

INTRODUCTION

Anthony Trollope is perhaps best known as a prolific novelist, the creator of the much-loved Barchester Chronicles and the Palliser series of parliamentary novels. He did however also write non-fiction; he travelled extensively, both for work and pleasure, and wrote accounts of these travels which were well received by the reading public. He travelled to South Africa in 1877, at a time when the British Empire was approaching its zenith. The object of this dissertation is to explore the ways in which Trollope's work contributed to what has been referred to as "the writing of Empire": the maintenance of imperial power by textual means. I will be examining Trollope's travel narrative *South Africa* and four of his novels: *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*, *John Caldigate*, *An Old Man's Love* and *The Fixed Period*.

Whilst his travel narratives have been discussed by many Trollope scholars,¹ this discussion has been brief, and as regards Trollope's "colonial" fictions, there has been very little critical work published.² In this study, therefore, I would like to pose the question: In what ways did the works of Anthony Trollope contribute to "the writing of Empire"? This will involve an examination of Trollope's representations of the colonies in a travel narrative (*South Africa*) and also in those novels which feature a colonial plot element. Two of the novels, with which I shall deal fairly briefly, are set partially (*John Caldigate*) or wholly (*Harry Heathcote*) in Australia. Although my primary interest is in Trollope's South African travels and their influence on his writing, these works offer some valuable insights into his views on the role of the colonies. *An Old Man's Love* is set partially in South Africa, with one of the principal characters going to seek his fortune in the diamond mines of Kimberley. The diamond mining scenes in this novel have much in common with the gold mining

episode in *John Caldigate*, with Trollope using the motif of gambling as a means of elucidating the dangers posed by life in the colonies. *The Fixed Period* is a very different work from the other novels mentioned; it is a futuristic tale set in an imaginary ex-colony that, having obtained its independence from Britain, is re-annexed. In this work Trollope examines the motherland / colony relationship in some depth. J. H. Davidson has argued that this novel constitutes “a parable . . . an oblique apologia for the annexation of the Transvaal”,³ and this is an assertion that I shall explore in my discussion of the novel.

In my examination of these works I will be using some of the insights of postcolonial theory. The ideas of Elleke Boehmer, Edward Said and Simon Gikandi have informed my thoughts on the texts. Boehmer’s theories regarding the textuality of the imperial enterprise, Said’s explanation of how imperial texts produced an “othering” of the colonized peoples and Gikandi’s concept of “Englishness” and its origins will be used throughout my readings of *South Africa* and Trollope’s “colonial” novels.

After a discussion of this theoretical framework, I will go on to discuss what, for Trollope, the purpose of a colony was, and how he represented and analysed the phenomenon of “Englishness”. In Chapter Two I will give a brief summary of Trollope’s travels in South Africa before discussing the narrative of *South Africa* in more detail. Chapter Three will examine the two novels which have an Australian setting: *John Caldigate* and *Harry Heathcote*. Chapter Four deals with *An Old Man’s Love*, which features the diamond mines of Kimberley, and in the final chapter of this dissertation I will look at *The Fixed Period*, examining Davidson’s contention that the novel was “an . . . apologia for the annexation of the Transvaal” as well as

exploring the motherland / colony relationship which I consider to be the central issue of the novel.

At its height, the British Empire covered four million square miles, producing a “world map flushed pink.”⁴ The colonies which formed part of this sprawling empire comprised many communities – native populations, British civil servants, settlers, migrant labourers, fortune hunters – existing in complex relationships to one another and each experiencing colonialism in a different way. Victoria’s millions of subjects were by no means a homogeneous group, and the consequences of the colonial experience are felt in myriad ways today.

It is important to establish precisely what we mean by the words “empire” and “colony.” The O.E.D. defines an empire as “an extensive group of States or countries under a single supreme authority . . . a large commercial organisation etc. owned or directed by one person or group . . . the British Empire.”⁵ A colony is defined as “a group of settlers in a new country (whether or not already inhabited) fully or partially subject to the mother country.”⁶

John McLeod describes the relationship between imperialism and colonialism thus: “Colonialism . . . is *only one form of practice* which results from the ideology of imperialism, and specifically concerns the *settlement* of one group of people in a new location In these terms, colonialism is one historically specific experience of how imperialism can work through the act of settlement, but it is not the only way of pursuing imperialist goals.”⁷ Elleke Boehmer elaborates: “Colonialism involves the consolidation of imperial power, and is manifested in the settlement of territory, the

exploitation or development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands.”⁸

Ania Loomba offers a more emotionally charged definition of colonialism, pointing out (as is implied in the dictionary definition above) that the act of settlement of people in a new territory almost always involved the displacement of others already resident in that territory: “The process of ‘forming a community’ in the new land necessarily meant *unforming* or re-forming the communities that existed there already, and involved a wide range of practices including trade, plunder, negotiation, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellion.”⁹ We could add to this list the imposition of European cultural practices, languages and norms of behaviour – colonial communities formed in the image of the colonial power. This concept of an image or reflection is an important one. As I will show in my discussion of his work, Trollope depicted the colonies as “images” of Britain; however, these images are often distorted in some way, and I will explore these distortions and offer possible reasons for Trollope’s use of this metaphor.

Loomba goes on to elucidate the relationship between colonialism and capitalism thus: “Colonialism was the midwife that assisted at the birth of European capitalism... without colonial expansion the transition to capitalism could not have taken place in Europe.”¹⁰ Boehmer agrees, pointing out that “the centrality of the wealth-making drive is hard to miss in most arguments for empire. Prosperity, material improvement, treasure: as the Romans and Spaniards well knew, these were the most desirable prizes of expansion.”¹¹ Others argue, however, that the Empire expanded in a relatively haphazard way, with new territories being gained for a variety of reasons,

not always purely economic: J. Morris, for example, argues that “Britain’s essential vulnerability, with her extended colonial frontiers, her dependence upon imported food, her excess of population and her *smallness* – the basic fragility of the British position in the world goaded her into imperialism.”¹²

Imperialism, then, was both a capitalist enterprise and an imposition of an alien culture upon another people. As I will show, Trollope’s writings explore this issue: he was concerned with the *purpose* of the British colonies, stating in *South Africa* that they provided “a happy home for colonists or the protection of natives, rather than the benefit or glory of the Mother Country”.¹³ However, his “colonial” novels belie this statement: they depict the colonies as alien places of moral danger to European settlers, whilst being remarkably devoid of “natives”.

Once established, the Empire had to be maintained, and it is my argument that this was a *textual* undertaking as much as a political or military one: the Empire existed textually as well as physically; in fact, as Boehmer points out,¹⁴ the only way that the modern reader can experience the Empire is through its texts. Thomas Richards states that:

Textualizing the Empire helped to bring it into being, and maintained it, once in existence. In a very real sense this was a paper empire: an empire built on a series of flimsy pretexts that were always becoming texts. . . . Recording the Empire . . . becomes tantamount to controlling it.¹⁵

Early explorers wrote about their experiences in new and strange lands, settlers sent home accounts of their endeavours, travellers went to visit the settler communities in the colonies and reported on their progress, and those at “home” as well as the settlers and the natives of the colonized countries wrote the empire into fiction. Textual

interpretation of the colonial space helped settlers to understand and contextualize the strange environments in which they found themselves, and to justify their presence in these environments; ultimately these imperial texts were used to legitimize Britain's actions and policies in the colonies. Boehmer concludes that "[t]extual projection . . . was an attempt at both extensive comprehension and comprehensive control."¹⁶ For readers of these texts, the Empire thus existed (and exists) at an indirect, textual level.

Boehmer outlines some of the features of a colonial text: "Colonialist literature was informed by theories concerning the superiority of European culture and the rightness of empire. Its distinctive stereotyped language was geared to mediating the white man's relationship with colonized peoples."¹⁷ Various typical elements of the colonial text can be isolated: there was an attempt to provide justifications for empire (for example, "civilization" of the native peoples), and to describe that which was alien (landscapes, flora, fauna) in terms that were familiar, there being no other way of conveying the writer's experiences to his/her audience. However, this often involved using not only European languages to describe colonial experiences, but also imposing European standards of morality, justice, social acceptability, physical attractiveness and so forth. This resulted in value judgements that were not necessarily valid in the context of the new world being described. Use of stereotyping in descriptions of the native peoples was common, and these peoples were often "written out" of a text, or cast in the role of "other" which then formed a foil for the colonizer, a means by which the colonial identity could be defined by opposition.¹⁸ An analysis of a colonial text will thus produce a picture of the power relations underpinning the text, and the environments that produced it.

Such analysis is termed “postcolonial discourse analysis” and was first used in Edward Said’s groundbreaking work, *Orientalism*. Said showed how the West constructed, through an accumulation of “facts,” a body of work that defined the Eastern peoples in ways that are still current today. He showed how this construction revolved around an “Us/Them,” “West/East” dichotomy.¹⁹ He drew in new ways on the work of such writers as Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault, producing a synthesis that has had far-reaching influence in modern literary criticism. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman comment that:

One of Foucault’s insights which is important for Said’s project is the mutual implications of power and knowledge. In the context of *Orientalism*, Western power, especially the power to enter or examine other countries at will, enables the production of a range of knowledges about other cultures. Such knowledge in turn enables (legitimizes, underwrites) the deployment of Western power in these other countries. Moreover, such is the power of Orientalist or colonialist knowledge that even those discourses or modes of representation which are not formally or ideologically aligned with it may be pulled in an Orientalist direction, or may simply be appropriated by Orientalism and utilised as if they were just another facet of its world view.²⁰

In the hegemonic environment described by Said, a ruling group entrenches its power by getting the ruled peoples to participate in their domination, to consent to being ruled. This can be achieved by means of ideological control, such as that described by Louis Althusser:²¹ a subject is “interpellated” by the institution in power so as to ensure that s/he is manipulated into participating in a system whereby s/he is oppressed, without ever having a conscious awareness of this oppression. Textual representations provide a powerful means of such oppression, as do dominant language forms and social norms.

An important aspect of Said’s work is the way in which he reveals how the production of an “Other” is essential to the European sense of self.²² The writings of European settlers produced an image of the native peoples of a colony as alien or “other”,

possessing qualities different from and inferior to that of the Europeans. This strangeness or “otherness” provided an important source of affirmation for the colonists, a means of asserting their identity in a foreign environment.²³ This identification of the difference between “self” and “other” is an important phase in the constitution of a sense of self, of identity. The Other is the means by which we recognise the Self – there can be no Self without the Other. Jacques Lacan²⁴ describes how a child first becomes aware of this differentiation between “self” and “other” when it sees a reflection of itself in a mirror for the first time. Thus, a sense of self is a matter of reflection, of seeing oneself reflected – in a mirror or in the eyes of another. In *White Skins, Black Masks*, Gail Chiang-Liang Low elaborates: “[I]f the image in the mirror provides a pleasurable and erotic process of self-affirmation, it also produces an unpleasurable process of alienation and retroactive nostalgia for wholeness. The reflected image, after all, is not the self but an image of the self as Other; identification is hence both recognition and misrecognition.”²⁵ Those parts of the self which are unacceptable to the individual are often projected onto the Other, which becomes an object of fear or loathing as a result. The self is seen as “normal” and superior to the “abnormal” Other. During my discussion of Trollope’s works, I will show how the “Other” is represented in his narratives, and how it allows formation of an identity. The “Other” in these works takes various forms; it is not always the native population that offers the reflection of self: sometimes it is the *environment* of the colonial space.

Simon Gikandi takes this idea of the “Other” as a constitutive force a step further, by examining the concept of “Englishness” and showing that “it was superimposed over an array of internal differences in response to contact with the Other, and in response

to conflict with the Other.”²⁶ Thus, the Other was an important agent in the formulation of a sense of identity for the colonizing power, an agent that was not necessarily passive.

I find Gikandi’s theory especially compelling, for in Anthony Trollope’s colonial writings we constantly find the settler communities clinging to some sense of “home,” continuing with traditions, ways of dress and social mannerisms that are not appropriate for the situation and climate in which they find themselves, and ultimately being “more English than the English”. There is an almost strident insistence on “Englishness”. I suggest two reasons for this: first, that this behaviour may be a response to the colonists’ perception of themselves as somewhat “second-class” English people trying to prove that they can follow all the necessary social conventions as comfortably as those “back home”; or second, that this was a response to their contact with the native Other or the alien landscape, an attempt to create a distance from the Other by insisting on difference, perhaps a fear of the consequences of “going native”. Once again we see that the Other can act as a creative force.

The British Empire, then, was a textual undertaking: the Empire was “written” by those such as Trollope who represented the colonial spaces and the people occupying them. These representations show an unease with the colonial environment, which is depicted as a place of moral danger, of testing and potential corruption. The colony in the works I shall discuss here is an image of Britain, but one where English values are seen to be distorted by distance and difference. As in a fairground trick mirror, the reflection that Britain sees staring back at herself is not totally unrecognisable; it is a distorted image of herself, produced by her presence.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PURPOSE OF A COLONY AND THE CONCEPT OF “ENGLISHNESS”

In this chapter, I will be discussing Trollope’s views on Britain’s colonies, as he sets them out in *South Africa* and his “colonial” novels. Whilst in *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil* and *John Caldigate* Australia is seen as a place where a young man who is not afraid of hard work may do well for himself, South Africa is a different proposition: the large native labour force means that opportunities are more limited. In *Harry Heathcote* and *John Caldigate* Trollope shows that despite the alien landscape of the colonial space, an Englishman can find success of one sort or another, provided that he is prepared to accept that the rules of colonial society are different from those “back home”. In South Africa, however, the colonists’ first duty is to the native population: Britain has a responsibility to “civilize” the indigenous inhabitants, who, it is acknowledged, must form part of any future envisaged for the country. I will compare Trollope’s writings on this subject with some other colonial texts.

Simon Gikandi writes that

to understand England in the nineteenth century, one must travel to the extremities of empire; to understand what Englishness really means, one must explore how it thrives in the geographies that seem to be most removed from the imperial centre.¹

Trollope noted the phenomenon of seemingly excessive attachment to home country ways in the colonies; he described it in *South Africa* and utilizes it in his fictional narratives too. Trollope shows the practice to be faintly ridiculous, but his narrative indicates that the cause of the steadfast “Englishness” of the settlers is the fact of their having encountered an alien presence, whether that be human or environmental.

An increasing population in England was leading to poverty among the working classes, and Trollope saw Britain's colonies as offering opportunities for industrious people to better themselves and rise in the world in a way that would not be possible in England:

A British colony to the British mind is a land away from home to which the swarming multitudes of Great Britain may go and earn a comfortable sustenance, denied to them in the land of their birth by the narrowness of its limits and the greatness of its population, and may do so with the use of their own language, and in subjection to their own laws."²

What Trollope describes here is an English "home away from home"; there is no mention of the peoples who have been displaced to cater for the "greatness" of Britain's population, and whose "language" and "laws" have been superseded by those of Britain. This accords with Annia Loomba's comment, quoted in the Introduction, that "[t]he process of 'forming a community' in the new land necessarily meant *unforming* or re-forming the communities that existed there already".³ These people have no voice here; they have been "written out" of the text.

For Trollope, the "real" colonies were those that fitted the above description: Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States (which despite its independent status nevertheless fulfilled Trollope's criteria.) Places such as India, Ceylon and the West Indies he did not consider suitable, "because the tropical sun is too hot for a European to work beneath it."⁴ South Africa fell somewhere in between these two categories, for reasons which I shall address in this chapter.

In *John Caldigate*, a novel set in Australia, Tom Crinkett is evidently a man who was once working class, but who has risen to become the owner of the town's most

successful mine. The mansion he builds himself in the midst of the rubble associated with this mine is interestingly reminiscent of the country house of a wealthy gentleman “back home”:

It was of red brick, three storeys high, with white stone facings to all the windows and all the corners, which glittered uncomfortably in the hot sun. There was a sweep up to it, the road having been made from the debris of the stone out of which the gold had been crushed, but though there was the sweep up to the door carefully made for the length of a dozen yards, there was nothing that could be called a road outside.⁵

Here we perhaps have a colonial reflection of the *nouveau riche* phenomenon that was becoming a part of English society, as depicted by Trollope in his character Roger Scatcherd in *Dr Thorne*. It is interesting that the white stone facings are described as glittering “uncomfortably in the hot sun”. Possibly the discomfort lies in the incongruity of a hot Australian sun shining on a typically English building, or else in the ostentation of such a building in a place like Nobble. The sweep is “made from the debris of the stone out of which the gold had been crushed”: Trollope links the ostentation of Crinkett’s house with the means by which his wealth was garnered. The sweep looks misplaced, however, owing to the fact that there is “nothing that could be called a road outside”; once again we have a sense of a displaced English country house in an alien landscape with which it has no links.

Crinkett himself is described as follows: “He was dressed in black, with a chimney pot on his head, – and certainly did not look like a miner, though he looked as little like a gentleman.”⁶ John Caldigate and his companion Dick Shand are reminded that in this new environment, appearances cannot be relied on in the same way as they can “back home”; wealth and the concept of gentlemanliness are different propositions in this colony. In *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*, the eponymous hero, whom Trollope

seems to feel is a gentleman, has none of the outward accoutrements of his English counterpart:

The young man who had just returned home had on a flannel shirt, a pair of moleskin trousers, and an old straw hat, battered nearly out of all shape. He had no coat, no waistcoat, no braces, and nothing round his neck....As he dashed his hat off, wiped his brow, and threw himself into a rocking chair, he certainly was rough to look at; but by all who understood Australian life he would have been taken to be a gentleman.⁷

Flannel, moleskin and straw are certainly not the materials we would expect to make up the dress of a gentleman, and Trollope's reiteration of "no . . . no . . . no . . . nothing" in his description reinforces this initial impression. Harry's actions, however, indicate something of his real attributes: the fact that he "dashes" off his hat suggests a hastiness, "wiping his brow" leads the reader to think of Harry as one who is involved in physical labour, and he "throws" himself into a chair in a manner that suggests a degree of impetuosity and authority: all these hints are borne out later in the narrative. We are told that he "was rough to *look* at", a comment that immediately induces us to look deeper than appearances and see that he is, in fact, "a gentleman". The reader thus becomes one "who understands Australian life" and sees beyond the metropolitan stereotype of the gentlemanly figure. It is interesting that here Trollope is showing us a colonial who is *not* clinging to the norms of English life; he has adapted these to suit his circumstances, thereby creating something peculiarly Australian.

The Australian novels make it clear that hard work was essential to any good fortune in the colonies: we note that John Caldigate and Dick Shand, although Cambridge-educated gentlemen, have to be prepared to "rough it" and perform a great deal of hard physical labour before achieving any success as gold miners. Harry Heathcote, too, although the owner of a very large farm, must labour alongside his men to ensure

the success of his sheep-farming business. But, as Trollope discovered through the experiences of his son Fred, whose attempts at sheep farming in New South Wales were not successful, luck too played some role in the progress or otherwise of a settler: John Caldigate is lucky to strike gold before his available funds run out, and Harry's future depends to a large extent on when rain will come to break the drought that threatens to destroy everything he has built up at Gangoil. Other characters come through hard times to be content with a lower station than they might have expected when setting out for the colonies. For instance:

Sergeant Forrest was a graduate of Oxford, the son of an English clergyman, who, having his way to make in the world, had thought that an early fortune would be found in the colonies. He had come out, had failed, had suffered some very hard things, and now, at the age of thirty-five, enjoyed life thoroughly as a sergeant of the colonial police.⁸

Thus, in the colonies there is a different set of societal norms; an Oxford education and a respectable family history do not have the same currency as they do "back home" and the settler must adapt his expectations to accord with the Antipodean world view. Trollope's colonial fictions always show both sides of the colonial success story. Whilst some characters do achieve success in their colonial ventures, their stories are always contrasted with those who, through moral degeneration, laziness, alcoholic tendencies or sheer bad luck, have less success: Dick Shand in *John Caldigate*, Gordon's partner Tookey in *An Old Man's Love* and the Brownbies in *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*. Thus, Trollope's colonies are not depicted simply as places of certain economic success; there is always the possibility of failure present.

In *An Old Man's Love*, Trollope's "South African" novel, the prospects for young Englishmen seem slightly different from those offered by Australia: a large native population existed to compete with any British labourer for work, so opportunities for

this latter group were limited. In South Africa it would be the middle classes who might be able to make a living. In *An Old Man's Love* John Gordon, unlike John Caldigate, does not seem to do any physical mining himself, but makes his fortune by dealing in shares in diamond mines. For, in South Africa:

The work is done by black men. They plough, they reap; they herd and shear the sheep; they drive the oxen; they load the wagons; they carry the bricks; they draw the water; they hew the wood; they brush the clothes; they clean the boots; they run the posts; they make the roads; they wait at table; they cook the food; they wash the wool; they press the grapes; they kill the beef and mutton; they dig the gardens; they plaster the walls; they feed the horses; – and they find the diamonds. A South African farmer and a South African wool grower and a South African shopkeeper will all boast that South Africa is a productive country. If it be so she is productive altogether by the means of black labour.⁹

The list of activities performed by this black labour force is a long one, and the reader cannot help but be struck by the use of the word “they”. Its constant repetition forces it into prominence, suggests an “us and them” dimension and produces a degree of “othering”. Trollope’s descriptions of “them” as people who “draw the water ... [and] hew the wood” is particularly telling, for this echoes the Biblical verse (Joshua 9:23) which has often been used to justify the oppression of African peoples.

The relentlessness of the verbs in this passage, too, shows just how wide was the range of work undertaken by the native population: when reading the list of activities, the stress of each phrase is on the verb, and the overall effect is to impress upon the reader a sense of an immense body of work being carried out incessantly. Although all the work described in this passage is of the more menial, manual kind, Trollope shows that it is this labour, and not the efforts of the colonists, that results in a “productive country”. The “othering” produced by the repetition of the word “they” in this text is not of the usual denigrating kind, but offers a more positive interpretation of the role of black people in the formation of a society: their role is

acknowledged implicitly, and they are foregrounded rather than “written out” of the text.

There is indeed little scope for the expatriate English labourer in the country Trollope describes here. Trollope sees as Britain’s role in South Africa in the following way:

[T]hough we may not have succeeded in making homes for many English, – not even comparatively for many Europeans, – we have become the arbiters of the homes, the masters of the destinies, of millions of black men . . . we have imposed on us the duty of civilizing, of training to the yoke of labour and releasing from the yoke of slavery a strong, vital, increasing and intelligent population . . . the chief thing to be regarded is our duty to the nations over which we have made ourselves the masters.¹⁰

These words invite comparison with Rudyard Kipling’s poem “The White Man’s Burden” (Appendix I). Whilst the poem was written over twenty years after the publication of *South Africa*, the sentiments seem very similar, although Trollope’s emphasis is a little more positive: he speaks of a “strong, vital, increasing and intelligent population” whereas Kipling describes “fluttered folk and wild – / Your new-caught sullen peoples, / Half devil and half child.” Trollope seems to hold the view that Britain has the duty of “training [the native population] to the yoke of labour” for constructive results that will benefit both colonist and colonized, while Kipling’s words suggest that this will be a waste of time, as the colonists are warned that they will have to “Watch sloth and heathen folly / Bring all [their] hope to nought.” Said refers to “a long tradition of executive responsibility towards the coloured races”,¹¹ and certainly *duty* seems to be the key term for both Trollope and Kipling. There seems to be a more positive meaning to Trollope’s concept of duty, however: he sincerely believes that Britain will be changing the lives of the native population for the better, whereas for Kipling the responsibilities of colonial mastery

bring no reward for either colonizer or colonized. What for Trollope is a duty darkens into a burden for Kipling.

Trollope continues:

As in India or Ceylon, where the people are a coloured people, Asiatic and not European, it is our first duty to govern them so that they may prosper, to defend them from ill-usage, to teach them what we know ourselves, to make them free, so in South Africa it is our duty to do the same thing for the Natives there.¹²

It is interesting that Trollope lists “mak[ing] them free” as one of the aims of colonialism; he feels that ultimately the colonies must become self-governing, and that that government must be by the native people (once they have achieved the necessary education and “civilization”). His vision thus seems to include and recognize the inevitability of the post-colonial phase.

Once again Trollope’s view of colonization is seen to be different from that of many of his contemporaries. The Empire he is “writing” here is one in which the colonized will achieve equality and self-determination (although he does not go so far as to explicitly condemn the initial colonization process that resulted in the “imposition” of the “duty” he describes). However, as Boehmer notes, the British duty of civilization and enlightenment of the native peoples was not entirely selfless: “As is well known, the Victorians had a genius for fashioning moral ideals which matched their economic needs: they stapled duty onto interest, Christianity onto profit.”¹³ In most cases, the economic imperatives of Empire predated the humanitarian ones.

Trollope’s attitude differs markedly from that expressed in John Buchan’s *Prester John*, published in 1910. By this time the “White Man’s Burden” has become even

more onerous, although the sentiments of Buchan's character are a close echo of those expressed by Kipling:

I knew then the meaning of the white man's duty. He has to take all the risks, recking nothing of his life or his fortunes, and well content to find his reward in the fulfilment of his task. That is the difference between white and black, the gift of responsibility, the power of being in a little way a king; and so long as we know this and practise it, we will rule not in Africa alone, but wherever there are black men who live only for the day and their own bellies.¹⁴

It is evident that Buchan's concept of the black man is far less positive than that of Trollope; he views him as inferior, with no sense of responsibility or concern for the future, living "only for the day and [his] own [belly]". This is precisely the type of characterization that Said describes: the creation of a cultural myth about a people which results in each member of a population being regarded as an example of their kind, rather than as an individual. The creation of such negative myths allows the colonial power to assert its dominance and provides a justification for the intervention of the white man in the colonies: the native peoples cannot look after themselves, and so must be cared for by the more advanced civilization of Europe.

In *South Africa* Trollope states that "the important person in South Africa is the Kafir and the Zulu, the Bechuana and the Hottentot; – not the Dutchman or Englishman."¹⁵ The role of Britain would then seem to be to advance the "civilization" of the native peoples until such time (a time which Trollope feels to be a very long way into the future) that they have reached a level where self-governance may be possible. "Our duty to the Kafir of course is to civilize him, – so to treat him that as years roll on he will manifestly be the better for our coming to his land."¹⁶ The British colonist certainly has opportunities in South Africa for a successful life, but this will always be in a situation which makes use of the native labour force. Hence the difference in the

means by which John Caldigate and John Gordon achieve prosperity (Caldigate by physical digging, Gordon by dealing in shares): Trollope illustrates the ways in which the colonies of Australia and South Africa required different approaches for the personal advancement of an Englishman.

And what of the “Englishness” of which Gikandi writes, and which Trollope noted throughout his travels in the empire? Trollope describes it thus:

But in the colonies there is a sort of loyalty of which we at home know nothing. It may be exemplified to any man’s mind by thinking of the feeling as to home which is engendered by absence. The boy or girl who lives always on the paternal homestead does not care very much for the kitchen with its dressers, or for the farmyard with its ricks, or the parlour with its neat array. But let the boy or girl be banished for a year or two and every little detail becomes a matter for fond regret. Hence I think has sprung that colonial anger which has been entertained against ministers at home who have seemed to prepare the way for final separation from the mother country.¹⁷

The concept of “home” as a country is linked here with the idea of “home” as a house, and the analogy uses the most domestic of settings: “the kitchen . . . the farmyard . . . the parlour”. The use of “banished” is interesting in that it implies an exile, an absence that is not desired by the person who is away from home, and bound to result in “fond regret”. This opens the way for the use of the word “anger” to describe the feelings of the colonials threatened with independence from the motherland. Trollope suggests here that the colonial settlers do not see themselves as citizens of a new country, but as “banished” exiles who see in their homeland a better place than that in which they find themselves.

In his colonial fiction, too, Trollope describes this “loyalty” to the mother country, poking gentle fun at the way in which his characters cling to this concept of “home”. In the midst of an Australian heat wave, the Heathcote family celebrate Christmas

with a “great pudding come into the room all afire – just to remind one of the old country – when it has been so hot that one could hardly bear a shirt on one’s shoulders.”¹⁸ Harry feels that “one likes to think of the old place, though one is far away”¹⁹ and Kate and Medlicot discuss their “home” in England, although it would seem that Kate was actually born in Australia.²⁰ Kate and her sister “dressed for dinner, and were bright and pretty as they would have been in a country house at home.”²¹ In *The Fixed Period*, Neverbend remonstrates with his son Jack: “England is not your home”. “It’s the way we all speak of it,” is Jack’s reply.²²

During Trollope’s travels, he noted the ways in which the settlers would establish, as far as possible, a “home away from home” in their new surroundings: “[A] colonial town is ashamed of itself if it has not its garden, its hospital, its public library, and its two or three churches, even in its early days.”²³ Although the colonists themselves tended to measure their town’s amenities against those in England, Trollope compares one colony with another. For instance, he compares Cape Town with Melbourne, noting that the latter, although 200 years younger, had attracted 220 000 more white settlers,²⁴ and he found the Cape Town Botanic Gardens to be vastly inferior to “the beauty and the perfect grace of the gardens at Sydney.”²⁵ Trollope indicates that it was important for each colony to advance itself for the good of its inhabitants, and not in order to live up to some imported standard from the mother country. Gikandi has an explanation for Trollope’s desire to see the colonies as places which needed to generate their own character:

. . . to retain its pure character, the domestic space must, nevertheless, be conceived as ontologically different from its colonial possessions. It is not by accident, then, that writers like Trollope, though English to the core, decry the transplantation of English culture to the colonies . . .²⁶

Perhaps this strident “Englishness” on the part of colonial settlers was to some extent a reaction against the Other as encountered in the native populations and the alien landscapes with which they were faced, as I suggested earlier. David Lloyd writes of the conventions of the journey myth in colonial narratives (the journey to Africa results in experiences there, followed by a return home) and notes that in some cases the “return” phase of the protagonist’s journey may take the form of a recreation of England on foreign soil,²⁷ which offers an alternative explanation for the Englishness that Trollope encountered on his travels in the colonies.

Ultimately, although he viewed the colonies as places that would afford opportunities for Englishmen to better themselves, Trollope’s writings make it clear that the colonies must eventually achieve an independence from Britain, and govern themselves. This offers us an interesting insight into Trollope’s views on the concept of a colony, and the role of both the European colonizers and the native population in any given colony. His views would certainly seem to be more enlightened than many of his contemporaries in that he was prepared to look forward to a time when Britain would give up her colonies and her control over their populations, with the possibility of independence and self-determination. His novel *The Fixed Period* in particular gave him an opportunity to explore and debate the relationship between Britain and one such independent ex-colony, and I will deal with this issue in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

CHAPTER TWO

SOUTH AFRICA

In this chapter I will discuss Trollope's travel narrative *South Africa*. I will begin by outlining Trollope's travels through the country, as he describes them, and will then go on to discuss the text in greater detail, paying particular attention to descriptions of the native population of South Africa, and examining the ways in which the narrative exhibits the features of the colonial text discussed in the Introduction.

By the time Anthony Trollope arrived in South Africa on 22 July 1877, he was a seasoned traveller, having explored the West Indies, British North America, Australia and New Zealand¹ as well as Ireland, Egypt, Ceylon and the Holy Land. He published books on his impressions of the West Indies, North America, Australia and New Zealand,² and before leaving for South Africa he made arrangements with both a publisher, to write a book, and with a newspaper, for a series of travel articles.³

Arriving in Cape Town on a wet Sunday, Trollope stayed in the city for two weeks. He was not overly impressed, complaining about the state of the roads and the pavements, and finding it "in truth ... not of itself a prepossessing town."⁴ He was characteristically busy, however, and visited the Anglican cathedral, the library, the museum, a sitting of Parliament⁵ and (of course) the post-office. It was in Cape Town that he met and interviewed ex-President Burgers, erstwhile leader of the Transvaal Republic. He then travelled as far as Port Elizabeth by ship, arriving there on the 6 August, and visiting Uitenhage before returning to Port Elizabeth to travel to Grahamstown (by rail and coach). He then travelled through several Eastern Province

towns (Alice, King Williams Town and the missions at Heald Town, Lovedale and Peelton) on his way to East London. From there he travelled by sea to Durban, which he reached on 22 August. After a short stay during which he explored the sugar cane farms on the north coast as well as the town itself, he left by mail coach for Pietermaritzburg. Here he met the governor of Natal, Sir Henry Bulwer, who took him on an excursion to Greytown which afforded Trollope the opportunity to meet many of the area's Boer farmers. Whilst in Pietermaritzburg he had an opportunity to hear Bishop Colenso preach, and found that, despite the Bishop's notoriety, "the most innocent and trusting young believer in the Old Testament would have heard nothing on that occasion to disturb a cherished conviction or to shock a devotional feeling."⁶ Leaving Pietermaritzburg on 13 September, Trollope travelled as far as Newcastle by post-cart, joining up there with a young partner with whom he purchased a cart and some horses to take them to the Diamond Fields of Griqualand West. Travelling through Standerton they reached Pretoria on 24 September, and stayed there a few days, during which time they were taken to visit the nearby Salt Pan.

Trollope and his companion left Pretoria for Kimberley on 1 October. This was a difficult journey through drought-stricken country, and the town awaiting them at the end of the journey was not one that Trollope found very prepossessing. Despite (or perhaps because of) his antipathy towards all that Kimberley stood for, Trollope's descriptions of the mechanics and the morality of diamond mining are masterly. He noted with some interest the many native labourers employed in the diamond fields, and this gave him an opportunity to discuss his vision for the "civilization" of the native population by dint of hard work. This visit to Kimberley had an influence on his fiction, forming part of the plot mechanics of *An Old Man's Love*. He left

Kimberley on 22 October for Bloemfontein, from where he went on an excursion to Thaba Nchu. Returning to Bloemfontein, he travelled to Port Elizabeth, leaving by ship for Mossel Bay and then going in search of the scenery offered by George and Knysna, the novelties of ostrich farming in Oudtshoorn and the natural wonders of the Cango Caves. From Mossel Bay he sailed for Cape Town where he stayed for some time, seeming to enjoy himself a little more on this visit – he stayed in the leafy suburb of Wynberg and was taken to the winelands for a week, an area with which he was favourably impressed.

Trollope departed Cape Town for home on 11 December 1877, having covered an enormous amount of territory in the nearly 6 months he spent in South Africa. His book on the country was completed before his homeward journey was over, and published early in 1878. Reviews in Britain were generally favourable,⁷ but his South African readers were disappointed. The *Cape Times* of 22 June 1878 took Trollope to task for his views on Kreli, showing how he had not quite understood the combustible nature of the situation in the Eastern Cape (he made a similar blunder regarding the American South when he visited there). However, Trollope points out in his Introduction that: “In regard to Kreli and his rebellious Galekas . . . I have to ask my readers to remember that my book has been written while these disturbances were in existence. In respect to them I can not do more than express an opinion of my own, – more or less crude as it may necessarily be.”⁸

During Trollope’s visit to the Eastern Cape a Xhosa tribe, the Galekas, under their chief Kreli, were waging a tribal war with their neighbours the Fingos, whose territory had been granted to them by Britain. The Fingos being British subjects, Britain felt

obliged to assist them in their attempts to defend themselves from the Galekas. During his visit, Trollope did not feel that Kreli would pose too much of a problem for the British, and predicted that Britain would annex the territory occupied by Kreli's Galekas. He was wrong, however: another Xhosa tribe, the Gaikas, joined Kreli in defying the British and the subsequent war was very bloody.⁹

Trollope described the attributes and peculiarities of each of the population groups that he encountered in South Africa, often describing them in the scientific manner that was current at the time, but which we find so distasteful today. For instance, he writes thus about the Zulus:

While I was writing of 'The Colony' as the Cape Colony is usually called in South Africa, I spoke of Kafirs.¹⁰ Now I am speaking of Zulus, – a comparatively modern race of savages as I have already said. . . . The Zulus. . . are certainly a peculiar people, and very picturesque. I have said of the Kafir that he is always dressed when seen in town, but that he is dressed like an Irish beggar. I should have added, however, that he always wears his rags with grace. The Zulu rags are perhaps about equal to the Kafir rags in raggedness, but the Zulu grace is much more excellent than the Kafir grace. . . . The Zulu is often slow, often idle, sometimes hopelessly useless, but he is never awkward.¹¹

Here we have an example of the way in which a colonial narrative could create a sense of the "Other" when describing a non-European people. Evident here is the way in which generalizations are made about an entire people, and the way in which the language used coolly expresses these generalizations, as if the writer were observing some scientific fact rather than describing individual people with individual attributes and personalities. We have here too an expression of the concept of the "noble savage"¹² so beloved of the fiction writers of the time, with the Zulu being held up as a superior being to the Kafir. We see later examples in such works as *King Solomon's Mines* and *Prester John*, where a particular native character is portrayed as

being of superior moral standing when compared with his compatriots; this nobility is usually accompanied by superior physical attributes as well. This passage illustrates that notwithstanding his apparently liberal views, Trollope was nevertheless a product of his time and saw the native populations as “other” to Europeans. Gikandi notes that “while Trollope’s observations and experience of blacks – and indeed his relationship with them – are apparently sympathetic, his conceptual encounter with them is limited by . . . ‘intellectual and social prejudice.’”¹³ Trollope writes in somewhat less positive terms about the native inhabitants of Cape Town:

A walk through the streets of Capetown is sufficient to show the stranger that he has reached a place not inhabited by white men. . . . Perhaps, as regards labour, the most valuable race is that of the Malays. . . so-called Mohomidans . . . to be seen flaunting about town in turbans and flowing robes. . . . Then there is a Hottentot admixture, a sprinkling of the Guinea-coast negro, and a small but no doubt increasing Kafir element. But all this is leavened and brought into some agreement with European modes of action and thought by the preponderating influence of Dutch blood. So that the people, though idle, are not as apathetic as savages, nor quite so indifferent as Orientals. But yet there is so much of the savage and so much of the oriental that the ordinary Englishman does not come out and work among them.¹⁴

Said’s point¹⁵ that colonial narratives placed people into categories comes across clearly in this passage; “savages” are “apathetic” whilst “Orientals” are “indifferent”; Malays have a “value” that is linked to their “labour”, their potential as generators of capital. It is significant that it is assumed that the civilizing influence of “Dutch blood” is that which makes the native citizens of Cape Town acceptable workers, albeit not acceptable as *co-workers* for the European residents. Throughout his travels in South Africa, Trollope found an aversion on the part of the colonists to working with members of the native populations. He relates a tale of “two sturdy English beggars” who accosted him and his companion, “demanding charity” and asserting that they could get no work. When it was pointed out to them that work was to be had at the nearby railway, they replied that they “were not going to work along

side of niggers for 2s. 6d., which would only supply them with grub!” Trollope comments that “we told them that certainly we did want real Englishmen to earn their grub honestly and not to beg it.”¹⁶ His point is that it would not be any disgrace to work alongside a black man; certainly it would be more honourable than begging. For Trollope, work was ennobling, not denigrating. It is this concept that is at the heart of his long-term solution for South Africa:

If a man be taught to want, really to desire and to covet the good things of the world, then he will work for them and by working he will be civilized. If, when they are presented to his notice, he still despises them, – if when clothes and houses and regular meals and education come in his way, he will still go naked, and sleep beneath the sky, and eat grass or garbage and then starve, and remain in his ignorance though the schoolmaster be abroad, then he will be a Savage to the end of the chapter. It is often very hard to find out whether the good things have been properly proffered to the Savage, and whether the man’s neglect of them has come from his own intellectual inability to appreciate them or from the ill manner in which they have been tendered to him.¹⁷

Trollope here shows that the white colonists are sometimes responsible for the “savagery” of those whom they despise, due to the “ill manner” in which they offer the so-called virtues of civilization. Trollope is careful here to show that the accusations of “intellectual inability,” laziness and ignorance so often levelled at the native inhabitants could in fact be due to the colonists’ own mishandling of their duty to these native inhabitants. For, along with the civilizing nature of hard work and capitalism, Trollope’s other major point regarding the relationship between the white colonists and the indigenous populations concerns the concept of *duty*. He feels that Britain has a duty to care for the peoples in her power, but Trollope struggles to articulate exactly what that duty is. He exclaims that “[t]here are so many views of our duty!” and goes on to describe the various ways in which that duty has been understood:

One believes that we have done the important thing if we teach him to sing hymns. Another would give him back, – say a tenth of the land that has been

taken away from him, and then leave him. A third, the most confident of them all, thinks that everything hangs on ‘a rod of iron’, – between which and slavery the distance is very narrow. . . . A fourth would give him a franchise and let him vote for a Member of Parliament, – which of course includes the privilege of becoming a Member of Parliament, and of becoming Prime Minister if he can get enough of his own class to back him.¹⁸

This passage reveals the way in which the future of an entire people could be decided without any reference to those people. They are seen as a problem to be solved, a duty to be done; there is no engagement with the actual individuals involved, and they have no say in their future: any decision will be made by the colonizing power and imposed by it. Trollope outlines the various views taken in Britain on the “native problem” in South Africa, and his choice of words indicates that he was aware that none of the solutions offered was adequate. There is a mocking tone to the suggestion that the “important thing” is to “teach him to sing hymns.” The option of land restitution is shown to fall far short of returning land that was forcibly taken, with only “a tenth” of the land being restored, and the “confidence” of those advocating a “rod of iron” is rather chilling, given that the approach differs very little from “slavery”. The final option, of allowing the native population the franchise and the opportunity to become “Prime Minister” whilst initially seeming to advocate a concept of equality between black and white, is immediately undercut by the use of the term “his own class”: the black man clearly belongs to a different (lower) class than his white compatriots, and the implication is that a native Prime Minister is not a desirable outcome.

Trollope’s own view is complex: “I am afraid that I cannot agree altogether with any of these four.” Ultimately, he believes that:

Our duty to the Kafir of course is to civilize him, – so to treat him that as years roll on he will manifestly be the better for our coming to his land. I do not

think that missionaries will do this, or fractions of land. . . . The iron rod certainly will not do it. Nor will the franchise. But equality of law, equality of treatment, will do it; – and, I am glad to say, has already gone far towards doing it. The Kafir can make his own contract for his own labour the same as a white man; – can leave his job of work or take it as independently as the white workman; – but not more so. Encouraged by this treatment he is travelling hither and thither in quest of work, and is quickly learning that order and those wants which together make the only sure road to civilization.¹⁹

Thus we return neatly to the concept of work as the great civilizing influence. Trollope fails to see, however, that “equality of law” without the franchise, without the right to vote to change the conditions of society, is no real equality after all. He speaks of the “order” and the “wants” that are “the only sure road to civilization”; these are an “order” imposed by a colonial authority and “wants” that will benefit the industries of the colonial power. The equality he speaks of here relates solely to the native’s economic activity: there is no mention of social equality here.

And what of Trollope’s views of the white population in South Africa? Generally, he showed that opportunities for white colonists were more restricted here than in say, Australia or New Zealand, primarily because of the large native work force that existed in South Africa. Therefore, for the working classes, there were only two options:

The English labourer who comes to South Africa either rises to more than the labouring condition, or sinks to something below it. And he will not be content to simply supply his daily wants. He at once becomes filled with the idea that as a Colonist he should make his fortune. If he be a good man, – industrious, able to abstain from drink and with somewhat above ordinary intelligence, – he does make some fortune, more or less adequate. At any rate he rises in the world. But if he have not those gifts, – then he falls.²⁰

In his novel *An Old Man’s Love* Trollope shows us a man who does possess these “gifts” and returns to England having made his “fortune”.

Trollope found the Boers to be far from the barbarians whom he had been led to expect. Most of the accounts to which he would have had access, such as the writings and lectures of David Livingstone,²¹ painted the Boers in a very unfavourable light, and Trollope writes that he “had heard much of the manners of the Boers, and of their low condition of life.”²² Characteristically, however, he “took every opportunity that came in [his] way of entering the homes of the Dutch.”²³ Although he found that “[t]hings in the Boer’s house are no doubt generally very dirty,” this was because an “earthen floor will make everything dirty, – whether in Ireland or in the Transvaal.”²⁴ It is interesting that Trollope chooses to equate the Boer “earthen floor” with one in Ireland, which was also a British colony that was giving the government some trouble regarding its future status. There were certainly earthen floors in many English country hovels.²⁵ Ultimately, “[t]he Dutch Boer is what he is, not because he is Dutch or because he is a Boer, but because circumstances have isolated him . . . distance from crowded centres will produce the same falling off in civilization among one people as among another.”²⁶ Trollope’s implication here is that civilization is inherently a metropolitan construct; distance from the European cultural centre results in a decrease in those social mores indicative of “civilization.” This suggestion is borne out by the descriptions of the colonies in his novels: the towns of Ahalala and Nobble in *John Caldigate* and Kimberley in *An Old Man’s Love* are places where a “falling off in civilization” is described in some detail, and in *The Fixed Period* Trollope depicts a colony where some very “uncivilized” acts would have taken place had Britain not intervened.

In the same way that Trollope’s visits to Australia provided him with material for *John Caldigate* and *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*, his travels in South Africa gave him

elements that were of use in some of his later fiction. Kimberley, which had made such a strong, negative impression on him, provides a setting for *An Old Man's Love*, and elements of his thinking regarding the future role of Britain in her colonies are explored in *The Fixed Period*. These works will be discussed in the chapters that follow, where I will explore the ways in which elements of the colonies were integrated into Trollope's novels.

CHAPTER THREE

THE AUSTRALIAN NOVELS

Trollope's visits to Australia resulted in two fictional works set in that country. Although this dissertation deals primarily with his writings on South Africa, the Australian novels are the only other of Trollope's works to be set in a colonial situation and therefore offer valuable insights into Trollope's views on the relationship between Britain and her colonies.

Harry Heathcote of Gangoil is a novella which was written in 1873 for the Christmas number of the *Graphic*.¹ Trollope was honest about the fact that the character of Harry Heathcote was based on his son Fred, who had emigrated to Australia and taken up sheep farming: "Harry Heathcote is my boy Frederic – or very much the same."² Trollope's stay with Fred and his family in New South Wales in 1871-2 provided the background material for this story.

The novella is set in Queensland, during the height of a dry summer, with the threat of devastating fire forming the main storyline. As Christmas approaches, the young sheep farmer Harry Heathcote must keep a vigilant eye on his enormous sheep run so as to prevent its destruction by fire – fire that will in all probability be started by arson rather than accident, for Heathcote is on less than friendly terms with most of his neighbours. One of these neighbours, the recently arrived "free settler" Giles Medlicot, offers Trollope the opportunity to discuss the Australian system of "squatting" versus "free-selecting"; there are parallels here with nineteenth-century English class structure. Harry, as the "squatter" is of a higher Australian social class

than the free-selector Medlicot; however, Medlicot would undoubtedly have been considered a gentleman in England whereas Harry's origins and lack of money or family standing would have been a social handicap, and he would have had very little chance of being considered Medlicot's equal. In the colony, everything is reversed; we have what amounts to an upside-down image of the British class system. Medlicot, however, ultimately reveals himself to be on Heathcote's side in the battle against the arsonists who do start a fire on Christmas Eve. After injuring himself fighting the arsonists, Medlicot is welcomed into Heathcote's family as a suitor for Harry's sister-in-law Kate, and becomes a member of the highest class in the new society.

This slight story is of interest for a few reasons. Trollope seems at pains to depict a world far removed from the metropolitan centre; the Christmas motif allows direct comparison between the cold northern winter and the drought-stricken Australian summer; between England with its small, compact farms and the colony with its vast sheep runs. The searing heat, the way of life of Heathcote and his family, the isolation of the farmers in the huge spaces they occupy, all emphasize how far away from England this place is. Nicholas Birns notes that Trollope has set this novella in Queensland rather than New South Wales (where Fred's farm was situated) because "[t]he temperate climate of New South Wales is too much an approximation of that of England; what [he] needs to undergird his book's structure is an utter contrast."³ However, Heathcote's world is in many ways not definitively Australian either. Asa Briggs writes that "it is doubtful whether he would have needed to travel [to Australia] to write *Harry Heathcote of Gangooli*."⁴ Apart from the possums that eat Mary's vegetables (as they did those of Trollope's daughter-in-law), no indigenous

animals are mentioned. In a novel that emphasizes the strangeness of a the colonial space, one would have expected Trollope to introduce at least a kangaroo. Sheep and cattle populate the area instead and transport is facilitated by horses (all these animals having been imported from Europe). The people, too, are all alien to Australia: aside from those of English extraction, there are an Irishman, a German, a Chinaman and a band of Polynesian labourers. These non-English nationals are represented stereotypically; the Chinese cook is referred to as “Sing Sing” although this is not his real name, and the Polynesian labourers are described as “sleek swarthy fellows, from the South Sea Islands, with linen trousers on and nothing else.”⁵ No indigenous people feature at all.

So in *Harry Heathcote* we have both an apparent inversion of the metropolitan world, but also a reflection of it – a reflection through a heat haze, as it were. As Birns rightly states, “[i]n the reversed space of Trollope’s *Antipodes*, both everything and nothing are different.”⁶ Ultimately, it is Englishness that wins out: English notions of gentlemanliness, fair play and hard work are shown to be important requirements for success even in the alien landscape of Australia. Even in a place as different from the metropolis as Australia, the same values that are important “back home” are valuable in the colonies. This is underlined by the way in which the storyline reflects that of the typical Trollopian novel, with male characters establishing one another’s gentlemanly status and a young couple overcoming initial objections to their connection in order to marry.

In the second novel set in Australia, the narrative of *John Caldigate* concerns a young man who makes his fortune in the gold mines of New South Wales. However, the

Australian episodes of John Caldigate's story make up only a small part of the novel, the major part being taken up with the protagonist's life in England both before he leaves for Australia and after his return. Although he returns home a wealthy man, wealthy enough to win the hand of the woman he has dreamed of for many years, allegations of bigamy soon surface, and the greater part of the novel deals with the drama that unfolds as a result, both within his wife's family and in court. Although the time spent by Caldigate in Australia makes up only a small section of the novel, the effects of his sojourn there resonate throughout the book. Trollope's treatment of the emotional lives of the characters in *John Caldigate* is masterly (as in many of his other works, he gives us an insight into the emotions of even those characters for whom we feel an intrinsic dislike). However, it is on the influence of the colony and Trollope's treatment of it that I intend to focus here.

In *John Caldigate* Australia is used as a place of moral testing, where characters are placed in situations which cause their true natures to be revealed. As in *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*, Trollope is not concerned with accurate descriptions of typically Australian flora and fauna: the alienation that the characters experience results as much from the different social mores and the sheer ugliness of the business of mining, as from the Australian setting. When John Caldigate says of Nobble that "[i]t is not quite as nice walking as the old Quad at Trinity"⁷ he makes a comment that would be as valid in a Welsh coalmining town as it is in New South Wales. So whilst Trollope is at pains to show that John Caldigate and his companion Dick Shand are in an alien place in which they will be morally tested, this alienation is as much moral as geographical.

Trollope describes John Caldigate's English home, Folking, as a rather unattractive place:

Folking is not a place having many attractions of its own. . . . In the two parishes of Utterden and Netherden there is no rise of ground which can by any stretch of complaisance be called a hill. The property is bisected by an immense straight dike . . . which is so sluggish, so straight, so ugly and so deep, as to impress the mind of a stranger with the ideas of suicide. . . . The house itself is dark, picturesque, well-built, low and uncomfortable.⁸

The reader feels that Caldigate has good reason to wish to leave home and seek his fortune! There is very little idealization of the mother country at this stage of the narrative. However, Caldigate discovers that the environment at the gold mining towns of Nobble and Ahalala is not very prepossessing either. Whilst Folking is “well-built”, in Nobble “each enterprising proprietor had been his own architect”,⁹ while at Ahalala “the houses, such as they were, stood here and there about the place, while a great part of the population lived under canvas.”¹⁰ Thus, John Caldigate learns that although the flatness and straightness of Folking might “impress the mind of a stranger with the ideas of suicide”, to someone for whom it is home it may be longed for and appreciated when compared to the straggling, muddy, impermanent settlements at Nobble and Ahalala. Folking's straightness can be seen figuratively as well as literally, and the straggling settlements of the goldfields give the impression of being morally unsound in comparison. Trollope uses the colony, not as a place of promise and plenty, but as a mirror wherein he shows to his characters how valuable, after all, are the people, places and social values that they have left behind them. Once again, Nicholas Birns' comment that “both everything and nothing are different”¹¹ in Trollope's colonies, holds true. Caldigate finds that there is ugliness in Nobble and Ahalala as well as Folking, but also that the moral climates of the two worlds are very different. The success (or lack of it) of Caldigate and Shand depends

upon the degree to which they can practice the sound moral values of hard work, honesty and abstinence that they learned back home, in the alien environment of the goldfields.

Trollope had severe misgivings about the business of gold mining. When in Australia, he visited the gold fields of New South Wales, and was dismayed by what he saw there, with men giving up paid employment for the chance to strike it rich. Describing a typical example, he stated, “[i]n truth he has become a gambler.”¹² It is noteworthy that one of the ways in which John Caldigate dissipates his inheritance is by betting on the races at Newmarket, and Trollope allows him to make restitution by means of an industry which he saw as another form of gambling! But this is perhaps fitting, for John Caldigate shows that he has a head for the business side of mining, and he accumulates his wealth fairly slowly and surely through the acquisition of shares in other mines after finding gold in his own. His growing wealth is a sign of his growing maturity. His companion Dick Shand and their Australian partner, Mick Maggott, however, are shown not to have the same moral fibre: Dick Shand slips lower and lower down the social ladder, finally ending up as a shepherd on a Queensland sheep run¹³ “hardly earning better wages than an English ploughman”¹⁴ while Maggott drinks himself to death (thus fulfilling the expectations aroused in the reader by his name, which is rather suggestive of an ignoble end!).

At one point, early on in their endeavours, all three men are on an equal footing, toiling all day at their claim, with nothing to show for it. In *Australia and New Zealand* Trollope describes a young man whom he met at the New South Wales gold fields, someone whom he had known:

...at home, who had been at school with my sons, and had frequented my house. I saw him in front of his little tent, which he occupied in partnership with an experienced miner, eating a beefsteak out of his frying pan with his clasp knife. He was occupied with his companion on a claim, and his work consisted in trundling a rough windlass, by which dirt was drawn up out of a hole. They had found no gold as yet, and did not seem to expect to find it. He had no friend near him but his mining friend, – or mate, as he called him. I could not but think what would happen to him if illness came, or if his mate should find him too far removed from mining capability. He had been softly nurtured, well educated, and was a handsome fellow to boot; and there he was eating a nauseous lump of beef out of a greasy frying pan with his pocket-knife, just in front of the contiguous blankets stretched on the ground, which constituted the beds of himself and his companion.¹⁵

Trollope's distaste is palpable. Words such as "rough", "dirt", "nauseous" and "greasy" contrast with Trollope's memories of a "softly nurtured, well educated . . . handsome fellow" to provide the reader with a sense of his disgust at the scene described. This young man's situation seems to have provided the seeds in Trollope's mind for the mining episodes in *John Caldigate*: many details of the monotony of the physical labour and of the rough life lived by the average gold miner are depicted in *John Caldigate*. Caldigate, like the young man described above, had been "softly nurtured" and "well educated" and "without being absolutely handsome, was a youth to find favour in a woman's eyes."¹⁶

It is perhaps this last quality of Caldigate's that is his undoing; for whilst he has the moral strength to resist the dangers of speculation and alcoholism, he is by no means immune to the allures of Mrs Euphemia Smith, who ensnares him while they are both voyaging out to Australia on the same ship. Trollope draws a veil over the precise nature of their relationship, but it is obvious that she spends time at Ahalala as his mistress, and her claims that they were married there do not seem entirely without foundation when tested in court. Herein lies the dramatic centre of the novel's plot. So Caldigate, too, finds Australia a corrupting place.

Comparisons are clearly drawn between the morally dubious Smith, and the pure and innocent Hester Bolton, whom Caldigate marries on his return to England. However, we should note that all the corrupting influences associated with the gold fields are those imported from Europe: the alcohol, the avaricious love of gold and wealth, even the fallen woman. For Smith is an Englishwoman, not an Aboriginal Australian, or even an Australian-born colonist. The slovenliness, the ugliness, the immorality of Nobble and Ahalala are all *European* constructs.

So Trollope's message about the colony is not as clear-cut as we might expect; whilst it functions as a place of moral testing and temptation, that temptation is the result of polluting European influences, and this concept adds complexity to the novel's structure. Thus the emphasis in *John Caldigate* is different to that in *Harry Heathcote*, where English value systems are shown to win out in the end, for the greater good of society. Both novels, however, depict a colony that seems strangely devoid of indigenous Australian elements. Native peoples and geography have been "written out" of these texts to make way for European values and concerns.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN OLD MAN'S LOVE

This is the only one of Trollope's novels to have a South African plot setting, inspired by his visit to the Kimberley diamond mines. Trollope's views on diamond mining are similar to those he expressed on gold mining in *John Caldigate*: he saw the activity as a form of gambling, and one which had inherent risks for the moral status of those engaging in it. In *An Old Man's Love* he explores this point, depicting the colony as a place with the potential to corrupt. In this chapter I will compare Trollope's thoughts on Kimberley in *South Africa* with his descriptions of it in *An Old Man's Love*, showing how this concept of corruption is explored in the novel and analysing Trollope's depiction of the colony as a place of moral danger.

An Old Man's Love, Trollope's last novel,¹ is a slight work, almost a novella in length. Unlike most of his novels, it has only one plot, which revolves around a love-triangle: Mary Lawrie has affianced herself to her guardian Mr Whittlestaff (the "old man" of the title) on the assumption that she will never again see John Gordon, the man whom she truly loves. However, Gordon returns from the Kimberley diamond fields, where he has been seeking his fortune in the hope of becoming wealthy enough to claim Mary as his bride, only to find that he is a day too late, and that she has promised herself to Whittlestaff. The greater part of the novel is taken up with Mary's determination not to go back on her word to Mr Whittlestaff, despite her knowledge that she loves another man, and with Mr Whittlestaff's vacillations over whether to do the selfish thing (marry Mary anyway, which he believes will be better for her in the long run) or the unselfish one (give her up to the young man she loves,

whom he feels to be something less than a gentleman because of the way in which he has gained his fortune). The issue of Gordon's gentility (or lack of it) is central to the novel; this text examines the corrupting influence of the colonial diamond mines on a young Englishman, and debates whether it is possible to return from the colony with one's social status intact.

It is fairly clear that Whittlestaff's distaste for diamond mining is Trollope's own (his authorial interjections support Whittlestaff's prejudices), and this is the main interest of this novel, in that what Trollope had to say about Kimberley in *South Africa* accords closely with the views expressed by Whittlestaff in *An Old Man's Love*.

Whittlestaff views the means by which John Gordon has attained his wealth as tantamount to gambling, and the authorial voice explains that

. . . [Gordon] was the possessor of many complete shares in many various adventures which were quite intelligible to him, though to the ordinary stay-at-home Englishman they seem to be so full of peril as not to be worth possessing.²

The use of the word "adventures" here suggests that Gordon's business dealings are somewhat risky. Trollope would seem to be just such an "ordinary stay-at-home Englishman" as described above. In *South Africa* he elaborates on the "peril" of "adventures" such as Gordon's:

There can be no doubt that many have ruined themselves by fruitless labours, and that others who have suddenly enriched themselves have been unable to bear their prosperity with equanimity. The effect of a valuable diamond upon a digger who had been working perhaps a month for nothing was in the early days almost maddening. . . . There is at Kimberley much more of gambling, much more of champagne, much more of the rowdy exhilaration (sic) coming from sudden money, than at older towns. . .³

In *South Africa* Trollope seems at pains to attempt a balanced report of the enterprises he witnessed at Kimberley, and while he makes it clear that he did not like the town or the work of diamond mining and dealing in diamonds, he did report accurately on the wealth produced by the mines for the colony (“[o]f the national benefit arising from the diamonds there can be no doubt”⁴), and did note that improvements were planned which would eventually result in a more settled and wholesome lifestyle for the townspeople of Kimberley. There are asides, however, which leave the reader in no doubt as to his feelings towards the business of prospecting for diamonds:

I could not but think as I watched the man [sifting river sand for alluvial diamonds] of the comparative nobility of the work of a shoemaker who by every pull at his thread is helping to keep some person’s foot dry.⁵

Here we see that Trollope considered the “get-rich-quick (maybe)” philosophy of Kimberley to be somehow ignoble, perhaps because the enrichment of an individual was so much a matter of chance rather than of effort or ability. Trollope, musing on this issue, concludes that diamond prospecting is not an occupation for a gentleman:

It would be untrue to say that he who works to ornament the world is necessarily less noble than the other workman who supplies it with what is simply useful. . . . Why therefore should not the man who finds diamonds be above the man who finds bread? And yet I feel sure that he is not. It is not only the thing procured but the manner of procuring it that makes or mars the nobility of the work. If there be an employment in which the labourer has actually to grovel in the earth it is this search for diamonds. There is much of it in gold-seeking, but in the search after diamonds it is all grovelling. Let the man rise as high as he may in the calling, be the head of the biggest firm at Kimberley, still he stands by and sees the grit turned, – still he picks out the diamonds from the other dirt with his own fingers, and carries his produce about with him in his own pocket. If a man be working in a coal mine, though he be himself the hardest worked as well as the head workman in the business, he is removed from actual contact with the coal. But here, at Kimberley, sharp prying eyes are wanted, rather than intelligence fitted for calculations, and patience in manipulating dirt than skill in managing men or figures.⁶

There is a definite sense here of Kimberley as a place of moral danger and corruption.

Throughout this passage there is an emphasis on “dirt”; the word’s dual meaning of

both “earth” and something unclean or unwholesome gives a strong impression of pollution. The image of “grovelling” in the “dirt” in search of diamonds likewise has negative connotations, implying an inability to rise to better things, to escape from the “dirt” involved in the work, no matter how rich the searcher might become. There is thus a dual implication of both physical and moral degradation in the finding of diamonds.

Trollope’s emphasis on the “nobility of work” is a theme that recurs throughout the Victorian age; Thomas Carlyle was one of the first to propound this theory, and his influence on the writers who came after him was profound. In *Sartor Resartus* Carlyle writes that “[o]ur Works are the mirror wherein the spirit first sees its natural lineaments”⁷ and therefore, by extrapolation, that work which one does will to some extent define who and what one is. For Trollope and his character Whittlestaff, the work of diamond mining was not of a noble nature, and would negatively affect any man who undertook it, reducing a gentleman to a lesser state.

This seems to be Whittlestaff’s main objection to John Gordon – that he has engaged in work that is less than noble, that he has “carrie[d] his produce about with him in his own pocket” and been contaminated by his association with Kimberley. Although it would seem that Gordon has never actually done any *de facto* mining, but merely dealt in shares in various mines, this makes no difference to how his wealth is seen to have been obtained. The mere fact of his having been in Kimberley and associated with the procuring of diamonds is seen to have reduced his standing in the (English) world, certainly amongst such landed gentry as Mr Whittlestaff. The narrator notes that “[t]he sort of acquaintance with whom a steady man becomes intimate in such a locality often surprises the steady man himself”⁸, and Gordon’s business partner is

depicted as the sort of man with whom Gordon prefers to have as little contact as possible, once back in the “civilized” world of London.

These things stick to the very soul of a man. They are a poison of which he cannot rid himself. They are like gambling. They make everything cheap that should be dear, and everything dear that should be cheap. I trust them not at all, – and I do not trust you, because you deal in them.⁹

Thus Whittlestaff addresses John Gordon, accusing him of being something less than the gentleman who would deserve the hand of Mary Lawrie. In *South Africa*, Trollope says something very similar: “there is a stain sticking to the diamonds.”¹⁰ Once again we encounter the concept of the contamination that is possible from contact with the “dirt” from which the diamonds have been obtained, a “dirt” both literal and figurative. And yet it is clear to the reader that Gordon is the same man who won Mary’s love before he went away to the diamond fields to seek his fortune – the fortune that has enabled him to claim her hand. So whilst Trollope makes it clear both in this novel and in his chapter on Kimberley in *South Africa* that the town is no place for a real gentleman, yet the reader feels that John Gordon is nevertheless still a gentleman, that the dust and the flies and the diamonds have not yet altered him. It is significant, however, that there is no question of Mary returning with him to Kimberley. Gordon says to Whittlestaff: “South Africa is no place for her, – nor for me either, with such a wife”.¹¹ Trollope provides us with an ambivalent stance: he creates in John Gordon a man whom the reader is convinced has survived the evils of Kimberley without sacrificing his claim to the title of “gentleman” and yet at the same time he convinces us that diamond mining is a business that cannot fail to corrupt those who engage in it. At the end of the novel we are left with the feeling that Gordon has had a lucky escape from the evils of Kimberley, that he has somehow managed to emerge unbesmirched by the “stain” of the diamonds. This immunity to

the corrupting effects of the diamond-mining business serves to further recommend Gordon to the reader.

It would seem to be a lucky escape indeed, and John Gordon can perhaps be regarded as no ordinary man for surviving Kimberley. The narrator in *An Old Man's Love* makes his dislike for the town very clear:

I know no spot more odious in every way to a man who has learned to love the ordinary modes of English life. It is foul with dust and flies; it reeks with bad brandy; it is fed upon potted meats; it has no tree near it. It is inhabited in part by tribes of South African niggers, who have lost all the picturesqueness of niggerdom in working for the white man's wages. The white man himself is insolent, ill-dressed and ugly . . . [I]f a man be sharp, clever, and able to guard what he gets, he will make a fortune there in two years more readily perhaps than elsewhere. John Gordon had gone out to Kimberley, and had returned the owner of many shares in many mines.¹²

Are we to surmise from this that John Gordon was “sharp, clever and able to guard what he gets”, or that he was “insolent, ill-dressed and ugly”? The former, surely, and yet there is the implication that the latter was always a possibility:

Mr Whittlestaff had his own ideas about Kimberley. Kimberley was to him a very rowdy place, – the last place in the world from which a discreet young woman might hope to get a well-conducted husband.¹³

The authorial interjection from *An Old Man's Love* quoted above is interesting for what it has to say regarding the native workers in Kimberley: they are referred to here as having “lost all the picturesqueness of niggerdom in working for the white man's wages”. This phrase is suggestive of the colonial gaze, with the colonist regarding the “nigger” as an interesting object of scrutiny rather than a human being. However, it is the “white man's wages” that have caused the loss of the “picturesque” state of the native population: contact with European influences is seen as a corrupting force. As in *John Caldigate*, the corruption that endangers the moral lives of the characters in this novel is European in origin. In *South Africa*, Trollope takes quite a different

standpoint. He writes at some length about how the “civilization” of the native peoples has begun at Kimberley by the fact of their working for wages:

Who can doubt but that work is the great civilizer of the world – work and the growing desire for those good things which work will only bring? . . . Civilization cannot come at once. . . . But this is the quickest way towards it that has yet been found. . . . I regard Kimberley as one of the most interesting places on the face of the earth. I know no other spot on which the work of civilizing a Savage is being carried on with so signal a success.¹⁴

It is ironic that the same occupation that will “civilize” a “Savage” will also, in Trollope’s eyes, reduce a white colonist to something less than a gentleman, and that in this passage there is no talk of “grovelling” or “dirt”. The wages that resulted in the loss of the natives’ “picturesque” status in *An Old Man’s Love* are seen, in *South Africa*, to be a civilizing force.

Perhaps the different depictions of the native population in these two works has something to do with the purpose of each of the texts: in *South Africa* Trollope was striving to present a balanced picture of Kimberley’s present and possible future, whereas in *An Old Man’s Love* it was necessary to depict Kimberley as something of a “den of iniquity” that could corrupt even a “picturesque nigger”, although John Gordon does seem to have escaped this corruption. Thus, the difference in genre could account for the more emotive representation in *An Old Man’s Love*.

Given that Kimberley made such a strong, if negative, impression on Trollope, it is hardly surprising that it was this town and all that it stood for that he chose to use in a work of fiction which had a South African plot element. Ultimately, the reader is left in some doubt as to the effects of three years in Kimberley upon John Gordon. Did he return something less of a gentleman than he set out, despite his greater financial worth, or did he somehow manage to avoid the “stain” that Whittlestaff and the

narrator both feel to be the legacy of any time spent in the diamond fields? If the latter, this is a powerfully positive comment on Gordon's character. Mary Lawrie is satisfied that he has not altered, and certainly Gordon's actions and thoughts are as gentlemanly as any of Trollope's other heroes. Nevertheless, one is induced to conclude that Kimberley is indeed a place that would be "distasteful" to any "ordinary, stay-at-home Englishman".

Both *John Caldigate* and *An Old Man's Love* have a short colonial episode as part of the plot structure. It is interesting that Trollope chose to use the industries of gold and diamond mining in these novels: these were enterprises which had a tremendous potential to corrupt because of their association with fabulous riches. He did not send his impecunious young gentlemen heroes to the colonies to become farmers or businessmen or editors of newspapers; there was a deliberate choice of an undertaking that would be full of both financial and moral risk for his characters. We need to ask whether this was because Trollope genuinely felt that the colonies *were* places of financial and moral danger, or whether they simply offered an exotic location for the moral testing of his characters. Given Trollope's extensive travels in the colonies, and the nature of his thoughts on them in his travel narratives, I would suggest that it is the latter that is probably the case.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FIXED PERIOD

This novel is unusual in that Trollope departs from his usual formula to write a futuristic novel. It is of interest for various reasons, which I shall discuss briefly. For the purpose of this dissertation, however, the major concern is the influence that Trollope's South African travels had on the narrative. Whilst in South Africa, Trollope met with and interviewed ex-President Burgers, and Davidson proposes that he modelled the protagonist of *The Fixed Period* on Burgers.¹ I will discuss this suggestion by comparing relevant sections of the texts of *South Africa* and *The Fixed Period*. Davidson also contends that the novel offers "an . . . apologia for the annexation of the Transvaal"² and I will investigate this assertion too. The novel, which is set in a post-independence ex-British colony, foregrounds the issue of Britain's relationship with her colonies, and I will show how Trollope explores the extent to which Britain can be said to have the right to interfere in an ex-colony. I shall also examine the language used in the descriptions of the colony, and discuss what this reveals regarding Trollope's "writing of Empire".

The Fixed Period is a strange tale, and differs markedly from Trollope's other novels. It concerns a fictional ex-colony, Brittanula, which is situated on an island somewhere in the Pacific. The colonists have come there from New Zealand, and have obtained independence from Britain and are free to run their own affairs. Their President, Fidus Neverbend, has been influential in the passing of a parliamentary bill that will ensure that all Brittanulans live only for a "fixed period" of sixty-eight years, thus saving the colony the costs of caring for an aged population that no longer has any

economic contribution to make. Having reached sixty-seven years of age, candidates are “deposited” in a “necropolis” to wait out the final year of their lives and prepare for euthanasia, which is to be followed by the cremation of their remains. As the novel opens, the first candidate for deposition is about to reach the critical age; he is the President’s closest friend. Just as his deposition is taking place, amid protests from many Brittanulans, including the President’s son, a British warship arrives in the harbour, and the island is re-annexed: Britain has heard of the doctrine of the “fixed period” and considers it too barbaric to be permitted to continue. The latter part of the novel debates Britain’s interference, and Neverbend and the British representatives discuss the motherland / colony relationship in some depth.

The Fixed Period is the only one of his works to be set in a future time: Trollope’s other works take place at the time of writing, or very close to it, and he usually makes full use of the opportunity to make allusions to contemporaneous events and issues. *The Fixed Period*, however, is set in the 1980s and is filled with futuristic devices, from steam tricycles to water telegraphs to interesting changes to the laws of cricket. Nevertheless, Trollope does make use of several issues that were current at the time of his writing the novel, such as cremation,³ and manages to introduce various political figures of the 1880s into the narrative (he names a town after Gladstone, and a ship after John Bright).⁴

This novel is also remarkable for being written entirely in the first person, thus departing from Trollope’s usual practice of writing in the third person with occasional authorial interjections, and allowing Neverbend to reveal his character to the reader in his own words. Like *An Old Man’s Love*, it is not one of Trollope’s better works,

being somewhat patchy in quality, but this unusual novel does offer us some valuable insights relevant to this study.

There has been some speculation regarding Trollope's departure from his usual formula. Whilst it might be seen as a vehicle for the advancement of cremation, or euthanasia, or both, the *Saturday Review* felt that "the story may be regarded as a sort of epic intended to exhibit dogged obstinacy in heroic proportions."⁵ One twentieth-century critic has similar views: "*The Fixed Period* is . . . a satire on the narrow-mindedness and the lack of human sympathy that characterize abstract reformers. . . . Trollope's purpose is neither to advocate nor attack euthanasia, but rather to portray an enthusiastic reformer as he refuses to abandon his theories or accept life as it is."⁶ Trollope's departure from his customary omniscient third-person narrative in favour of the first person allows us to gain a close understanding of the workings of the protagonist's mind; his narrative shows us the flaws in the reformer as they are revealed by Neverbend himself, and is a powerful device. Henry N. Rogers III notes that Neverbend's narrative "is a continual digging beneath himself."⁷

J. H. Davidson sees in the novel a different purpose from that of merely depicting an "enthusiastic reformer" gone to extremes. In his notes on *South Africa*, he remarks that Trollope's visit to this country soon after the annexation of the Transvaal by Britain, and his meeting with President Burgers, may have provided the seed for *The Fixed Period*. He sees the novel as an allegory for the annexation, an apologia, a means of reasoning out whether Britain's actions in the Transvaal had been justified. This theory rests on the premise that there are similarities between President Burgers and the protagonist of *The Fixed Period*, Fidus Neverbend, and between the

annexation of the Transvaal and the repossession of the fictional state of Brittanula, and I will look at these assumptions here.

I will first examine the characters of the two men in question, as they are described by Trollope. Despite the fact that Trollope interviewed President Burgers, *South Africa* provides little information on his personal characteristics. Trollope writes that

Mr Burgers, whom I had the pleasure of meeting in Capetown, is still a man in the prime of life. . . . Known as an eloquent, enthusiastic man. . . [h]is mind seems to have been filled with the idea of competing with Washington for public admiration. . . . I believe that Mr Burgers thought more of his country than of himself. That he was sanguine, unsteady, and utterly deficient in patience and prudence was the fault of those who elected him rather than himself. . . . The words and bearing of the man recommended themselves to me much.⁸

Trollope seems to view Burgers as something of an idealist who had little idea of what his country's priorities were – he introduced “a national flag, and a . . . gold coinage . . . and a code of laws and a promised railway,”⁹ all of which Trollope feels would be laudable projects, were it not for the fact that the treasury was empty and the Republic's war against Sekhukhune was not progressing well. Trollope felt that Burgers was “putting the cart before the horse”, sending his people “ruffles” when they wanted “a shirt . . . the ordinary calico shirt of taxation and the knee-breeches of security for property.”¹⁰

Neverbend bears some resemblance to the man described above: he too is an eloquent speaker,¹¹ and his greatest desire is to be known to posterity as a benefactor of his people. He “dared to regard [him]self as the foremost spirit of [his] age,”¹² and models himself on Galileo, Columbus and others: “. . . suddenly there came upon me a memory of Socrates, of Galileo, of Hampden, and of Washington. What great

things had these men done by constancy in opposition to the wills and prejudices of the outside world! How triumphant they now appeared to have been in fighting against the enormous odds which power had brought against them!”¹³ Neverbend’s rather Dickensian name is suggestive: as the novel progresses, it becomes clear that the “constancy” he admires in “Socrates . . . Galileo . . . Hampden and . . . Washington” becomes in him a “never-bending” rigidity, an obsession with the fulfilment of the doctrine of “The Fixed Period”.

Trollope is of the opinion that Burgers’ mismanagement of the government of the Republic was a major factor in Britain’s decision to annex the Transvaal: “the war came up in the time of Mr Burgers and has been the cause of our annexation of the Republic.”¹⁴ Neverbend, in *The Fixed Period*, acknowledges his role in causing the invasion of Brittanula: “But upon me, my fellow-citizens, has fallen the great disgrace of having robbed you of your independence.”¹⁵

In this novel, Trollope makes one small comment that almost certainly refers directly to President Burgers. Discussing the Brittanulan currency (a sovereign that still bears the image of the British monarch), Neverbend explains why he has not changed the coin to reflect the country’s republican status: “I have never pushed the question much lest I should seem, as have done some presidents, over anxious to exhibit myself.”¹⁶ We can compare this to Trollope’s note in *South Africa* that Burgers “had a gold coinage struck, with a portraiture of himself – two or three hundred gold pieces worth 20s each,— which I would not hurt his feelings by calling sovereigns.”¹⁷ Neverbend’s comment suggests a criticism of Burgers, that he was over-ready to glorify himself. But coming from a man who sees himself as “the foremost spirit of

[his] age” the reader is likely to see similarities between the two men rather than differences.

To turn now to the issue of the annexations of the Transvaal and the Republic of Brittanula: we need to consider whether there are any similarities between Trollope’s account of the former in *South Africa* and the fictional account in the novel. The reasons given by Britain for the annexation of the Transvaal would seem to be very different from those advanced for the seizing of Brittanula. Trollope describes the situation in the Transvaal thus:

The condition of the Transvaal was very bad. Slavery was rampant. The Natives were being encouraged to rebellion. The President was impotent. The Volksraad was stiff-necked and ignorant. There was no revenue, no order, no obedience. The Dutch seemed to have forgotten even the way to fight. What were we to do with such neighbours, – for whose inefficiency we were in a measure responsible, having ourselves established the Republic?¹⁸

Brittanula, on the other hand, is well-run, prosperous, and ordered. Britain intervenes, however, on the premise that it cannot allow an ex-colony to institute a practice that it considers to be barbaric, namely the doctrine of the “the fixed period”. It could be argued that Britain’s distaste at the prospect of Brittanulan compulsory euthanasia could have parallels with her concern at the practice of slavery in the Transvaal, but I do not feel that this argument is a particularly strong one, as Britain’s primary concern with the situation in the Transvaal seems to have been the threat posed to the peace of the region by the Republic’s war with Sekhukhune.

However, the nature of the annexation itself is similar in both cases: not a shot is fired, and the act is accomplished by a very small force. Sir Theophilus Shepstone was accompanied into the Transvaal by an escort of twenty-five policemen,¹⁹ and

Sir Ferdinando Brown arrives in Brittanula aboard a single war ship with only its crew and one hundred soldiers and these are of the “North-north-west Birmingham regiment”²⁰ – surely an appellation chosen by Trollope to convey a sense of minor importance! In both cases, although the force used is small, there is the knowledge that it represents the entire might of Britain: “[Burgers] might cause Sir Theophilus and his twenty-five policemen to be marched back over the border, treating them on their way as unauthorized intruders. This he would not do, he said, because he knew it to be useless to wage war with Great Britain.”²¹ In *The Fixed Period* Neverbend says to Sir Ferdinando: “Your power is so superior to any that I can advance as to make us here feel that there is no disgrace in yielding to it. . . . [H]ow can a little State, but a few years old, situated on a small island far removed from all the centres of civilization, contend on any point with the owner of the great 250-ton swiveller-gun?”²² It is ironic that Neverbend here emphasizes Brittanula’s distance from the metropole, whilst elsewhere in the narrative he seems at pains to paint a picture of a society as civilized and well-regulated as Britain herself.

In *South Africa* Trollope wrestles with the rights and wrongs of the Annexation, pointing out that

[i]t is as though the rulers of Germany were to say that in their opinion the existence of a Switzerland in Europe was dangerous and deleterious, and that therefore they would abolish Switzerland as a Republic, and annex its territory. It will be said that the case would be different because Switzerland is well governed and prosperous.²³

In *The Fixed Period* Trollope depicts just such a “well governed and prosperous” nation. In *South Africa* he goes on to say that “[a] nation with a popular parliament can only be said to express its opinion to another nation by the voices of its parliament; – and the Volksraad of the Transvaal was altogether opposed to the

interference of Great Britain.”²⁴ Brittanula, too, has a parliament, and the laws relating to “deposition” of those over sixty-seven have been thoroughly debated there before being passed into law by a majority. Trollope argues that the decisions taken by a parliament are the only means by which the opinions of a nation can be known. And yet, in *The Fixed Period*, he discusses the shortcomings of the Brittanulan parliament: because there is only one house, no mechanism exists for veto, and thus one eloquent speaker can sway the vote on an issue which might give an upper house reason to pause for reconsideration. The implication is that the English system is a better one.

Trollope’s words in *South Africa* regarding the Transvaal seem to describe the situation in *The Fixed Period* exactly:

In the Transvaal we have annexed a dominion which was established by ourselves in express obedience to our own requisitions, which was in the possession of European rulers, which was altogether independent, and as to the expediency of annexing which we have had nothing to guide us but our own judgement and our own will.²⁵

Trollope’s descriptions of the attitude of the British to the deposed President of the Transvaal resonate in his novel. In *South Africa* he writes that:

When such a man has held high office in his State, – especially when he has been elected to that office by the voices of his fellow-citizens, – he is entitled to the merit of patriotism unless the crime of selfish ambition or unclean hands have been brought home against him by the voices which elected him. No such charges have been substantiated against Mr Burgers, and I shall therefore speak of him with all the respect which patriotism deserves.²⁶

In *The Fixed Period*, Sir Ferdinando Brown’s instructions from the Colonial Office say that “[i]n regard to Mr Neverbend himself it is the especial wish of H. M. Government that he shall be treated with all respect, and that those honours shall be paid to him which are due to the President of a friendly Republic.”²⁷

The position of the annexing country must be considered, too. Trollope, having argued in *South Africa* that the Annexation was advantageous for the “Natives, and for the Dutch, and for the English in the Transvaal,”²⁸ goes on to ask, “how will it suit the English at home?”²⁹ Here is the crux of the matter: what should Britain’s role be in those colonies which have become independent of her? Trollope summarizes Britain’s colonial policy thus: “[O]ur Colonies, as they are required to give nothing to us, are also required to support themselves.”³⁰ However, this would clearly not be possible for the Transvaal in the condition it was in when annexed by Shepstone. Trollope comments that:

we have been compelled thus to deviate from our practice and to put our hands deeply into our pockets by our folly in a former generation. It is because we came to a wrong judgement of our position in 1852, – when we first called upon the Dutch Boers to rule themselves, – that we are now, twenty-five years afterwards, called upon to pay for the mistake that has since occurred.³¹

Trollope would seem to be arguing that Britain should not have sanctioned an independent Transvaal, that the inhabitants of the region were not yet ready to cope with such freedoms and responsibilities.

What of Brittanula? Trollope seems at pains to paint a picture of a settled, prosperous and democratic country. But nevertheless Britain feels the need to intervene in order to reimpose English standards of “decency” and morality. Brittanula, on the surface, seems to be a carbon copy of an idyllic pastoral Britain (but with better weather!). Nothing seems to remain of the indigenous flora or fauna that the Brittanulans must have encountered when they arrived on the island. Instead, everything seems to be imported, as was the case in *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*. Neverbend describes the farm of his friend Gabriel Cressweller in these glowing terms:

The streams which watered the land were bright and rapid and always running.

The grasses were particularly rich and the old English fruit trees which we had brought with us from New Zealand throve there with an exuberant fertility of which the mother country I am told knows nothing. He had imported pheasants' eggs and salmon-spawn, and black-cock and grouse, and those beautiful little Alderney cows no bigger than good-sized dogs which when milked give nothing but cream.³²

This farm is called "Little Christchurch": one step removed from the Christchurch of New Zealand, and two steps from the original Christchurch of England. And yet, despite the distance in both time and geographical space from the "mother country", all things English are still considered superior and desirable; here once again we encounter the phenomenon of "Englishness". Brittanula seems to be a copy of Britain, but one that is more verdant, fertile and prolific than that which it emulates. There is a sense, however, that this colonial fertility ultimately results in a rankness, a form of moral decay. Trollope suggests an unnatural and possibly unhealthy fecundity in the description of fruit trees thriving "with an exuberant fertility" and cows giving "nothing but cream", but ultimately the flaws seem to be operating on a moral level. There is a sense in which the island can be seen as "virgin territory" that was "penetrated" by the Brittanulan colonists; this may explain why there is no mention in *The Fixed Period* of any pre-existing flora or fauna. It is as if Brittanula has been "seeded" with British produce, but the means of growth is peculiar to the colony and is shown to be somehow unnaturally fertile. Once again Trollope is suggesting that the colonies may be places of moral danger and corruption, where distance from the metropole equates to loss of those English value systems that hold society together in a morally acceptable manner. And once again it is the English systems themselves that are implicated in this decay: Brittanula is a democracy, a Republic sanctioned by Britain and run along the lines of Britain herself. But Brittanula is a Britain taken to extremes, an attempt at a perfect reflection of British

institutions and the British way of life, that has become distorted by time and distance. The Brittanulans, in neglecting to form an identity that is influenced by and in some way incorporates their situation on the other side of the world from Britain, in a place which has a history and geography that predates their arrival, have created a flawed society.

Britain does not hesitate to annex Brittanula once the doctrine of “The “Fixed Period” has come to her attention, and Trollope uses this action as a means of exploring what Britain’s rights and duties would be in those of her colonies which might one day be independent of her. Trollope showed that colonial independence was the best and most desirable situation for both Britain and the colony, but nevertheless acknowledged that the motherland would always have a close relationship with her former colony. Just what the nature of this post-colonial relationship should be is only partially explored in *The Fixed Period*: the question as to what extent Britain has the right to interfere in the affairs of a sovereign state whose government has been elected by the people, and whose laws have ostensibly been passed in accordance with Britain’s own principles, is not answered.

Davidson’s assertion that the novel amounts to an extended reasoning out of the rights and wrongs of the Annexation of the Transvaal is not entirely borne out by this text. There are undoubtedly influences here from Trollope’s South African experiences, but I do not believe that he wrote this novel with the express purpose of producing “an apologia” for the Annexation, as Davidson suggests. What Trollope has done in this novel is to explore the moral rights and wrongs of a possible future scenario for Britain and her colonies. Once again the colony he writes is a place of potential

corruption; like *Harry Heathcote's* Australia, the society he depicts is England through a distorting mirror, and once again the Other that Britain sees reflected back upon herself is a place that is morally unsound because of the European influences that she has introduced to a “virgin” colonial space – “virgin” because all the indigenous elements have been “written out” of the text and are never mentioned, never acknowledged to have existed at all.

CONCLUSION

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I discussed the concept of “Englishness” and how it operates in a colonial text. In Trollope’s “colonial” novels, Englishness is shown to be an alien import into the strangeness of the colonial environment, but also to be a moral force that prevents the corrupting influences of this environment from taking hold of a character. Trollope depicts the colonies as places of financial advancement for John Caldigate and John Gordon, but this is at the risk of their moral standing; the corrupting influences they encounter are, however, British in origin, foreign intrusions into the colonial space.

The native peoples of Australia and South Africa do not feature at all in the novels I have discussed here; however, in the travel narrative *South Africa* Trollope does deal with the black South African population, putting particular emphasis on Britain’s *duty* to the native peoples. Trollope saw that one day Britain’s colonies would govern themselves, and in *South Africa* he shows that the country’s future lay in the hands of the black and not the white population.

South Africa exhibits many of the features of a colonial text, such as “othering” of the native populations, scientific analysis of their characteristics, and use of concepts such as “the noble savage”. However, Trollope explores, at some length, the future relationship between black and white in South Africa and expands on Britain’s duty to the black colonized peoples: as they are numerically superior, they must be acknowledged as playing a role in any future for the colony. He depicts a colony where there is no potential for a working-class Englishman to rise in the world; South

Africa is a colony where a middle-class man may be moderately successful, but ultimately the future of the country is in the hands of black men. It is Britain's duty, Trollope writes, to ensure that these men will have received the right lessons: in working for wages, they are to learn the economic imperatives that underpin the capitalist system of the Empire so that they may perpetuate it.

In his Australian novels, Trollope depicts the colony as an alien place of moral testing, where English value systems win out over the corrupting influences of the colonial space. In *Harry Heathcote* there is a sense of a strange place where all the European certainties seem to have been reversed; the novella's Christmas motif accentuates the differences between Britain and Australia. Despite this inversion of the metropolitan world, the same values that ensure success in Trollope's English novels are important here too; Englishness wins out over colonial strangeness.

In the Australian episodes of *John Caldigate* there is emphasis on alienation, but this is shown to be as much moral as geographical. There are moral dangers aplenty in Australia: a woman of dubious character, alcohol, and the risky business of gold mining with its potential to corrupt. However, these are not inherently colonial dangers; they have all been imported into Australia by the British colonists. So whilst in this novel Australia offers Trollope a location for the moral testing of his principal character, he does not give us a clear picture of the colony as a place of inherent moral danger: the danger is imported into a space which is a blank page because of the "writing out" of any pre-existing flora, fauna or peoples. This blank page becomes filled with English characters, English concerns, English solutions.

In *An Old Man's Love* we again have the colony (South Africa this time) depicted as a place of moral danger and testing. Trollope uses the motif of diamond mining in this novel, and describes its corrupting potential at some length. The colony again functions as a place where an English hero can go to find a fortune, but at great risk to his status as a gentleman. John Gordon seems to maintain his gentlemanly credentials, but such is the danger that they are exposed to in Kimberley that the reader is not entirely sure that the colony has not after all had a corrupting effect on him at some fundamental level. Once again this corruption is European in origin, and has the potential to affect the native populations too.

The plot of *The Fixed Period* allows Trollope to discuss the future relationship of Britain and her colonies. Trollope's experiences in South Africa can certainly be seen in this novel: he seems to have modelled the protagonist on President Burgers, and there are similarities in the details of the Annexations of the Transvaal and Brittanula. The colony of Brittanula is depicted as an image of Britain, a "little England" in the Pacific. However, British value systems have come unravelled, and have to be re-imposed by the motherland. Once again Trollope shows us a colony that is empty of indigenous elements, which have been written out of the text to make room for a host of British animals, plants and people. Trollope implies that this transplantation of English systems to a colonial space is not always successful; British values and ideals become distorted, and he uses the novel to debate the question of whether or not Britain should interfere to reinstate her moral hegemony.

Trollope's travel narrative *South Africa* and those of his novels that have a colonial plot element contributed to the textual Empire; they depicted the colonies as places

where impecunious young men could create successful lives or make restitution for past peccadilloes, and where English values are an important part of any success. But the colonies are also places of moral danger and testing; imperfect reflections of Britain that have the potential to distort that “Englishness” that is the saving grace for many of the characters. Trollope’s colonies are inhabited by English-speaking colonials who have no contact with any indigenous peoples, animals or plants; the dramas all unfold on what is essentially an English stage despite its position on the other side of the world. Much of the moral danger depicted in Trollope’s colonies is inherently European in origin; the evils as well as the good values are imported from Britain.

Trollope’s contribution to the “writing of Empire” is thus to depict the colonies as places of moral danger where the value systems instilled by English society provide the only means of overcoming the corrupting influences of the colonial space. He writes the colonies as images of Britain, but these images are never true reflections of the homeland: there is always an element of distortion present, which serves to subvert the ostensible “Englishness” of his colonial landscapes.

APPENDIX

The White Man's Burden

Take up the White Man's burden –
 Send forth the best ye breed –
 Go, bind your sons to exile
 To serve your captives' need;
 To wait, in heavy harness,
 On fluttered folk and wild –
 Your new-caught sullen peoples,
 Half devil and half child.

Take up the White Man's burden –
 In patience to abide,
 To veil the threat of terror
 And check the show of pride;
 By open speech and simple,
 An hundred times made plain,
 To seek another's profit
 And work another's gain.

Take up the White Man's burden –
 The savage wars of peace –
 Fill full the mouth of Famine,
 And bid the sickness cease;
 And when your goal is nearest
 (The end for others sought)
 Watch sloth and heathen folly
 Bring all your hope to nought.

Take up the White Man's burden –
 No iron rule of kings,
 But toil of serf and sweeper –
 The tale of common things.
 The ports ye shall not enter,
 The roads ye shall not tread,

And mark them with your dead.

Take up the White Man's burden,
 And reap his old reward –
 The blame of those ye better
 The hate of those ye guard –
 The cry of hosts ye humour
 (Ah, slowly!) toward the light: –
 "Why brought ye us from bondage,

Our loved Egyptian night?"

Take up the White Man's burden –
Ye dare not stoop to less –
Nor call too loud on Freedom
To cloak your weariness.
By all ye will or whisper,
By all ye leave or do,
The silent sullen peoples
Shall weigh your God and you.

Take up the White Man's burden!
Have done with childish days –
The lightly proffered laurel,
The easy ungrudged praise:
Comes now, to search your manhood
Through all the thankless years,
Cold, edged with dear-bought wisdom,
The judgement of your peers.

Rudyard Kipling

oo

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. By, for example, Graham Handley, Asa Briggs, Helen Heinemann and Richard Mullen.

2. J. H. Davidson discusses *An Old Man's Love* and *The Fixed Period* in his edition of Trollope's *South Africa*; Nicholas Birns' article deals with *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil* and *The Fixed Period*, and Henry N. Rogers III has written on *The Fixed Period*.

3. J.H. Davidson, ed., *South Africa by Anthony Trollope: A Reprint of the 1878 edition with an introduction and notes*. (Cape Town: A. A. Balkema, 1973), 493.

4. Elleke Boehmer, *Colonialism and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 12.

5. Concise Oxford Dictionary, 8th ed., s.v. "empire."

6. *Ibid.*, s.v. "colony."

7. John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 7.

8. Boehmer, 2.

9. Annia Loomba, *Colonialism / Postcolonialism* (London: Routledge, 1998), 2.

10. *Ibid.*, 4.

11. Boehmer, 37.

12. James Morris, *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 25. See also Anthony Trollope, *South Africa* (Gloucester: Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1987), 1:234-235: "The first thing an Englishman has to understand in the story of South Africa is the fact that the great and almost unnatural extension of our colonization, – unnatural, when the small number of English emigrants who have gone there is considered, – has been produced by the continued desire of the Dutch farmers to take themselves out of reach of English laws, and English feelings Then we have run after them . . ."

13. Trollope, *South Africa* 1:62.

14. Boehmer, 12.

15. Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London: Verso, 1993), 4-6.

16. Boehmer, 97.
17. *Ibid.*, 3.
18. Boehmer, 12-21.
19. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 1995), 43.
20. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, eds., *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993), 8.
21. Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" in *Essays on Ideology* (London: Verso, 1984).
22. Said, 43-44, 332.
23. *Ibid.*, 3.
24. Jacques Lacan, "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience" in *Ecrits, A Selection* trans. Alan Sherridan in Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh, eds. *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader* (London: Arnold, 1989).
25. Gail Ching-Liang Low, *White Skins, Black Masks: Representation and Colonialism* (London: Routledge, 1996), 194.
26. Simon Gikandi, *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), xviii.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Gikandi, 89.
2. Trollope, *South Africa* 1:43.
3. Loomba, 2.
4. Trollope, *South Africa* 1:45.
5. Anthony Trollope, *John Caldigate* (London: Zodiac Press, 1972), 74.
6. *Ibid.*, 75.
7. Anthony Trollope, *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil: A Tale of Australian Bush Life* (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1987), 14.
8. *Ibid.*, 143.

9. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:241-242.
10. *Ibid.*, 2:235.
11. Said, 226.
12. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:237.
13. Boehmer, 36.
14. John Buchan, *Prester John* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1910), 365.
15. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:236.
16. *Ibid.*, 2:240.
17. *Ibid.*, 1:39.
18. Trollope, *Harry Heathcote*, 127-128.
19. *Ibid.*, 128.
20. *Ibid.*, 16.
21. *Ibid.*, 8.
22. Trollope, *The Fixed Period* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 114.
23. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:202.
24. *Ibid.*, 1:55.
25. *Ibid.*, 1:59.
26. Gikandi, 105.
27. David W. Lloyd, "The Encounter with the African Interior: An Examination of a Major Structural Theme in the South African English Novel" (D.Litt et Phil. diss., University of South Africa, 1989), 3.

CHAPTER TWO

1. *The Cape Argus*, 24 July 1877.
2. Victoria Glendinning, *Trollope* (London: Hutchinson, 1992; London: Pimlico, 1993), 527-530.
3. Davidson, 12.

4. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:53.
5. *The Cape Times*, 24 July 1877.
6. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:208.
7. Davidson, 11-12.
8. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:9.
9. *Ibid.*, 2:207-210.
10. Trollope's use of the word "Kafir" denotes a Xhosa, Thembu or Pondo person resident in the Transkei area, and does not refer to black people in general. The term did not then have the pejorative connotations that later became attached to it.
11. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:231.
12. "In literature, an idealized concept of uncivilized man, who symbolizes the innate goodness of one not exposed to the corrupting influences of civilization. The glorification of the noble savage is a dominant theme in the Romantic writings of the 18th and 19th centuries, especially in the works of Jean-Jacques Rousseau." Encyclopaedia Britannica, <http://www.brittanica.com/eb/article?eu57422>
Charles Dickens, however, wrote a vitriolic attack on the concept of the "noble savage" in *Household Words* in 1853. (This article is reproduced at <http://www.underthesun.cc/Classics/Dickens/reprinted/reprinted13.html>.)
13. Gikandi, 108.
14. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:55.
15. Said, 7.
16. Trollope, *South Africa*, 1:110-111.
17. *Ibid.*, 1:235.
18. *Ibid.*, 2:237.
19. *Ibid.*, 2:240.
20. *Ibid.*, 1:111.
21. "When [Livingstone] returned to England after his great journey across Africa in 1853-6, his opinions and judgements were accepted without question as those of a pre-eminent authority. What he wrote about the Boers in his book *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, and what he said about them in his lectures (notably at Cambridge), did very much indeed to establish among the British people a markedly unfavourable stereotype of the Boer character." From the Preface to

David Livingstone: South African Papers 1849-1853, ed. I. Schapera (Cape Town: van Riebeeck Society, 1974).

22. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:7.

23. *Ibid.*

24. *Ibid.*, 2:9.

25. Richard D. Altick, *Victorian People and Ideas* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973), 35.

26. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:8.

CHAPTER THREE

1. Glendinning, 529.

2. N. John Hall, ed., *The Letters of Anthony Trollope*, vol. 1 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), 114.

3. Nicholas Birns, "The Empire Turned Upside Down: The Colonial Fictions of Anthony Trollope," *Ariel* 27:3 (1996): 9.

4. Asa Briggs, *Trollope the Traveller*. In John Halperin, ed., *Trollope Centenary Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 27.

5. Trollope, *Harry Heathcote*, 54.

6. Birns, 14.

7. Trollope, *John Caldigate*, 69.

8. *Ibid.*, 11.

9. *Ibid.*, 68.

10. *Ibid.*, 84.

11. Birns, 14.

12. Graham Handley, ed., *Trollope the Traveller: Selections from Anthony Trollope's Travel Writings* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee Inc., 1995), 147.

13. "Shepherds, so called, Harry kept none upon the run, and would have felt himself insulted had anyone suggested that he was so backward in his ways as to employ men of that denomination. He had fenced his run, and dispensed with shepherds and shepherding as old-fashioned and unprofitable." Trollope, *Harry Heathcote*, 65.

14. Trollope, *John Caldigate*, 101.
15. Handley, 127.
16. Trollope, *John Caldigate*, 20.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. A. L. Rowse, Introduction to Anthony Trollope, *An Old Man's Love* (New York: Arno Press, 1981), no page number.
2. Trollope, *An Old Man's Love*, 1:115-116.
3. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:142.
4. *Ibid.*, 142-143.
5. *Ibid.*, 117.
6. *Ibid.*, 2:143.
7. Thomas Carlyle, *Sartor Resartus*, in *Victorian Prose and Poetry* ed. Lionel Trilling and Harold Bloom (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 20.
8. Trollope, *An Old Man's Love*, 2:97-98.
9. *Ibid.*, 2:165-166.
10. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:143.
11. Trollope, *An Old Man's Love*, 2:169.
12. *Ibid.*, 1:113-114.
13. *Ibid.*, 1:124.
14. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:132-133.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Davidson, 495.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Trollope was a member of the Cremation Society of England, although cremation did not become legal there until 1884, nearly two years after his death. See R. H. Super's Introduction to *The Fixed Period*, x.

4. The warship is named after the Liberal politician John Bright, who, ironically, was a Quaker pacifist. A. N. Wilson, *The Victorians* (London: Arrow Books, 2003), 465.

5. R. H. Super, Introduction to *The Fixed Period*, xii.

6. The reviewer is Robert Tracy, quoted in R. H. Super's Introduction to *The Fixed Period*.

7. Henry N. Rogers III, "The Fixed Period: Trollope's 'Modest Proposal,'" *Utopian Studies* 10,2 (1999): 21.

8. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:28, 30, 32.

9. *Ibid.*, 2:30.

10. *Ibid.*

11. See, for example, Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 2, 4, 141-144.

12. *Ibid.*, 30.

13. *Ibid.*, 46.

14. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:33.

15. Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 142.

16. *Ibid.*, 60.

17. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:29.

18. *Ibid.*, 2:37.

19. *Ibid.*, 2:35.

20. Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 128.

21. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:41.

22. Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 123.

23. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:36.

24. *Ibid.*

25. *Ibid.*, 2:37.

26. *Ibid.*, 2:28.

27. Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 128.
28. Trollope, *South Africa*, 2:45.
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*, 2:45-46.
32. Trollope, *The Fixed Period*, 11-12.

WORKS CITED

- Althusser, Louis. *Essays on Ideology*. London: Verso, 1984.
- Altick, Richard D. *Victorian People and Ideas*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Birns, Nicholas. "The Empire Turned Upside Down: The Colonial Fictions of Anthony Trollope." *Ariel* 27:3 (July 1996): 7-23.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Briggs, Asa. "Trollope the Traveller," in *Trollope Centenary Essays*, ed. John Halperin. London: Macmillan, 1982, 25-52.
- Buchan, John. *Prester John*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1910.
- Davidson, J. H. *South Africa by Anthony Trollope: A Reprint of the 1878 edition with an introduction and notes*. Cape Town: A. A. Balkema, 1973.
- Gikandi, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Glendinning, Victoria. *Trollope*. London: Hutchinson 1992; Pimlico, 1993.
- Hall, N. John. *The Letters of Anthony Trollope*, vol. 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983.
- _____. *Trollope: A Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Handley, Graham. *Trollope the Traveller: Selections from Anthony Trollope's Travel Writings*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee Inc., 1995.
- Heinemann, Helen. "Anthony Trollope: The Compleat Traveller." *Ariel* 13:1 (January 1982): 33-50.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Man's Burden." In *Rudyard Kipling's Verse: Definitive Edition*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1940.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits, A Selection*. Translated by Alan Sherridan. In *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*. ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh. London: Arnold, 1989, 126-131.
- Lloyd, David W. "The Encounter with the African Interior: An Examination of a Major Structural Theme in the South African English Novel." D.Litt et Phil. Diss., University of South Africa, 1989.
- Loomba, Annia. *Colonialism / Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.

- Low, Gail Ching-Liang. *White Skins, Black Masks: Representation and Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Morris, J. *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire*. London: Faber and Faber, 1968.
- Mullen, Richard. *Anthony Trollope: A Victorian in his World*. London: Duckworth, 1990.
- Richards, T. *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London: Verso, 1993.
- Rogers, Henry N. III. "The Fixed Period: Trollope's 'Modest Proposal.'" *Utopian Studies* 10, no. 2 (1999): 16-25.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Schapera, I., ed. *David Livingstone: South African Papers 1849-1853*. Cape Town: van Riebeeck Society, 1974.
- Trilling, Lionel and Harold Bloom, eds. *Victorian Prose and Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Trollope, Anthony. *The Fixed Period*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990
- _____. *Harry Heathcote of Gangoil*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1987.
- _____. *John Caldigate*. London: Zodiac Press, 1972.
- _____. *An Old Man's Love*. New York: Arno Press, 1981
- _____. *South Africa*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton, 1987.
- Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1993.

