it would be hard in our time to find a parallel to this demonstration of enthusiasm for a public servant. The Capetown people are by race and habit the reverse of demonstrative; yet it was noticed that day, as it had been noticed when Frere left Sattara thirty years before, and again when he left Sind twenty-one years before—a sight not uncommon two

or three centuries ago, but almost unknown among men of English or German race in our day—that *men* looking on were unable to restrain their tears. At Sattara and in Sind the regret at losing him was softened by the knowledge that his departure was due to a recognition of his merit; that he was being promoted in a service in which his influence might some day extend with heightened power to the country he was leaving. It was far otherwise when he left the Cape. On that occasion the regret of the colonists was mingled with indignation, and embittered by a sense of wrong.

No one who has not associated with colonists in their homes can rightly enter into the mixed feelings with which they regard the mother country. As with a son who is gone forth into the world, there is often on one side the conceit of youth and impatience of restraint, shown in uncalled-for acts of self-assertion or in dogmatic speech; and on the other side a supercilious want of sympathy with the changed surroundings, the pursuits and the aspirations of a younger generation. It seems as if there were no bond left between the two. But a day of trial comes; parent or offspring is threatened by a stranger; and then it is seen that the old instinct and yearnings are not dead, but only latent. Amid many mistakes, the mother country had hitherto not been forgetful of its natural obligations to its South African offspring. Lately, at a critical time, it had bestowed the best of its gifts, it had sent as Governor, a statesman trained from youth and practised in carrying out the best traditions of the old country, and with a varied experience such as probably no other living Englishman possessed—such as could not possibly be gained by any colonial politician, to whom statesmanship in the early days of a Colony comes but as an interlude in the struggle for subsist-

ence. He had not flattered the colonists. So far from it, he had single-handed dismissed a Ministry commanding a majority in a Legislative Assembly sensitively jealous of any interference with its prerogative. Yet so completely had he gained their confidence and seized upon their affections, that with him and him only of living statesmen as their guide, east and west, Cape colonist and Natalian, Englishman and Dutchman, were ready to join in one great confederation, bound together by common loyalty to the British Crown. With strange perversity the consummation of this great work was marred by one British Ministry and destroyed by the Ministry which succeeded it. The gift of bread from the parent country was exchanged for a stone. Those who on that fateful evening watched the hull of the *Pretoria* slowly dipping below the western horizon felt that if, as seemed only too probable, dismemberment of the British Empire in South Africa were sooner or later to follow, the fault did not lie with the colonists. It was not they or their Ministers who were disloyal, it was the mother country which was looking on in apathy while its Government sacrificed the welfare of South Africa and endangered the integrity of the Empire, in order to conciliate an ignorant and fanatical clique and to maintain a party majority in the House of Commons.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE BREACH OF FAITH.

The Boer Emissaries at Capetown—Outbreak of the Rebellion—Aylward—The Surrender—Sufferings of Loyalists—Bechuanaland—Zululand—Cetywayo restored—Frere policy in South Africa.

BEFORE following the course of the few remaining years of Frere's life after his return to England, it will be convenient to anticipate and to trace shortly the chain of events in the Transvaal and Zululand after his departure from South Africa. For although his responsibility for the administration of those provinces had ceased finally upon Sir Garnet Wolseley's arrival to supersede him in July, 1879, yet events there had so important a bearing on Cape questions, and especially on that of Federation, that, as has been related, he had had frequently to express his views in reference to them in writing to the Secretary of State from Capetown. Nor did his endeavours to make the truth known, and to bring about—if it were possible—that right should be done, cease after his return to England.

The Boer leaders, Krüger and Jorissen, when, as already described, they came to Capetown in May, 1880, had not confined themselves to intrigues in the Legislative Assembly. They had begun to make preparations for

armed rebellion. A Dutch gentleman of high standing, an intimate and attached friend of Frere's, hearing this, went, on his own responsibility, to remonstrate with them. Frere, he reminded them, had always recommended that the Transvaal should have local self-government granted it, and ultimately a constitution as liberal as that of the Cape Colony. What more could they reasonably ask? Would they have an interview with Frere? They declared their willingness to accept such a constitution, provided the annexation were rescinded and the English flag hauled down for a single day as a confession of national error and apology for national wrong-doing. They declined, however, to allow this proposal to be officially laid before Frere, "because the Governor's power was gone, and he was, they were assured, to be recalled." * Frere asked them to postpone their departure from Capetown till Sir George Colley, then daily expected, arrived. They did so, and Colley, on his arrival, was applied to by the same peacemaker and asked if he would see the Boer emissaries. This, however, he declined to do, and in the course of the conversation which ensued, he indicated that he attached little importance to the strength of any resistance which might be made by the malcontents. The other ventured to remonstrate, assuring him that he underestimated their fighting power.† But Colley was not to be persuaded.

When Frere left South Africa, he added to his telegraphic message of farewell to Colonel Lanyon the following words:—"Tell Pretorius and all sincere

* Frere to Mr. J. M. Maclean, April 22, 1881.

† He mentioned, as a proof of their skill as marksmen, that a boy of thirteen or fourteen would be sent out to bring home a head of game for the table, and—powder and lead being expensive—as a matter of course only one cartridge was given him, the contingency of his making a miss not being admissible.

Transvaal men they have my best wishes for their prosperity, and that they will see, in joining you to give good government to the country, the best road to the same independence as their friends here [*i.e.* at Capetown] have achieved." And soon after reaching England he took an opportunity of impressing on Lord Kimberley the necessity of speedily granting the Boers a constitution "otherwise there would be serious trouble there."

Matters at first seemed to be quieting down. Colonel Lanyon, though he objected to the too rapid reduction in the numbers of the troops, which, in spite of Colonel Bellairs's protest, were, in obedience to pressure from the British Government, being sent home, reported on the whole favourably. But the encouragement given to the malcontents by British sympathizers during the elections had produced an effect not to be easily overcome. Mr. Gladstone, speaking at Peebles of Cyprus and the Transvaal, had said—

"If these acquisitions were as valuable as they are valueless, I would repudiate them, because they are obtained by means dishonourable to the character of the country." *

These and similar words had flattered the vanity of the Boers, increased their confidence, and given permanence to their attitude of disaffection. Nor was their excitement allayed, or their respect for British rule increased, when they were made aware that these expressions, after

* In another speech he had said: "They [the Conservative Government] have annexed the Transvaal territory inhabited by a free European Christian Republican community, which they thought proper to bring within the limits of a monarchy, although out of eight thousand persons in that Republic qualified to vote upon the subject, we are told, and I have never seen the statement officially contradicted, that 6,500 protested against it."

serving the purpose of the Opposition speaker at Midlothian, were repudiated by him in practice, when he became Minister, without so much as a word of apology or excuse to those whom they had deceived.

In December came the news that on the 16th the Boers had issued a proclamation declaring the re-establishment of their Republic, but deprecating an appeal to arms, pending negotiations. Nevertheless, on the same day a Boer force made an armed attack on Potchefstrom.

On the 20th two hundred and fifty men of the 94th Regiment, with a long column of baggage and several women, were marching with no suspicion of hostilities towards Pretoria. When the column was near Brounckers Spruit, thirty-eight miles from Pretoria, it was met by five hundred armed and mounted Boers. A parley ensued, during which the Boers took up sheltered positions surrounding the column; and when Colonel Anstruther, who was in command, declared his intention of proceeding to his destination, notwithstanding the Boers' prohibition, a fire was poured in upon his force, which in a few minutes killed or wounded 157 of them, only two of the officers being left unwounded. The rest had no choice but to surrender.*

* Much was said at the time by British sympathizers of the kindness shown by the Boers to the prisoners and wounded of their antagonists. Colonel Lanyon, writing from the scene of action at Pretoria, gives a different account. He says—

"The Boers were very clever in being kind to our wounded soldiers, for they well knew that such action would obtain sympathy at home. But where it was impossible for their deeds to become known their conduct was far from creditable to them. Poor Clarke and Raaf were kept for two months in a dark room, and were only allowed out twice for exercise. Barlow was robbed of everything, and only left the clothes he stood in. A Hollander, who is secretary to Cronji at Potchefstrom, is still wearing the rings of poor Captain Falls, who was shot. Englishmen have been murdered, flogged, and robbed of everything. The Boers at Potchefstrom forced the prisoners

Frere, at the first intelligence of the outbreak, at once suspected who might be the principal instigator.

It was not a Boer, or a man of Dutch descent, who had applied the match which had kindled the combustible elements of insurrection.

In a memorandum for the Colonial Office, Frere says—

"December 21, 1880.

"It may be well to inquire the present whereabouts of Mr. Aylward.

"He was one of the principal advisers of Messrs. Krüger and Joubert when they attempted to turn the Zulu war to their own account in 1879. He was said to be an ex-Fenian, pardoned for turning on his accomplices in the murder of the policeman at Manchester, subsequently tried for murder at the Diamond Fields, and a leader of foreign mercenaries under President Burgers.

"He offered himself to me for employment in Natal during the Zulu war, professing to be in correspondence with Mr. Froude and others whom I knew in England. He is a clever but very dangerous and untrustworthy man. When I last heard of him he was editing the *Witness* newspaper in Natal, and generally writing in a very seditious and mischievous strain, and if still in that neighbourhood, I have no doubt he has taken an active part in advising the present outbreak as a diversion in favour of his Irish friends."

And he writes to Mr. F. Greenwood, editor of the *St. James's Gazette*:—

of war to dig their trenches, and some were shot from the Fort while so employed. Woite and Van der Linden were shot as spies, because they had been in the Boer camp and left it some days before they proclaimed the Republic. Carolus, a Cape boy, was shot by Boer court-martial because he left the Fort when food became scarce. A white man and nine natives were similarly shot without any trial. Explosive bullets were used, notwithstanding that Colonel Winsloe pointed out to the Boer leader in a letter that such was against the rules of war."

There is abundant evidence that many acts of treachery and barbarity similar to and worse than those referred to by Colonel Lanyon were perpetrated by the insurgent Boers.

"December 28, 1880.

"Birdwood tells me you would like to know my reason for believing the present outbreak in the Transvaal to be of Irish origin. I have told the story so often officially and unofficially that I thought it an oft-told tale; and you must pardon me if I only repeat what you have heard before.

"In 1879, when I was among the Boers in the Transvaal, I found that the real wire-pullers of their committee were foreigners of various nationalities, notably some Hollanders (not Africanders) imbued with German Socialist Republicanism, and an Irishman of the name of Aylward. I was told he was a man of great natural ability, educated as a solicitor, an ex-Fenian, pardoned under another name (Murphy, I think) for turning Queen's Evidence against others who had murdered the policeman at Manchester. Emigrating to the Diamond Fields, he was tried, convicted, and suffered imprisonment there for homicide. When he came out of prison he betook himself to the Transvaal and had a command of foreign free lances under Mr. Burgers, then President of the Transvaal Republic, in his unsuccessful attempt to take Secocoeni's stronghold. After the annexation of the Transvaal he came to England and published one of the few readable books on the Transvaal, and went out to Natal during the darkest hours of our Zulu troubles, seeking employment; but he was an impossible man, and was urging the Boers to rise at the same time that he was offering his services to me and Lord Chelmsford. Finally he settled at Pietermaritzburg, where he was, when I last heard of him, as editor of the *Witness*, writing anti-English republicanism and sedition with much ability, especially when opposing the Cape Government and its governor, whom he never forgave for warning the Boers against following Fenian advice. When I was in the Transvaal and afterwards I found him always connected with any opposition to the English Government. He knew all the leaders of the simple-minded but very suspicious Boers, and had gained their ear, so that he had no difficulty in persuading them to reject any good advice I offered them, —'Wait-a-bit' being always the most acceptable suggestion you can offer to a Boer.

"Directly I heard of the attack on our troops in the Transvaal, I felt assured that my old acquaintance was

pulling the wires with a view to create a diversion in favour of his old colleagues in Ireland.

"The attack took place apparently near the farm of Solomon Prinsloo, one of the most bitter malcontent Boers, who was always a firebrand, and who, when I visited the Boer camp in 1879, was with difficulty held back by Pretorius and Krüger from directing an attack upon us in Pretoria. I very much doubt whether without some such external instigation, the Boers would have broken out. . . .

"The facts I have mentioned and many more about Aylward are on record in Scotland Yard,* and in the Colonial Office, and I am anxious you should know the truth and not attribute too much of the blame in this sad business to the unfortunate misguided Boers, the victims of his bad advice, still less to any fault of Colonel Lanyon's administration." †

* Sir E. Henderson, then commanding the London police, writes to Frere in answer to a letter of his (March 6, 1881): "I just managed to get a note to Sir Frederick Roberts, as he left yesterday morning, anent Mr. Aylward. The record of him at Scotland Yard tallies so far entirely with the account recently published in the newspapers. He is a born traitor and conspirator, and would betray and conspire against any one and anything. There can be no doubt that to the best of his not inconsiderable ability he has helped to foster this unhappy movement on the part of the Boers, and incurred an amount of responsibility which may some day prove inconvenient, unless he gets a chance to betray them."

† That the legitimate Boer leaders were not at first prepared to proceed to extremities appears probable from the following letter of Colonel Lanyon's, written from Pretoria:—

"Once more we are in a state of siege here, only this time affairs have suddenly and, as it were, unexpectedly, even to the leaders of the Boers, assumed a much more serious aspect than was the case before. I say unexpectedly, for I believe the decision that they should start their Republic was entirely an impulse of the moment and acted upon there and then. I know that the leaders were very anxious to get a bridge to retreat over, for they wanted some of the town people to go out and interview them in order to bring about mediation, and I was in great hopes that it would have been possible. —— came in on the 15th and stated that both Krüger and Pretorius had had a long talk with him the day before to this effect. Whether they were in earnest or not remains to be proved, but it is strange that on the evening of the 15th the whole camp moved away to Heidelberg, and that their proclamation was sent to Potchefstrom to be printed. . . ."

Frere proved to be correct in his conjecture. Aylward had at once joined the insurgents; he was on Joubert's staff and was one of their acknowledged leaders.* Sir George Colley had been warned against him, but had replied that he found him useful in getting him information. Afterwards, when Colley was killed, it was Aylward who, as "military secretary" to Joubert, objected to giving up his body, on the ground that the messenger sent for it was not of sufficient rank. Nor was he a solitary, unsupported adventurer. Money to stir up the insurrection was coming in from the Irish rebel societies. The Transvaal was one of the points of attack of the anarchical plots which had their head-quarters in Ireland and America.†

The insurrection did not draw its forces from the Transvaal alone. Many joined from the Orange Free State and from elsewhere. It had attractions for the vagabond and floating population which on the borders of civilization "loathes a law," and in Africa, especially a law which has anything to say in restraint of dealings with, or conduct towards the natives. Burger's Republic had been an aggregation of farmers and adventurers doing each pretty much what was right in his own eyes. Anarchy

* Major-General Hope Crealock writes to Frere (January 7, 1881): "A young Irishman named S——, who knew Aylward in Natal, and who was under my command in the Natal Pioneers, called on me to-night and told me Aylward formerly used to boast of being a Fenian, and vowed he would pay the English Government off for what he had got, by raising the Boers whenever Ireland was rising; and within the last few days has written to him saying he gloried in being one of the instigators of the present Boer revolt, etc., etc. He wrote from Utrecht. . . ."

Aylward was the author and composer of the Boers' "Solemn Oath and Covenant."

† Major Le Caron stated in his evidence before the Parnell Commission and repeated in his book that money was sent by the Irish Rebel Societies to stir up the Transvaal rebellion.

and licence had brought them to the brink of destruction by the Zulu impis, and they had cheered the red-coats as they entered Pretoria to support Shepstone and maintain order. But they had looked on, unaiding, as though indifferent to the issue, while the red-coats, shedding their blood like water, had relieved the Transvaal once for all from the Zulu terror. Anarchy and licence would be safer now, and now they would shoot the red-coats and get rid of them, and henceforth have, as far as might be, no laws and no taxes.

And they did shoot the red-coats. Colley entered upon the campaign with a force so inadequate that the insurgents, confident of success, repulsed the British troops with great loss on three separate occasions, in the last of which Sir George Colley was killed. These successes had the additional bad effect of obtaining for them sympathy and adhesion among the Dutch population elsewhere, and there was danger lest out of the war should arise a bitter hostility between Dutch and English throughout South Africa.

All this was bad enough. What followed was far worse. In the Queen's speech (January, 1881) was the following sentence: "A rising in the Transvaal has recently imposed upon me the duty of taking military measures with a view to the prompt vindication of my authority, and has of necessity set aside for the time being any plans for securing to the European settlers that full control over their own local affairs, without prejudice to the interests of the natives which I have been desirous to confer." The method chosen of vindicating the Queen's authority was to treat with successful rebels in arms. From the time of the outbreak of the insurrection the British Government had, through Brand, the President of the Orange Free State, been endeavouring to negotiate with the

insurgents. And after Colley's death at Majuba Hill, it gradually became known that the plighted word of the British Crown, over and over again pledged to retain the Transvaal, on the faith of which hundreds of Europeans had settled in the country and staked their all, and on which seven hundred thousand natives relied for protection, was to be deliberately repudiated and broken.*

The details of the surrender were entrusted to a Commission, of which the British representatives were Sir

* Mr. Rider Haggard, who had been Shepstone's private secretary, writes to Frere from Newcastle, Natal, close to where the fighting had taken place :—

"June 6, 1881.

"I do not believe that more than half of those engaged in the late rebellion were free agents, though once forced into committing themselves they fought as hard as the real malcontents. . . . The natives are the real heirs to the soil, and should surely have some protection and consideration, some voice in the settlement of their fate. They outnumber the Boers by twenty-five to one, taking their numbers at a million and those of the Boers at forty thousand, a fair estimate, I believe. . . . As the lash and the bullet have been the lot of the wretched Transvaal Kafir in the past, so they will be his lot in the future. . . . After leading all these hundreds of thousands of men and women to believe that they were for once and for ever the subjects of Her Majesty, safe from all violence, cruelty, and oppression, we have handed them over without a word of warning to the tender mercies of one, where natives are concerned, of the cruelest white races in the world.

"Then comes the case of the loyal Boers, men who believed us and fought for us, and are now, as a reward for their loyalty, left to the vengeance of their countrymen, a vengeance that will most certainly be wreaked, let the Royal Commission try to temper it as they will.

"Lastly, there are the unfortunate English inhabitants, three thousand of whom were gathered during the siege in Pretoria alone, losing their lives in a forsaken cause. I can assure you, sir, that you must see these people to learn how complete is their ruin. They have been pouring through here, many of those who were well-to-do a few months since, hardly knowing how to find food for their families."

Hercules Robinson, Sir Henry de Villiers, and Colonel Evelyn Wood. Every point, however unjust and unreasonable, demanded by the Boers was yielded. Those who had murdered Englishmen, or who had otherwise violated the usages of war, were to have been tried. Even this was in no instance carried out. Either they were not brought to justice at all, or a jury was impanelled from which Englishmen were excluded. Upon the report of the Commission was founded the "Convention of Pretoria" (August, 1881). Nominally the Queen's supremacy as "Suzerain" was retained. How much that was worth was indicated shortly after at a banquet at Pretoria, at which the British representative was present, when the Queen's health was drunk, with ironical cheers, *last* of all the political toasts.

Amongst the English in South Africa the consternation and resentment were intense and universal. But there were no adequate means for loyal men to give expression to their feelings, for it was practically impossible, in the midst of a population of mixed races, to denounce an act of the British Government without at the same time appearing to denounce the British connection. It was difficult to restrain the people, but it was done. Mr. R. W. Murray of the *Cape Times* even refused to advertise a notice of a public meeting in his paper, fearing lest if a meeting were called the British flag should be pulled down.*

Letter after letter reached Frere from his friends in South Africa full of grief and indignation. They knew

* Mr. R. W. Murray to Sir B. Frere, May 16, 1881 :—

"Ask your English statesmen," he writes, "if, in the history of the world, there was ever such a cruel desertion of a dependency by the parent State. How can England hope for loyalty from South Africans? The moral of the Gladstone lesson is that you may be anything in South Africa but loyal Englishmen."

that, if he could not help, he would at least sympathize with them.

Colonel Lanyon, who since the first outbreak had been shut up in Pretoria, writes:—

"March 29, 1881.

"Last night the saddest news I ever received in my life came in the shape of a letter from Wood. . . . After three Secretaries of State, three High Commissioners, and two Houses of Commons had said that the country should not be given back, it seems a terrible want of good faith to the loyals that this decision should have been arrived at. The scene this morning was a heart-breaking one; the women, who have behaved splendidly all through the siege, were crying and wringing their hands in their great grief; the children were hushed as if in a chamber of death; and the men were completely bowed down in their sorrow—well they might, for the news brought home ruin to many and great loss to all. I am ashamed to walk about, for I hear nothing but reproaches and utterances from heretofore loyal men which cut one to the very quick. . . . How I am to tell the natives I know not, for they have trusted so implicitly to our promises and assurances. . . . One man who has been most loyal to us (an Englishman) told me to-day, 'Thank God my children are Afrikanders, and need not be ashamed of their country!'" *

* Colonel Lanyon writes again:—

"April 26, 1881.

"The Boers are practically dictators, and have been ruling the country in a manner which is simply humiliating to Englishmen. Active persecution is going on everywhere, and, consequently, all that can are leaving the country. Thirty families have left Pretoria alone; B—— and M—— have left, having been frequently threatened because of their having been members of the Executive, and those two poor fellows J—— and H—— are completely ostracised for the same reason. They are both ruined men, practically speaking, and all because they trusted to England's assurances and good faith. . . .

"But, hard as these cases are, I feel that the natives have had the cruelest measure meted out to them, and they feel it acutely. The most touching and heart-breaking appeals have come from some of the chiefs who live near enough to have heard the news. They ask

Amongst the comparatively few in England who were acquainted with the facts the indignation was deep. In the House of Lords the surrender was denounced by Lord Cairns in powerful and unanswerable language. But in the House of Commons there was no debate adequate to the occasion. The breach of public faith, the betrayal of and cruelty to British subjects, white and black, involved in the surrender became known in England only by degrees, and was never fully realized by the British people.

To cover the disgrace and to conceal the true issues of the case, Mr. Gladstone invented a rhetorical phrase which served its purpose well enough. In a published letter he declared that "it was a question of saving the country from sheer blood-guiltiness." The phrase had no foundation in fact. Sir Frederick Roberts had been sent to the Cape with force enough to have put down the rebellion with an amount of bloodshed which, compared with the bloodshed the surrender has since caused, is causing now, and may cause for generations, would have been as nothing. No conceivable crime—for it is no less—in matters where uncivilized races are concerned, is more certainly conducive to shedding of blood than a breach of faith. It was the fear, not of shedding blood, but of endangering the unity of their party, which actuated the British Government in the course they had taken.

why they have been thrown over after showing their loyalty by paying their taxes and resisting the demands made upon them by the Boers during hostilities. They point out that we stopped them from helping us, and that, had we not done so, the Boers would have been easily put down. They say that, as we so hindered their action, it is a cruel wrong for us now to hand them back to the care of a race which is more embittered against them than ever, and who have already begun to harass them because of their loyalty. These points are unanswerable, and I do not see how we can well reply to them. . . ."

In a letter to Miss Trench, Frere writes—

"March 31, 1881.

"Let no one ever say that England lost prestige through Sir George Colley. I do not like the word so much as 'character' or 'conduct,' which create it. But no country ever lost real prestige through defeat. Nelson, wounded and repulsed at Teneriffe; Grenvil, overpowered and dying on the deck of the *Revenge*, did as much for England's prestige as Marlborough at Blenheim or Wellington at Waterloo. Sir George Colley miscalculated his own and his enemy's strength, but he had nothing to do with disgraceful surrender, and I am sure had rather be where he now rests than sign a disgraceful peace, which is the only thing that can injure England's prestige."

To Mr. Gordon Sprigg he writes—

"April 21, 1881.

"What has come over the nation I cannot imagine, for while without a single exception every one seems ashamed of the course the Government has adopted in South Africa, there is no public movement, and a superficial observer might suppose there was acquiescence. . . .

"The apparent apathy is due partly to Lord Beaconsfield's illness and death and the consequent disorganisation of the Opposition; but more, I think, to the feeling that negotiations are still in progress, and that it is not right or wise to anticipate the disgraceful ultimate issue which seems almost inevitable but which is still in the future. . . .

"I only hope that both colonies [the Cape and Natal] will remain loyal to England as England, and not believe that the unpatriotic and timid course adopted by the present Government at all represents the real feeling of the nation."

In a letter to Mr. Albert Grey, dated July 25, 1881, in reference to an impending debate in the House, Frere thus sums up the situation at that time:—

"No doubt the non-fulfilment of our promises of some sort of self-government was the cause which kept in the

ranks of the malcontents many Boers who would otherwise have reluctantly acquiesced in the annexation of the Transvaal.

"For this breach of faith Liberals and Conservatives are equally to be blamed, perhaps the Conservatives most, for it was they who divided the authority Lord Carnarvon had united in my hands, and prevented the consideration of my proposals for a constitution such as Mr. Sprigg and Mr. Brand concurred in suggesting. But the Liberals cannot escape blame, for it was they who allowed six months to elapse without any sign of willingness to repair the omission of their predecessors, which I specially brought to Lord Kimberley's notice in the only interview I had with him after my return home.

"But if the gunpowder was laid by the late Government, the match was applied by the present. 1. In the Midlothian Speeches. 2. By sympathizing correspondence of Members of Government and their friends, leading the malcontents to believe that if they threatened loudly and imitated Fenian tactics, concessions would be made to them. . . .

"I do not agree with Mr. Gladstone that if the annexation was wrong we can correct that wrong by breaking faith with the people we have wronged. You cannot redress a murder by robbing the man who inherited at his death. . . . No doubt we could secure fair treatment for the natives if we could persuade the Boers that annexation would be the penalty if the Boers hereafter maltreated the natives. But how can we persuade them of this? Who will believe us after what has passed? The Boers know we have retracted pledges given by two successive Governments and by three Secretaries of State, and they believe they can beat us if we attempted to interfere. . . ."

After the conclusion of the Pretoria Convention, Frere writes to Mr. Brampton Gurdon:—

"December 10, 1881.

"I have never been able to discover any principle in our present colonial policy except that of giving way whenever they find opposition or trouble. They seem to me to have thoroughly alienated both English and Dutch and to have irritated the natives, earning contempt from every quarter;

and the entire severance from all useful connection with South Africa seems to me only a question of time, unless we change our mode of proceeding. I should regret this less did I not feel sure that if we go, other Europeans will step in with a protectorate or alliance, which will render our retention of the Cape Peninsula a costly and difficult task."

A year and a half after the Convention of Pretoria had been signed, Frere writes of its results as follows to Mr. J. M. Maclean :—

"February 23, 1883.

"The Convention under which the Transvaal was given up, stipulated for many things to be done by the new Government of the Republic, none of which have yet been accomplished and for the most part they have not been attempted. The chief reason given for retaining a British 'Suzerainty' (whatever that may imply) over the Transvaal was that it would be some protection to the 700,000 loyal native subjects against any aggression by the Boer Government.

"It has not, however, been of the slightest use for that or any other visible purpose. The natives scattered among the European farms have been reduced to the same condition of serfdom in which we found them before the annexation.

"Mapoch and other chiefs to the east and north-east, who had been loyal to the British rule, have been attacked, and great numbers of their followers have been slaughtered. A large 'commando,' said to comprise two thousand Burghers with two cannon, supplied by the Cape Government, is at present engaged in crushing this tribe, blowing up their caves with dynamite; their greatest offence is fidelity to the British Government. To the south-west, tribes beyond the Transvaal boundary, as fixed by the Convention, are being attacked by Boer commandoes, and the chiefs who had been loyal to the British Government are being despoiled of their lands, whilst their people are murdered in cold blood. The Transvaal Government, when appealed to, say 'the country is beyond their jurisdiction.'

"To the natives of Transvaal and its neighbourhood the surrender by the British Government has brought loss of all security for liberty, life, or property.

"To the white population of the Transvaal the consequences of surrender have been scarcely less disastrous. Though many months have passed since the Convention was signed, no settled government has yet been organized. The English banks have withdrawn, following a large proportion of the settlers, and the only districts where industry is not paralyzed are the gold-fields, to which there has been of late a considerable immigration of diggers, amongst whom it will require a strong Government to keep order. This stagnation seriously affects the neighbouring British Colonies of Natal and the Cape, where trade suffers and where the loyal party have not recovered from the disgrace and alienation consequent on the abandonment by the British Government of the loyal party in the Transvaal; so that in short it cannot be said that either in the Transvaal or in our older colonies any benefit has resulted from the pusillanimous conduct of the British Government either to Europeans or natives. We have got nothing to show as a set-off for our disgraceful loss of character."

The Transvaal war had left behind a bitter feeling, against the British Government, and there was a general sense of insecurity.

Baron Hübner, the veteran Austrian diplomatist and traveller, then, in his old age, on a tour round the world writes to Frere:—

"September 12, 1883.

"I cannot refrain from confiding to you that things here are far from satisfactory. In the highest sphere I see a want of confidence and an uncertainty quite natural, as no one is able to penetrate the views and wishes and intentions, if there any exist, of the Home Government, and the public at large is dissatisfied with the South African policy of Mr. Gladstone. Business is also very slow. But notwithstanding all that, people are quiet and patient. It seems to me that there are so many elements of prosperity in South Africa, and that the whole population is so law-abiding, that with more consistency at home it cannot be very difficult to govern the two colonies. But in the last twenty-five years all * the governors have been recalled in

* Not, of course, literally all, but the most eminent.

disgrace! This fact alone speaks louder than books could do. Your name is on everybody's tongue; I wish you could listen to what they tell me." *

The effects of the surrender were as injurious to the natives outside the Transvaal border as to those within it.

For nearly half a century British missionaries, of whom Livingstone was one, had been settled in Bechuanaland, the country on the north-west boundary of the Transvaal By them the natives had been reclaimed from utter barbarism to an unusual degree of civilization. Khama chief of the Bamangwato, was and is a conspicuous instance of a native chief having adopted Christian morality and doctrine, and exemplifying them by ruling his people with justice, firmness, and self-restraint. But in general the power of the chiefs diminished in the presence of the white man, and devolved in greater or less degree on the missionary. Several of the chiefs formally resigned their authority and begged the British Government to undertake the protectorate of their country. This Frere was prepared to do, and he had a plan for carrying on the administration by native officials under a British Resident's supervision; but before he could obtain the sanction of the Home Government he was superseded.

Ever since the Boers had occupied the Transvaal, the Bechuanas had been exposed to marauding attacks by them, the Boer Government being too weak—even if it had had the will—to exercise restraint over those of its subjects who were inclined to filibustering. Sir George

* In a former letter (July 23, 1883), Baron Hübner had written:—

"Je dois vous dire une chose, c'est que jamais gouverneur, ni ici ni ailleurs, a laissé de meilleurs souvenirs et de plus universels regrets que vous. Tout le monde, même ceux qui peutêtre n'ont pas complètement partagé votre manière de voir, m'ont parlé dans ces sens."

Grey had intervened to protect them in 1858, and under subsequent governors the protection had been continued. During the Zulu troubles several attempts were made by Boers to "jump" farms in Bechuana territory, but they were promptly checked by Colonels Lanyon and Warren by means of police and volunteers from Kimberley, and the Boers were made to understand that extensions of frontier in that direction would not be tolerated. By the Pretoria Convention also the right of the British to protect the Bechuanas was expressly recognized. But the attitude of the British Government gave little reason for supposing that their promises to the natives outside the Transvaal boundary would be any better kept than their obligations to those within it had been. Marauding began at once, and little more than a year elapsed before a body of Boers and European adventurers, driving out the lawful owners, seized and marked out a slice of territory dividing Bechuanaland in two and cutting off one of the best roads from Kimberley to the interior, so that traders who still ventured to go had to take a circuitous route through the desert, where in case of a breakdown they had to abandon everything and make the best of their way to water.*

* Mr. J. Layton Mitchell, to Sir Bartle Frere (April 18, 1883). He writes from Batlaros and goes on to say—

"At Flockfontein, in June, 1882, thirteen natives were shot down while trying to save their cattle. Mr. Howard, a trader, was there and only saved his by reaching the Griqualand West boundary line. The men who did this were under the orders of De la Rey and an outlaw called Honey, whom they have since murdered. . . . It is estimated by men who know this part well that upwards of twenty thousand head of cattle have been taken from the Batlapins and other adjacent tribes. Mooro, who is the chief of the Batlaros, has assured me that he never in any way whatever interfered with the Boers, yet they have shot down his people and taken their cattle. . . . Should any doubts exist in England as to the Transvaal being connected with Stellaland, I can get the evidence of a man who wrote out the agreement between a Transvaal official and six men whom he equipped

Here, within sixty miles of Kimberley, they proclaimed a Republic, which they named after the star which they carried on their flag—Stellaland. Another similar filibustering attempt at a Republic was named Goshen. The Transvaal Government, on being remonstrated with, had nothing to say, but that they were powerless to restrain their own people.

Was faith to be kept with these natives, or was it to be broken, according to the last precedent? The British Government inclined at first to the latter course. The Convention, it was said, gave it a right, but did not impose an obligation to interfere.

Frere put forth all his influence on the side of fulfilling our obligations. In communications to the Colonial Office, and in letters and articles in the Press, he earnestly strove to convince the Government and the public of the wrongfulness, folly, and danger of failing in our duties and abdicating our position of authority.

In a memorandum he writes—

"November 15, 1883.

"Any recognized agent of the English Government has, like the missionary, without seeking it, much ruling power forced on him by circumstances. Up to 1880 this power was often used by the English officials in the interest of peace. Since 1880 this has been forbidden, and the result is the present anarchy. . . . The difficulty and cost of protecting the Bechuanas from aggression have been greatly exaggerated. Why should they be more than in 1877 to 1880, when Colonels Lanyon and Warren kept the peace, after putting down actual rebellion with no other force than police and volunteers? They scarcely called in

on their promising to give him half the cattle they captured, and they were to return horse, saddle, and gun to him; he kept a copy of this for future reference. Cattle known to have come from here are publicly sold in the Transvaal, and yet the Transvaal Government in the Colonial Blue-books denies having anything whatever to do with the new Republic."

a single English soldier, and what is wanted now is not ten thousand or even one hundred soldiers, but two or three English officers, who will do what Lanyon and Warren did—organize and direct the local forces for self-defence, and be just and considerate to the Transvaal and all men.

"At first, no doubt, their proceedings might be unpopular in the Transvaal and in the Orange Free State, and even among the Dutch at the Cape. But I am quite sure we may in the long run rely on the good sense and respect for law which actuates the majority of the Dutch population, and which will support us in what we can clearly show is a duty.

"Even under the Sand River Convention the filibustering proceedings in Bechuanaland would have been illegal, and we should have been justified in opposing them. The Boers, if we are just and considerate to them in other matters, will soon recognize the justice of our protecting the Bechuanas.

"As regards the possibility or probability of interference by other European nations there can, I think, be no doubt, if England stands aloof. Before the Franco-German war there was much pressure put on the German Government by influential commercial bodies in Frankfort, Bremen, and Hamburg, to acquire a German colony in some temperate climate. A scientific expedition was sent out to South and Eastern Africa to report on it with a view to colonization. President Burgers, of the Transvaal, was in favour of the project, but the report of the scientific men sent out from Germany was not so favourable as to overcome the objections of Prince Bismarck. He approved of the idea on general grounds, but considered that Germany had then, as the objection was expressed to me, 'too much hay on the fork' to make any large scheme of colonization prudent. Latterly the commercial agitation in favour of a German colony has been revived, and permission has been given to hoist the German flag at Angra Pequina, a small fort on the west coast, north of the Orange river, heretofore held to be English territory.*

"Whatever we may think of it here, this step is regarded

* Germany then acquired Damaraland and Namaqualand, the protectorate of which Frere had in vain pressed on Lord Carnarvon in 1877 (chap. xviii. p. 191).

at the Cape as important and significant. There are Berlin missionaries in Eastern Bechuanaland who, four years ago, threatened Colonel Warren with the displeasure of the German Government if he did not respect their claim to freedom from his control within the limits of their own mission; and German traders will not be slow to follow the example thus set, if we withdraw from the paramount position we have hitherto held in those regions.

"Why should we gratuitously open the door to such trouble by abandoning the Bechuanas, who for fifty years have been considered under our protection?"

Nothing effectual was done during Frere's lifetime, and anarchy and misery continued. Ultimately, in 1884, the British Government assumed the protectorate of Bechuanaland; a force of more than four thousand men was sent out under the command of Sir Charles Warren, who cleared the country of freebooters, and at a heavy cost, though without firing a shot, successfully accomplished what Frere had proposed to do, had he been allowed, four years before, and which might then have been done almost without the aid of a soldier.

Still more disastrous was the course of events in Zululand.

As Frere immediately after Isandhlwana had told Sir Michael Hicks-Beach would be the case, the Zulus, once decisively beaten, had accepted their defeat. After Ulundi an Englishman could travel unguarded anywhere in Zululand. All that the Zulus asked for was that the white men who had destroyed the old Government should provide them with a new one.

This the British Government refused to do. They did, indeed, send a Resident to Zululand, but with the way cleared for native administration, as it had never been before, by the collapse of the power of Kreli and of Cetywayo, and with the ever-present example of the good work done by British Residents in Indian Native States

before them, they rendered him useless by giving him strict injunctions to abstain from exercising any authority or any judicial functions. The Zulus, Frere writes to Dr. Acland (May 5, 1882), "only want to be ruled, and we give them advice and a fresh fancy policy every three years. No one could rule a nursery on such conditions. It is Ireland over again on a minute scale, and would be ludicrously foolish were not the lives and happiness of so many hundreds of thousands at stake." *

Bad as Cetywayo's rule had been, it was better than the anarchy which England's refusal to perform its duty as paramount power occasioned. Undecided disputes ripened into chronic civil war between tribe and tribe. Captain Hallam Parr writes from Pietermaritzburg (August 26, 1881): "John Dunn's impi has eaten up Sitimela's men. The butchery, I hear, was very great. What has become of the deposed Chief Umhandela

* Mr. Osborn, the first British Resident in Zululand after the war, says in his report to Sir George Colley (August 4, 1880)—

"On first entering Zululand on 15th March last . . . I received a very friendly welcome from all the Chiefs. . . . Very shortly after this applications were frequently, I may say almost daily, made to me by the people, and sometimes by Chiefs of considerable rank and standing, for my personal interference in their disputes. These were invariably referred by me to the appointed Chiefs for redress; and I availed myself of every opportunity to explain to the people that I could take no part in judicial administration, which function was to be exercised by those Chiefs. To the latter on different occasions I made as clear as I could their duties, and the responsibilities attaching to them in the positions they now hold. Notwithstanding these explanations, applications of the kind stated, and especially for my interference as a Court of Appeal against decisions of the Chiefs, continue to be made. . . . This action on my part is, I have often noticed, a cause of serious disappointment. The desire to have their disputes and affairs settled by the Queen's officers, as is the case in Natal, is very strong with the people, who seem to be unable to understand that after conquering their country the Government should relinquish all authority there in favour of the Chiefs, and leave them no means of appeal from the Chief."

(deposed by his own men) I have not heard. There is complete anarchy in Zululand at the present time." In October, 1881, about fifteen hundred natives were killed in a single intertribal broil.*

Early in 1883 the crowning act of folly was committed of sending Cetywayo back to Zululand. When this course was suggested, Frere, in an article (November, 1882) in the *Fortnightly Review*, had written as follows :—

"The English Government may simply turn Cetywayo loose in Zululand, or it may protect and support and attempt to control him. Either course would be equally inconsistent with all that has been done or said or promised hitherto, but neither could be effectual in giving peace and prosperity to Zululand, or securing its neighbours against Zulu troubles.

"If Cetywayo is merely let go and left to his own devices, what is likely to happen? He may be killed at once as Secocuni was, and as, with rare exceptions, all his predecessors have been. If he lives, will he be content? Certainly not, unless he is able to recover somehow all he has lost, and of that he has little chance. His power rested on force, on a general conviction that he had power and could and would keep it; that belief has been effectually dissipated. He can only recover his power by fresh exercise of force, by slaying or terrorizing all his adversaries; but those adversaries are neither few nor powerless, and the process of getting rid of them will not tend to rest or peace. He may, of course, be protected and supported by the British Government. This, however, can hardly be done unless the British Government takes some responsibility for controlling his acts. . . . To send back Cetywayo on such terms would be not to restore Cetywayo, but to supplant him, and it may be doubted whether such

* Mr. John Robinson, M.L.C., of Natal, writes from Durban, October 23, 1881 :—

"The Wolseleyan settlement is breaking down everywhere. I hear that Oham scarcely left a male of the Bagulisini tribe alive. The latter were a very troublesome lot, and in one sense their annihilation is a good riddance, but it could scarcely have been contemplated that it was to [be] the firstfruits of Sir Garnet's paternal beneficence."

a plan would content Cetywayo or insure rest. . . . He may submit to his fate, but he cannot be content, and he is not likely to submit without an effort to recover the power he has lost." *

Not many months elapsed before Frere's anticipations were fulfilled. Within a week of his restoration civil war broke out between the Usitus, or King's party, and Usibepu, one of the thirteen kinglets in alliance with Omahu, a brother of Cetywayo.† The combined forces of the latter fell upon Cetywayo's men, killing six thousand of them, and held a "sanguinary carnival in Cetywayo's territory, killing all the King's people, regardless of age or sex." ‡ Cetywayo took refuge in the bush, and afterwards surrendered to the British Resident at Ekowe. He died suddenly in 1884.§

* Frere and the members of his family used frequently to visit Cetywayo when he was a prisoner of war in the castle at Capetown. When he was in London, in August, 1882, Frere went to see him. "I am very glad to see you," Cetywayo said to him. "It is very kind of you to come and see me. Ah! now I see my father. It is of a piece with all your kindness to me while I was at Capetown."

† Mr. Seymour Haden writes (August 17, 1883) from Natal :—

"Every one was, I think, a little startled to see the determined disregard by Cetywayo of all conditions, from the moment he landed at Port Durnford. At the same time it must be confessed that his advisers—his irresponsible advisers—have much to answer for."

‡ Noble's "Hand-book of the Cape and South Africa," p. 195.

§ The Rev. Horace Waller, who went out in 1860 as Bishop Mackenzie's companion to Central Africa, and afterwards was occupied with Livingstone in what is now Nyassaland, writes as follows to Frere (June 14, 1882) :—

"Colenso and Chesson [Secretary of the Aborigines Protection Society] are the greatest burdens under which South Africa labours. To me it is always one of the saddest signs of the times to witness how the Press can be turned to incalculable mischief in the hands of an unscrupulous fellow like Chesson, who is able to insert, and get inserted, all sorts of decoy paragraphs in newspapers to catch public opinion, which, aided by ignorance on the subject, is easily entrapped. When the whole history of the troubles of Africa comes to be written, Colenso and Chesson ought to be credited with the loss of thousands of lives and millions of money.'

Mr. John Robinson, M.L.C., writes to Frere (February 12, 1884):—

"Cetywayo, you will see, has gone at last. No one here really regrets it. How could they? He was treacherous, mendacious, and self-willed up to the last, and had only just formed a plot to massacre the Resident and garrison, foiled by the summary refusal of the military to let him find a place within their lines. . . . How many Zulus have perished since Cetywayo's restoration it would be hard to estimate. Several thousands at least. One could weep to compare the Zululand of to-day with what it might have been now, had your policy and plans had full and free development and fruition. . . ."

Still the British Government declared that it had not responsibility in Zululand beyond the "Reserve."

The Boer farmers on the Transvaal border were less indifferent to the strife. They installed Dinizulu, a son of Cetywayo, King of Zululand, and assisted him to defeat Usibepu. To recompense themselves they established a new Republic, with Vryheid as its centre, on Zulu territory, which they afterwards annexed to the Transvaal.

As in India, so in Africa, time has amply vindicated Frere's policy and prescience. In 1879 his advice to establish an effective protectorate over Zululand was summarily rejected and denounced. In 1887 the remnant of the Zulus, whom the consequences of "masterly inactivity" and of the misrepresentations and meretricious rhetoric of the Midlothian and other speeches had left alive were silently and without a protest from any English politician made British subjects; and what remained to them of their country unappropriated by the Boers was annexed to the Empire. The Midlothian speaker who in 1880 held up to execration the policy which "mowed down by hundreds and thousands" the Zulus "who, in defence of their own land, offered their naked bodies to the terribly improved artillery and arms of modern science," was the

Prime Minister who in 1893 was responsible for the employment of still more deadly artillery against the equally naked bodies of the Matabeles, in a cause perhaps equally righteous, but in which no imminent peril to a British colony existed as in the former case. Frere, from the first, had declared that the extension of the British Protectorate as far as the Zambesi was ultimately inevitable in the interests of peace and civilization amongst the natives, and of union and harmony between the South African colonies. This had been, in 1880, condemned in the Midlothian speeches as a dangerous and aggressive policy. In 1893 Mr. Gladstone accepted the same policy at the hands of Mr. Rhodes which he had denounced when suggested by an old and tried servant of the Crown.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE RECALLED GOVERNOR.

Frere lands at Southampton—Visits the Queen and the Prince of Wales in Scotland—Correspondence with Mr. Gladstone—The occupation of Candahar—The Ilbert Bill—Irish Police—Gordon—Press attacks—Last illness and death.

THE *Pretoria* reached Plymouth Sound on October 5. On her arrival being telegraphed to London, a special train brought Sir Barrow Ellis, Sir Henry Yule, and a number of Frere's personal friends to Southampton to greet him on his landing there, and also a deputation of Cape merchants, who presented him with an address, expressing regret at his recall. Nothing could be more cordial than his welcome home.

Wressil Lodge, their house at Wimbledon, being let, Frere and his family occupied a house in Hyde Park Gardens, lent them by his old friend Mr. Arthur Mills. They had scarcely arrived when an invitation came to visit the Prince of Wales at Abergeldie.

Thither he went on the third day after his arrival, and met with a cordial and gracious reception from the Prince and also from the Queen, who twice sent for him to Balmoral and showed him the greatest kindness. During his stay in South Africa he had, at the Queen's desire, written regularly to her, and she evinced the greatest

interest in and clearest understanding of what had passed there.

Nothing could exceed the solace and gratification afforded to him by this reception. Writing to his old friend Mr. G. T. Clark, he says—

"October 16, 1880.

"At one time I felt almost convinced that the vindictive spirit of party politicians would have insisted on putting me in the felon's dock to answer for such high crimes as telling the truth and daring to do my duty, and in that case I should not have escaped ruin from law expenses, however satisfactory might have been the verdict; but I think I see some mitigation of the storm of abuse, which improvement I value, as I have not bowed to the storm, and I have some hopes that I may yet live to be acquitted by my countrymen otherwise than by the verdict of an Old Bailey jury. . . . Nothing could be more kind or more *constitutional* than the kindness of the Queen to her recalled Governor, and I felt as I travelled home that there were other beings besides Katie's dog who would gladly 'die for the Queen.'"

He lost no time in going to see old friends and acquaintances, mixing freely in society, and often meeting political men of both parties, many of whom had been amongst his assailants. At the Colonial Office there was some embarrassment when he appeared there, till he "told the under-secretary and the permanent officials that he had not come to ventilate any personal grievance, and that he should be glad if any of the knowledge he had acquired could be of use towards the better government of South Africa." "Of non-officials," he writes, "I have not met one on either side who does not abuse the opposite party for the way they have treated me." Mr. Albert Grey, for instance, as a Liberal, writes: "I attribute the false ideas about you entirely to the fact that the late Government having thrown you over, it was not the interest of either party to stand up in your behalf at the last General Election."

A dinner was given to him by more than two hundred of his friends on November 10, at Willis's Rooms, at which his reception was most enthusiastic, and which gave him extreme pleasure. Whenever he appeared on any public occasion, as at a scientific meeting or at a public dinner, or was recognized by any chance assemblage of people, he invariably received an unmistakably enthusiastic welcome, which contrasted strangely with the generally hostile attitude of political speakers and of the Press.

In November he learnt that he had been chosen Chancellor of the Cape University. Dr. Dale, the Vice-Chancellor, in writing to announce it, said: "We are still feeling the impetus which your own words and presence imparted to our Art Machinery. . . . The hiatus caused by your departure is felt more keenly every day." In March, 1882, a hospital, built in the Colony at East London, was by acclamation named after him the "Frere Hospital."

As time went on and troubles gathered in South Africa, many of the leading colonists were in frequent correspondence with him, in the hope of his being able to make the true state of affairs known to the British Government and to the public. He made a point of transmitting to the Colonial Office any information which reached him; and from time to time he wrote letters on the subject to the daily papers, and published articles in the magazines. "You can have little idea," he writes to Mr. R. W. Murray (October 21), "of the pertinacity of the ultra-Radicals and pseudo-humanitarians, or of the extent to which they have poisoned our English opinion by false statement of fact." "I do not find the ignorance at all wilful," he writes (January 26, 1881) to Mr. Gordon Sprigg; "people generally are glad to get information, but they do not know where to go for it, and that which comes to them in authentic Blue-books is merely raw material, not

chronologically arranged, and necessarily long after date in publication."

On one occasion only did he enter into a controversy in which a personal question was involved.

There were three matters as to which he had been persistently charged with having pursued or advocated a policy of aggression and war—the invasion of Affghanistan, the annexation of the Transvaal, and the Ultimatum to Cetywayo. For the last only, as has been shown, was he responsible. He had never advocated the invasion of Affghanistan, and had had no hand in the annexation of the Transvaal.

The general public, which has no time to read despatches or to compare dates, had excuses for the misapprehension. Frere had been cited, and rightly cited, as an authority for abandoning the "masterly inactivity" policy on the Indian frontier, which in his opinion was leading not to peace but to war; and many, under the guidance of Liberal speakers, and in the silence of Conservatives, jumped to the conclusion that the only alternative was a policy of aggression and war.

For the mistake of believing him to be responsible for the annexation of the Transvaal, the excuse was that it happened a few days after he arrived at Capetown. *Post hoc ergo propter hoc* was the pardonably erroneous conclusion of people who had not time to inquire.

These three matters had been made the subject of bitter invective by Mr. Gladstone, in attacking the Government in his Midlothian speeches. Common fairness, under the circumstances, required that when he attacked Frere by name he should make it clear that he did not attribute to him a responsibility beyond that which really attached to him. Far from doing this, he mixed the three questions up together in such a way as to confirm instead of contradicting

the impression that Frere was responsible for them all. After speaking of the "enormous guilt, the immeasurable responsibility" of undertaking "wilful, unjust, and destructive wars;" after denouncing in scathing language the iniquity and horrors of the war in Affghanistan, he says: "Now, what happened? There were two gentlemen, men of distinguished names, who supported the Indian policy of advance into Affghanistan. Who were they? Sir Henry Rawlinson and Sir Bartle Frere. These were the two great authorities." And a few sentences later on he says: "Sir Bartle Frere's mode of action at the Cape does not tend to accredit his advice in Affghanistan." *

In another speech he said—

"Sir Bartle Frere, who was the great authority for the proceedings of the Government in Affghanistan, has announced in South Africa that it will be necessary for us to extend our dominions till we reach the Portuguese frontier on the north." †

It was impossible for Frere to reply with any effect from

* "Midlothian Speeches," vol. i. p. 205.

† "Midlothian Speeches," vol. i. p. 49. Frere had written, May 13, 1878 (C. 2220, p. 35), on the subject of the tribes between the Transvaal and the Kalahari desert.

"It will be seen that they are all of them more or less anxious to be under the British flag. . . . It will be found necessary, sooner or later, to extend the British dominion or protectorate, in some form or other, over all the tribes between the Orange River and Lake N'gami, and between the sea and the present Transvaal frontier, and the longer it is deferred the more troublesome will the operation become. . . .

"By refusing to accept the position of a protecting power habitually acting as arbiter in inter-tribal disputes, we escape nothing save the name of responsibility. Its realities are already incurred, and when at length we unwillingly undertake the burden of dominion, we shall find it greatly aggravated by delay and neglect. . . .

"To declare such a protectorate as I have suggested, appears to be a large scheme of annexation, but it is not so in reality. It is simply an authoritative declaration of facts." ("The Military Occupation of South Bechuanaland," by Sir Charles Warren, 1883, p. 5.)

the Cape, where it took nearly two months to get an answer from England; and the answer which he did make in writing to the Secretary of State (January, 1880), was not published in the Blue-book. When he had been about nine months in England, finding the old misrepresentations, to which the Midlothian speeches had given emphasis and currency, "constantly recalled and used by Mr. Gladstone's political followers to the prejudice of the interests and the ruin of the prosperity" of South Africa, he wrote to Mr. Gladstone, calling his attention to the matter, and enclosing the memorandum he had prepared in January, 1880, for the Secretary of State, explaining his views in detail.

Mr. Gladstone's answer contained the following passage:—

"August 15, 1882.

"The mode in which I connected your name with the recent Affghan war is fully explained in page 205 of vol. i. of my 'Midlothian Speeches.' It was simply treating you as an advocate of the 'policy of advance.' With the actual proceedings of Lord Lytton I never directly or indirectly connected you.

"You will, I think, agree with me that the lengthened passage in page 205 explains the short one in page 49. Had I been myself the corrector of my speeches, I should probably have inserted the word 'cited' after 'authority.'"

It is impossible to accept this explanation as a valid or a candid one. Whoever corrected, or ought to have corrected the "Midlothian Speeches," the word "cited" is not there, and, if it had been, it would have been of no avail to correct the meaning and the impression left by another speech made at another place and time. The interpretation contended for by Mr. Gladstone is not the obvious one, and would never occur to any one reading the speeches dispassionately; much less would it have

occurred to any of his hearers under the circumstances and at the time when they were spoken. The more closely the passages relating to South Africa and Affghanistan are examined, the more does it appear that their rhetorical effect was mainly produced by the cumulative force of the three distinct imputations—each charge conferring an appearance of probability on, and enhancing the gravity of the other two. It is impossible to suppose that such a master of rhetoric did not understand and foresee how his words would be understood. They were understood only too well. To this day it is common to hear even well-informed persons speak of Lord Lytton's action in Affghanistan and of the annexation of the Transvaal as matters for which Frere was directly responsible.

The correspondence was printed in the *Times*, and afterwards published in a pamphlet.

On other questions also Frere took up, as far as might be, the threads of his old interests. Indian and Egyptian matters came naturally under his notice.

In the course of the late Affghan war Candahar had been occupied by the British troops. It became known that the Government now proposed to evacuate it. Frere wrote a letter to the *Times* (March 3, 1881) deprecating this. Whether or not it had been right to occupy it in the first instance, he considered that the British force should not be hastily withdrawn now that it was there, both from the point of view of British interests, and also because its retention would probably be advantageous to and popular with the inhabitants, who were in close commercial connection and in constant intercourse with Sind. Affghan patriotism is clannish and tribal, not national; and the other Affghans would not resent the continued occupation of Candahar by British troops if the Candaharis were content.

He writes—

"What do the people of Candahar themselves wish? The balance of all the evidence I have heard or seen goes to prove that the great bulk of the industrious and quietly disposed people wish us to stay, at least till a strong, settled Government can be established which will not tyrannize over them more than we should do. . . . The trade of Candahar and Herat is almost entirely in the hands of Hindoo merchants, whose homes and chief houses of business are in Sind, especially at Shikarpur; and the few Mahommedan houses of Tereens, Kojaks, etc., are very closely connected with, often dependent on, their Hindoo correspondents and bankers, who are generally British Indian subjects, and with few exceptions take care to keep their spare capital and principal house of business in British territory.

"I had constant intercourse with the leading men of these mercantile classes whenever they visited Sind, as they did very frequently in the course of their business, and hence I can speak with some confidence as to their wishes and views. I doubt whether there were half a dozen merchants in South Affghanistan drawing Bills of Exchange on distant marts who were not British-Indian subjects, or completely under the influence of British-Indian firms, and I doubt whether one of them would vote for our quitting Candahar if he were here to express his real wishes."

The Government of Lord Ripon, then Viceroy of India, had introduced a Bill, known as the Ilbert Bill, which made fundamental changes in the judicial procedure. It was strongly opposed by the Europeans in India, and the "British India Committee," anxious to counteract this opposition, wrote to Frere for his support. In his reply he says—

"I could see in the Bill only the removal of very salutary provisions which all Indian experience tells us are necessary to ensure a fair trial to a large and most important class of Her Majesty's subjects—I mean, of course, British-born Europeans, a class on which depend the preservation of peace and the political cohesion of all the varied races

throughout India. The Bill legalized the indiscriminate entrusting of high judicial powers over this important class to men who, experience shows, are frequently not qualified for the due discharge of such judicial functions over alien races either by 'education, ability, or integrity.'"

On the same subject he writes to Mr. F. Greenwood :—

"May 24, 1883.

"The whole action of our Government in this matter is strongly wanting in common sense. The old Indian law was that any British-born subject might, if he pleased, plead his nationality, and demand to be tried by a particular tribunal of his own countrymen where he would be sure of a fair trial. There was no inconsistency, injustice, or partiality in this. It was simply applying to our own countrymen the old privilege secured to aliens under the English law of demanding, if the accused desired it, to be tried by a jury of which a certain portion were aliens. As matter of practice, few Englishmen who knew they were guilty ever insisted on this right, because they knew that they would probably get heavier punishment from a Supreme Court judge than from a native magistrate. But Englishmen who knew they were innocent always insisted on their rights as the only security for a fair trial. The sole good reason for altering the law was a wish to reduce the delay, expense, and trouble to witnesses which the old law *sometimes* caused. But this object could have been attained in half a dozen other ways without exciting race hatred or jealousy. I have often talked over the subject with wise old native judges and magistrates, and they almost invariably wished that the old law should continue in force on the ground that, to extend the power of native tribunals in cases where Europeans were the accused would be to confer a very invidious power, and to increase the chances of the guilty escaping as well as of the innocent being unjustly convicted—to impair, in fact, instead of improving their tribunals."

At the time of Frere's return home, Ireland, which for nearly a generation had enjoyed a period of comparative tranquillity and prosperity, was again falling back in the direction of anarchy and confusion. Old secret criminal

organizations had been revived, and new ones had sprung up, at whose instigation murders and outrages were being perpetrated with impunity, and many parts of the country filled with terror and misery. Month after month the evil increased and took deeper root. Secret criminal societies constitute a form of crime of which British statesmen have had comparatively little experience, and the Government then in office had not the skill or the resolution—if, indeed, it had the will, at the risk of diminishing its parliamentary following—to grapple boldly with the evil. In India, on the other hand, such criminal associations are common, and to unravel and extirpate them is a special duty of a department of the police. Frere, as an Indian statesman of experience, was asked privately by an official employed upon Irish legislation, to describe the systems of police in India with special reference to their applicability to Ireland.

This he did in detail, distinguishing the duties of Preventive, Protective, and Detective police, and laying stress upon the fact that when any particular form of crime, such as infanticide, Thuggee, or Wahabeeism, baffled the ordinary police, special detectives were selected and appointed *ad hoc*, and instructed to learn all they could about it, and to devise the means they thought necessary for eradicating it. They always, he said, succeeded sooner or later. "I do not recollect any case of failure in India." But he added significantly—

"Success depended, as you will gather from what I have said, not only on the ability of the man employed, and on the wisdom of the Government which employed and supported him, but on both parties being in earnest and having a definite purpose which they were determined to carry out. It is necessary at starting to determine whether it is a primary object to detect and eradicate the crime which makes life and property insecure, or whether such

object is to be subordinate to conciliating political or religious prejudices. It is useless to talk of making the highways safe from Thugs if you are in doubt whether our English notions of the sanctity of life and property are to prevail, or whether they are to be subordinate to the notions inculcated on his pupil in murder by the votary of the goddess Kali." *

To Mr. C. Forjett, a man of distinguished service in the police in India, and who was applying for police employment in Ireland, he writes—

"May 20, 1882.

"I feel sure there is nothing in the Irish difficulty to compare with those you surmounted when you were keeping Lord Elphinstone acquainted with the movements of rebels and mutineers in 1857, but no one save yourself can judge whether you can do any similar service to the State in Ireland. . . ."

"I wish you were in Ireland under Lord Elphinstone as Viceroy," he writes in another letter.

Upon Egyptian affairs Frere wrote, in answer to questions he was asked about them, a series of articles in the *St. James's Gazette.*

General Gordon's extraordinary powers and saintly character were well known to Frere. He had followed his career with keen interest and sympathy, as that of a man who, like Livingstone, was a heaven-born messenger of peace and goodwill to uncivilized races. Frere, when at the Cape, had asked for his services as a pacificator and civilizer of the natives.† Gordon was not sent there then, but afterwards, in 1882, he was appointed Commandant-General of the Colonial Forces in South Africa, and thus brought into close relations with the Basutos, with whom hostilities were

* Kali was the goddess of destruction, to whom the victims of the Thugs were nominally sacrificed.

† Gordon writes to Frere, October 27, 1880: "I feel much sympathy for all you have had to put up with. However, you will not mind these are only petty, ephemeral trials."

going on intermittently. With his usual success, he was rapidly gaining an extraordinary influence over them; but before he had held his command many months he was driven to resign it by an act of the Cape Government, which in his view was wanting in good faith towards them. In January, 1884, he was sent to Khartoum, to the scene of his former command from 1875 to 1880, to effect the safe evacuation of the Soudan by the Egyptian civilians and soldiers. The story is too recent to need repeating. The British Government refused to sanction the measures which he told them were essential to success and to the safety of those whom he had come to rescue, and listened to advice from the Anti-slavery Society and from any quarter rather than from their own chosen and devoted officer, who alone was competent and in a position to give it. His task was thus made hopeless. Abandoned and cut off from communication with the world outside, he remained at his post at Khartoum through long weary months, and in the end—though Frere did not live to see it—laid down his life, a sacrifice to his duty and to the neglect of his country's Government.

Thus in North-Eastern as in South Africa was filled up the measure of British disgrace.

The following letter to Miss C. F. Frere is from one who knew Frere well, Sir Dighton Probyn—Probyn of Probyn's Horse:—

"I loved your father and admired his character. Who would not who had ever known him at all? His courage, his generosity, his unselfishness, his thoughtfulness for others, his absolute fearlessness of responsibility, and his deep sense of religion, all these qualities seem to have been born in him, they came so naturally to him. He had no fear either bodily or mental. He could not have done an ungenerous thing, no matter how he had been tried, or in what situation he had been placed, and whenever

and wherever he possibly could do so, he was always anxious to help others. Indeed his was a most lovable nature. It often struck me that there was a great resemblance in many ways between his character and Gordon's. As Gordon wrote (in his Diary I believe), so dear Sir Bartle always must have thought, 'I feel sure of success, for I do not lean on my own understanding, and He directs my path.'

"Sir Bartle never seemed to waver. He was very quick of perception, perfectly free from bias or jealousy, open to conviction, and then, having made up his mind what ought to be done, he never seemed to doubt or hesitate, but went straight on till he had completed the task which he had undertaken.

"I never met a man who had a higher sense of duty. He had no wish to go to the Cape, but he thought it his *duty* to go, and therefore, unhesitatingly, when asked to accept the Governorship of the Cape of Good Hope, he did so. . . . He accepted the thankless office without a murmur; and then, last but not least, he accepted, again it may be said 'without a murmur,' the cruel treatment of the two successive Governments he had served under during his term of Governorship in that Colony.

"I pray that history may not be so ungrateful, but do justice to his actions and to his memory."

Not only in South Africa, but in Ireland and in Egypt, Frere beheld the British Government humiliating or abandoning its tried officers, thwarting and discouraging its adherents, and yielding to, and even taking into its councils, rebels or criminals, under the leadership of a Prime Minister who seemed to follow no other policy than, in the spirit of a courtier, to trim his sails to every passing gust of popular opinion, and to take small account of the honour and permanent interests of the Empire, or even of the simplest principles of right and wrong, in comparison with the present advantage to his party's game. To Frere, who for forty-five years had served his country with the single-minded devotion of a

knight of romance, this national degradation was a bitter and ever-present grief.

He was a servant of the Crown no longer. Such service as he could now render was only from the outside, through whatever influence he could exercise on the Government or on the public. He had returned from the Cape a heavily accused man, entitled in some form or other to a trial and a verdict. He had obtained neither. With all his wide experience, in full possession of his mental powers, and still, physically, comparatively vigorous, he found himself put on one side as one no longer needed. Both parties in the political world had in ignorance or prejudice, in greater or less degree, committed themselves against him, and politicians for the most part lacked the courage or the honesty to reconsider and to avow their opinions in the light of fuller knowledge. The attacks upon him by a section of the press continued to be virulent to a degree which, in default of any personal feeling on his part —for he was no man's enemy—and which, in the absence of any act or word which could be pointed to or quoted as unworthy of his reputation or inconsistent with his declared principles, is almost unaccountable. It seemed as if the very simplicity of his character, the plainness and candour with which he spoke and wrote, and the very impossibility of finding a solid basis for a charge, stimulated the ingenuity and recklessness of his assailants into inventing such as were not only not true, but were the very opposite of the truth.* Frere was the last man on earth to be

* For instance, it was again and again repeated that he aimed at forcing Christianity and Christian missions on the natives at the point of the bayonet. It is scarcely necessary to recall the fact that when in India he had actively opposed even the moral influence of the Government being used for this object, when others advocated it.

The *Spectator* of November 13, 1880, wrote as follows of him :—

"As Governor of Bombay, he believed fully in that gigantic bubble

moved one iota in his conduct by attacks or misstatements; but he was also overflowing with kindness and goodwill to all men, and genuinely humble, and it could not but be painful to him to be the subject of suspicion and attack, however unjust and unreasonable.

Incapable of nursing a personal quarrel, he was ever ready to meet on friendly terms even those who had most bitterly assailed him. This often happened at the dinners of the Grillon Club, where leading men of very different

—Bombay Company-making,—under which the old Bank of Bombay perished and half the well-to-do men of a Presidency were ruined—so believed in it that he proposed a large permanent increase of all official salaries, from members of council down to the police. . . .

"At the Cape he fought a war off his own bat, laid down his own foreign policy, and carried it out in defiance of instructions when he was so wholly unready that Cetywayo could have swept Natal, and that the British were nearly defeated, suffered a great disaster and gained absolutely nothing by the war. . . .

"All that survives of Sir Bartle Frere's Bombay policy is some hundreds of impoverished families. All that has resulted from his Affghan policy is a ruinous occupation of unneeded foreign territory. All that has come of his South African policy is the Basuto war."

These are concise statements, the truth or falsehood of which the reader of this book is able to estimate. The following passages (*Spectator*, August 27, 1881, p. 1098) are declamatory rather than concise. Of these too the reader can now judge.

"Sir Bartle Frere is perhaps the most conspicuous example of the class of men who will deliberately conceive and carry out an iniquitous policy, thinking all the while that they are doing God service and conferring benefits on the victims of their policy. . . .

"He was allowed to remain in South Africa till the event proved that he had no influence but for evil. . . .

"The truth is Sir Bartle Frere believed that he had a mission to civilize and evangelize the Zulus, and he seems to think . . . that bullets and bayonets are the most effectual instruments for propagating the gospel of Christianity and civilization.

"So much for Sir Bartle Frere's policy in South Africa. The obliquity of moral vision which is so evident there is still more conspicuous in Sir Bartle's too successful policy in Affghanistan. . . .

"We are thankful that a man so fanatically and sincerely colour-blind as to the fundamental laws of political morality no longer occupies a position of official responsibility."

types are wont to meet. "I hope you will not refuse to shake hands with an old enemy," said to him a former member of the Conservative Government who had on several occasions attacked him. "By no means," he answered, "you were only firing into your own outposts."

On one occasion he had accepted a dinner invitation from his old friend Sir Harry Verney. Before the day arrived Sir Harry wrote to him:—

"My dear Sir Bartle Frere,— —— will be here on the 24th, and my wife says that he has expressed opinions so different from yours on South African matters that she thinks it might be disagreeable to you to meet him.

"I should not have thought so. I think that we in England hold and proclaim opinions differing from each other and yet live together quite comfortably. But after what Lady Verney says, I think it right to tell you."

Frere replied—

"My dear Sir Harry,—Lady Verney is almost always right, but will you tell her, with my kind regards, not in this case.

"I have always felt that of those who spoke and wrote most strongly against the course I had taken in South Africa, some did so in blind reliance on party leaders, and all from very imperfect knowledge of facts, and I felt sure that in time, though perhaps not in my time, my countrymen here would do me the same justice as they who live in South Africa have done from the first. Hence I never felt personally sore at what was said in good faith, and had great pleasure in meeting those who differed from me on South African questions as widely as —— did, especially at the house of friends so constant and true as you and Lady Verney."

His burden lay the heavier upon him because he was a man who clung to his convictions with the utmost tenacity, for they were formed with the greatest care and deliberation. He was incapable of putting aside the interests and the aspirations cherished through a lifetime, and of taking to

other pursuits. Patient and unselfish, he bore his trouble in silence. No word of complaint concerning his own treatment ever passed his lips, even to his most intimate friends. Few who looked on his serene countenance knew that like the weight of public calamity which the tidings of Chæroneia brought to Isocrates, and the news of Austerlitz to Pitt, the burden of public disgrace was more than he could bear. Baron Hübner, who knew him well, said to a friend shortly after his death, "he died of a broken heart." If it was not literally true, still less was it wholly untrue. The iron had entered into his soul.

The last time he ever appeared in public was on January 15, 1884, when he took the chair at the meeting of the Universities Mission to take leave of Bishop Smythies of Zanzibar, and spoke the farewell with even more than his usual vigour and earnestness. The next day he caught a bad chill in London and was attacked by violent pain in the chest.

He himself believed that his illness was the beginning of the end, and busied himself in arranging his affairs. To those about him it did not at first appear serious; but after some days, his temperature having risen, Sir James Paget was called in, and subsequently Sir William Jenner. On February 3 he was seized by the first of a succession of fainting-fits, which were all but fatal, and for several days was in imminent danger from hour to hour.

From this time for sixteen weeks, till the end came, his weakness was such that he could not even turn himself in bed or lift his food to his lips. One form of illness succeeded another, till it seemed as if few parts of him were left untouched except the brain. There were paroxysms of agonizing pain, which wrung from him moans of anguish (for his highly strung temperament was keenly sensitive), but never one murmur. The thought of thankfulness was