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Abstract

Hugh Archibald Wyndham was born in 1877, on the eve of the so-called 'Scramble for Africa', and died in 1961, surviving long enough to witness the dissolution of empire and the exit of South Africa from the British Commonwealth. His eighty-six years break into four, almost equal periods; the second of which, his twenty-two years spent in South Africa, are the focus of this study. These years, marked by the creation of the South African state, the forging of an exclusive, white, South African nationalism and, increasingly, by conflict among her peoples, is the core of what seems to be a coherent historical period extending from approximately 1800 to 1950.

The study of a single life, used as a lens through which to study these and other processes, both within South Africa and the wider British world, allows the historian to narrow the focus to a more manageable area. And, in this regard, Wyndham is a useful vehicle. He is neither a prime minister nor somebody of wide reputation, but a gentleman farmer, albeit of noble stock, that arrived in South Africa in 1901 and spent the next twenty-two years trying vainly to repair the levees of an eroding British world.

Wyndham was the epitome of a nineteenth-century English country gentleman. After serving the British High Commissioner for South Africa, Lord Milner, for two years, he built a country house at Kromdraai, Standerton district, where he bred horses, wrote extensively, commanded his own regiment, and attempted to organise the 'British' settlers. After an unsuccessful attempt at Standerton in 1907, he won Turffontein as a Unionist in 1910: a seat that he held until beaten by 'a labour man' in 1920. More and more, his circle of friends and their residences were pockets of Britishness and Loyalty, enclaves growing in isolation and increasingly foreign in a changing South Africa. Disillusioned and sensing that South Africa had been 'lost' for the British Empire, he returned permanently to England in 1923. Yet, through his association with Milner's kindergarten and the Round Table movement, his membership of the Defence Council and albeit short political career as shadow defence minister, he helped shape early-twentieth-century South Africa.
Through birth and migration, Wyndham acquired a double allegiance joining two countries increasingly uncomfortable with their constitutional relationship. His personal unease at the constitutional stresses and nationalistic strains enlarges the scope and enriches the interest in his life and these turbulent times in South Africa. He is, moreover, a medium that allows an investigation that cuts across both the imperial hub as well as a portion of the periphery; too many studies focus solely on a particular part of the empire and to the exclusion of happenings in Britain or elsewhere. Wyndham and his wife, a Lyttelton of Hagley, and their vast family and imperial connections, provide an almost unique opportunity for a study that allows a (re)integration of Britain with their part of the empire. They shared much 'cultural glue' that held their families and friends together within a greater, interconnected, British world.

However, born with the design that they were to govern the empire in the fashion of their ancestors, they were exposed to the democratic revolution of the twentieth century and the inner struggles of these years as ideas on class and identity were redefined. They are, therefore, also a wonderful window through which to view class relations in turn-of-the-century South Africa as well as the notions of migrant nobles and their ideas concerning aristocratic settlement and the 'covering' of an already apparent imperial retreat.

Furthermore, except for few, brief references in standard works of the period, nothing has been written about Wyndham and no other biography exists. As a subject, however, he has a grave imperfection: little correspondence received by him has been saved. However, that all of his letters to his mother and much of his wife's correspondence has been preserved in its entirety is a compensating advantage. These and a wide array of official and other private papers form the foundation for this study. Many of these sources have never been utilised before and provide fresh insights into several much neglected aspects of an otherwise extensively-published period.

The range and richness of the Wyndhams' correspondence, and that of several of their acquaintances and associates, and the uniqueness of Wyndham’s life, enables the historian to open a range of issues, from the difficulties in transplanting aristocratic sprigs and British ideas and institutions through to the processes (nationalism, labour and syndicalism, egalitarianism) that threatened the concord and constancy of the British world. This study investigates and casts new light on these themes as well as on private
imperial entrepreneurship, class, gender and race relations, and the nature of early-twentieth-century South African society, fractured as it was along fault lines that were at once political, economic, social, ecclesiastical, cultural and, of course, increasingly racial.
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INTRODUCTION

Emoyeni, sited on Parktown ridge alongside the Johannesburg General Hospital and hemmed in by the M1 motorway and steady CBD creep, is the official guesthouse of the premier of Gauteng Province, Mbhazima Shilowa, the erstwhile leader of Cosatu and a member of the central committee of the South African Communist Party. A steady stream of sleek German marques draw up to the porch, delivering trade unionists, politicians, businessmen and foreign visitors to the erstwhile home of Hugh Archibald Wyndham.

The house was more salubrious in 1912. Its grounds and gardens were more extensive. Guests could walk down the hill into Saxonwold or along the ridge to the homes of the Randlords. The stable block accommodated several good horses, which could be ridden through the Saxonwold or draw carriages to neighbouring towns; while the reception rooms and veranda, with sweeping views toward Pretoria and the Magaliesberg, was an adequate venue for soirees and political gatherings.

However, for the decade that the Wyndhams owned the house (bought in 1912 and sold in 1923) the politicians and other guests in attendance differed quite markedly to those gathering at Emoyeni today. Hugh Wyndham (1877-1963) and his wife, Maud (1880-1953), a Lyttelton of Hagley, and their set formed what might be called a South African ‘imperial connection’; and Wyndhams (as Emoyeni was then called) and Kromdraai (their farm on the Transvaal highveld) were pockets of Britishness and loyalty in a turbulent South Africa. Although useful places of call for travelling relatives, they were but enclaves, growing in isolation and increasingly foreign in a changing South Africa.

Wyndham arrived in South Africa in 1901, at a time when Britain and things English seemed indestructible, and left in 1923 when the march of both militant Labour and Afrikaner nationalism seemed unstoppable. The British world underwent a dramatic transformation between the late nineteenth century and the period immediately after the First World War. The pre-war empire was a complex organism. It was, as David Cannadine has argued recently, a vast interconnected but unequal world, with a layered social hierarchy at ‘home’ that was replicated on the imperial periphery. Society was still
divided, largely, into the servant keeping and serving classes. It was a time, one of Maud’s cousins noted, when it was easy to distinguish a duchess from a housemaid. In the immediate post-Great War years, however, issues seemed suddenly far more ambiguous.

Aristocratic society had changed. Within a short period, marked approximately from the year of Wyndham’s birth to his departure from South Africa, the whole aristocratic edifice had crumbled under the succession of political, social and economic blows delivered by the challenges of the industrial revolution and the rise of the middling classes and the attendant succession of British legislation. The changes could neither be resisted nor reversed and, in many ways, as Lawrence Stone has noted, ‘what is so remarkable is how long the dikes and levees withstood the rising flood before they finally began to crumble.’

Scholars have argued that the mass of aristocratic migration, triggered by the loss of political and social power in Britain as much as by economic decline, took place to North America, East Africa and the antipodes. This is confirmed by a sampling in reference works on the peerage as well as the two tomes on the colonial gentry first published at the end of the nineteenth century. Out in the empire they attempted to recreate vanishing lifestyles and to serve as leavens, ‘civilising’ agents in otherwise barbaric, retrogressive and primitive zones. They entertained lavishly, paraded at the races and the opening of local legislatures, officered the local volunteer regiments, created British-styled clubs and societies, and

---

3. See, in general, D. Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy* (London and Basingstoke 1992), but chapters 2 through 8 more specifically.
demanded more than a measure of deference from the local inhabitants. Such theatricality and display of British ‘energy, success, and apparent omniscience’ mesmerised indigenous collaborators and reinforced the thin red line. As John Darwin has shown, private men and entrepreneurs like these ‘supplied much of the dynamic’ for the expansion and maintenance of empire.

The purpose of this study is to explore the life of Hugh Wyndham as a single migrant aristocrat, but one who migrated to South Africa, then a relatively unusual destination of choice. Biography, although open to a broad range of interpretations on its role and function, is a complex genre that exposes a range of social issues, including class, race and gender, as well as shedding new light on the politics of the day and the linkages between the subject’s personal and public life. ‘Biography and historical analysis’, as a group of American scholars have argued recently, ‘are inextricably intertwined’ and ‘biographical studies offer a way to analyze important historical questions.’ They are, according to Shirley Leckie, ‘prisms of history’ that first draw the reader’s attention and then fix concentration on the larger subject.

This study therefore has a set of further, wider purposes. Firstly it represents an attempt to recover something of the human dimension, downplayed in most histories of empire, and, at the same time, (re)integrate the histories of peoples ‘at home’ with that of relatives, friends and associates on the imperial peripheries. Furthermore, Wyndham’s life and, to some extent, that of Maud, his wife, and their literary transactions with friends and acquaintances and various members of their families also provides a unique vehicle through which to study a variety of larger issues. These range from the decline of the English aristocracy and the question of aristocratic migration, to such seemingly diverse matters as imperial defence, the organisation of women in the empire, and the vain attempts

---

by individuals to halt colonial retreat as well as providing a window into a ‘British’ South African household that during this period apparently came under increasing threat. And so, in a sense, this study, exploring in some measure two lives that intersect and run parallel, is a comparative biography.\textsuperscript{12} Maud, who married Wyndham in February 1908, was a woman of strong passions and iron will and her life rotated around three or four prime concerns. Apart from trying to produce an heir to the Leconfield title and estates, dabbling actively in her family’s history, and promoting her husband’s political interests, her main preoccupation was the conduct of an extensive correspondence with numerous members of her wide family and social networks, including members of the Wyndham, Maxse, Lyttelton, Talbot, Cavendish, Coke and Masterman families.

Here, telegraph and steam suddenly made the empire accessible toward the end of the nineteenth century. Some 22 million letters and postcards went from Britain to her dominions, colonies and dependencies each year; with a similar number making the return journey. There was a weekly service to South Africa competed for by the Castle Line and the Union Steamship Company. At the far end of the line of communications which ran from Johannesburg (or, during the parliamentary session, from Cape Town) to the United Kingdom there were the towering figures of Maud’s parents, Lord and Lady Cobham, and the dowager Lady Leconfield, Hugh’s mother. The latter, Rosebery’s sister, resided at 12, Great Stanhope Street, London; while the former inhabited Hagley Hall in Worcestershire, where the Lytteltons had lived for seven hundred years. Such continuous communication allowed the imperial elite to engage in debate on a range of issues, ranging from politics, imperial and national, through to domestic concerns such as the proper status and treatment of servants.\textsuperscript{13} Their letters are a manifestation of the ‘cultural glue’ (the sentiment, shared institutional values and the plethora of social and business networks still comparatively neglected by historians) that held the Wyndhams and their family and friends together within a greater British world.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} J.M. Cooper, ‘Conception, Conversation, and Comparison: My Experiences as a Biographer’ in L.E. Ambrosius (ed), \textit{Writing Biography: Historians & Their Craft}, pp 94-95.


\textsuperscript{14} These networks, according to Bridge and Fedorowich, ‘ranged from the obvious family and community connections to business, religious, educational, scientific and professional
The documentary record is therefore also in many ways both powerful and unique. While the wealthy and the powerful are more likely to generate and leave a legacy of written documents, seldom in South African history does one find a reasonably complete correspondence and then for both matrimonial partners. This, fortunately, is the case of the Hugh Wyndhams. Their documentary legacy is extensive and covers almost the entire period from 1901 through to 1923. This, in its South African context, is exceptional. However, the residue is not faultless. Historians never have at their disposal all the material for which they may wish and this study was no different. Wyndham produced no journal, kept no diary, and only reveals himself to a limited extent in his letters and official memoranda. He corresponded regularly with his mother, who dutifully kept all his letters, wrote occasionally to his sisters, but, never it seems, to his brothers. The record, inevitably incomplete and in many ways one-dimensional, is further complicated by the fact that Wyndham was a tremendously private man. This perhaps made for a poor correspondent. He did not write on household matters, unless directly pressed for details by his mother, who, during several long visits to South Africa, had become acquainted with Johannesburg society as well as with the household staff. After his marriage he quite willingly left domestic reportage to his wife, but insisted that he, not Maud, convey the political news in South Africa to his mother and this did not change until the outbreak of war, when Maud simply indulged in war news. He, moreover, conveyed news in a rather bland, matter-of-fact way; whereas Maud, who revelled in a wide-ranging correspondence with an array of people, is far more revealing. And then she dealt with all issues, from politics and "society", to servants and war fundraising, topics largely

associations, to trades unions, and to itinerant labourers, domestic servants, travelling players, soldiers and administrators." See C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich, "Mapping the British World" in C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich (eds), The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity, p 6.

15 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA. The Maxse Papers include the letters from Wyndham to his sister, Lady Mary Maxse, over the period 1901 to 1905, and fill an important hiatus in the Petworth House Archives.

16 See, for example, Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Apr 1912, 8 June 1912 and 16 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA. Also "Hugh I know tells you all ab[ou]t politics & I feel to've said my say for many years ab[ou]t house & garden & people." Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Oct 1915, WSRO: PHA.

17 Maud once wished that he 'wrote like he talks.' Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 May 1916, WSRO: PHA.

18 She so enjoyed mail letters she re-indulged in old correspondence and used them to compile a war memoir. See for example Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Aug 1917, WSRO: PHA; as well as Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 29 Nov 1918 (CFGM 1/17/11/1) and 7 Dec 1918 (CFGM 1/17/11/2), UBL: Masterman Papers.
avoided by Hugh, who according to Maud, ‘scorn[ed] to descend to trifles.’ Her topics, he thought, were ‘piffle’ – perhaps said only to tease her, but these were of immense importance to his female relatives as they are now to the historian. A great correspondent, Maud liked letters ‘dribbling in’ and particularly ‘delightful long letters’ with news about Hagley and Clent Hill and other invokers of childhood memories. Her replies were often written over several days and in detail that made Hugh feel that he was placed under ‘the searching eye of all Europe.’ He complained to her that ‘it was very trying to have all his doings shouted from the housetops after living for years in “decent obscurity”.’ Yet Maud was perhaps right in believing that he did not find it ‘as trying’ as he said.

Maud Wyndham also kept much of her correspondence. She found her mail ‘thrilling’ and, although feeling some pressure to ditch it all to save the ‘house from bursting’, much of this fortunately survives at Hagley Hall. The collection at Hagley, comprising many of the letters received by Maud as well as those sent by her and Hugh (the latter only very occasionally) to the Lytteltons, is therefore a vast supplement to the near-weekly missives they both wrote to Hugh’s mother, which are now at Petworth House. Maud’s letters, detailed and delightful and preserved as a full correspondence, is the most important supplement to Hugh’s own documentary legacy.

A second significant supplement is the private papers of his friends, acquaintances and associates. Here the Patrick Duncan and Richard Feetham collections are the most important. But to these must be added the letters of Maud’s parents and sisters, who visited on several occasions and were acquainted with Hugh before their marriage, as

19 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 Apr 1916, WSRO: PHA.
20 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 June 1918, 1 Oct 1918 and 20 Oct 1918, WSRO: PHA.
21 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA. See also Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA – ‘Yesterday I got 12 mail letters w[hi]ch was delightful, including yours & one that came in the afternoon & one this morning – I’m always so glad when the p[ost] o[ffice] mislays them & they trickle in all day.’
22 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
23 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Jun 1914 (‘decent obscurity’ and ‘as trying’), 8 Jul 1914 (‘searching eye’), WSRO: PHA.
24 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Sep 1914, WSRO: PHA.
25 She confessed in 1918 to ‘always hoard scraps & letters & such.’ See Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Feb 1918, WSRO: PHA. Sadly, unlike that of his wife, the correspondence received by Wyndham in South Africa does not survive, but then, if he did not send many, he probably did not receive too many either.
well as those of her brother, Jack Lyttelton, who had served in the Orange River Colony during the South African War and afterwards in Johannesburg as Selborne's ADC. Their letters have survived at Hagley, too, and provide further windows for observation into Hugh's private life. We otherwise do not get too much help from the people who knew them. Living out in South Africa they did not live among great memoir writers.

However, official records and those of non-governmental organisations provide a third valuable stream of information. This is true for much of the twenty-two years Wyndham spent in South Africa. The first two years he spent on Milner's staff and his activity, or lack thereof, as private secretary, is traced through the archives of the Governor of the Transvaal Colony; while traces of his military, settler and agrarian concerns as well as of his political ambitions, both in the Transvaal Colony and later in the Union of South Africa, are scattered through various archives groups in the National Archives (Pretoria and Cape Town) and the Military Archives (Pretoria). Unfortunately, the records of the Transvaal Volunteers are very incomplete, and the residue in the National Archives (Pretoria) relate to the headquarters of its commander, Colonel P.S. Beves. A massed destruction at regimental level took place in November 1913 robbing the historian of an intimate look at the finer fabric of the individual regiments, including, of course, Wyndham's Southern Mounted Rifles.26

This study could never have been completed without the help, guidance and encouragement of several people. The core of the study has been the Hugh Wyndhams' voluminous South African correspondence (covering, with few serious gaps, the years from 1901 to 1923) and other papers, which are scattered, with the bulk at Petworth, House and Hagley Hall. The first are arranged but uncatalogued, while the latter have been catalogued only recently, making this the first study to make use of them.27 I am therefore particularly grateful for the generous access that was granted in both cases. Hugh Wyndham's great nephew and heir in title, the Rt Hon Lord Egremont & Leconfield, very kindly allowed special access to, and permission to quote from, the

26 MAP: SA Citizen Force, Box 55, file 1090 Records Transvaal Volunteers to be destroyed.
27 Many studies on the Kindergarten and their later projects of course predate the accessibility of the papers. For example, Walter Nimocks, who catalogues the papers on the Kindergarten in the source list to his magisterial study on the Kindergarten, does not mention them. See his Milner's young men: the 'kindergarten' in Edwardian Imperial affairs (Durham, N.C., 1968), p 221.
Petworth House Archives and Mrs Alison McCann (West Sussex Record Office) guided me through the Hugh Wyndham holding. I am grateful also to Mr John Maxse for allowing me to see and quote from his grandparents' papers, and again to Mrs McCann for facilitating this access.

The Rt Hon Viscount Cobham kindly allowed me to see and quote from Hugh and Maud Wyndham's letters to and from various members of the Lyttelton family. Lord Cobham's grandfather, Jack Lyttelton, noted to a cousin in 1907 that their 'relations are so numerous I find it quite impossible to keep up a correspondence with them all.'\footnote{Jack Lyttelton to Lucy Masterman, 25 Dec 1907, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/17/15/3.} This, however, some Lytteltons did and with remarkable ability. And here Maud was no exception. Lord Cobham has no archivist and there is normally no access to these papers. He, however, very kindly placed his personal assistant - Mrs Joyce Purnell - at my disposal for week. Joyce not only received me at Hagley, but also guided me through the South African papers of Hon J.C. Lyttelton as well as the correspondence between Maud Wyndham, her parents, and various members of the Lyttelton and Talbot families.

Research for this study was conducted on three continents and took me on a rewarding adventure through seemingly countless libraries, archives depots and record offices, where, in each case, I was ably assisted by a range of librarians, archivists, research officers and other talented professionals. They include Alison McCann at the West Sussex Record Office; Joyce Purnell at Hagley Hall; Martin Killean and Tamsin Mosse at the University of Birmingham Library; Helen Orme at the Centre for Kentish Studies; Alan Bell at the National Library of Scotland; Lesley Hart and her staff at the University of Cape Town Libraries, Archives and Manuscripts Department; Marie Coetzee at the University of South Africa Library, Archives and Special Collections; Carol Archibald at the William Cullen Library, University of the Witwatersrand; Steve de Agrela at the Military Archives, South African National Defence Force, Pretoria; and the many others who assisted me at the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the Rhodes House Library, Oxford; the Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA; the Queen's University Archives, Kingston, Ontario; the Worcestershire Record Office; the National Archives of South Africa, in both Cape Town and Pretoria; and the Public Record Office, London.
In only one case was access to material denied. The National Archives of South Africa is the custodian of the Hertzog Collection. This is housed in the depot in Pretoria, but is only accessible by special application to the Hertzog family. Sadly, however, they refused access for this study. This raises the question as to whether private collections of papers should be kept at the cost of the South African taxpayer when they are subject to absurd gate keeping. This seems anomalous and particularly so when there is no declared time when the papers will be made available, if at all, to the broad public and exposed to rigorous enquiry.

I must thank Bill Nasson, firstly, for being my supervisor and, in this capacity, for his invaluable advice and ready sharing of his unrivalled knowledge of South Africa and her imperial connections during the period under study; and secondly for allowing me to present some early impressions on Wyndham at the British World Conference II held at the University of Cape Town in 2002. Kent Fedorowich, who has also been a great friend and excellent sounding board, very kindly included this paper as a chapter in the edited collection that flowed from this conference. He, Alex May and John Darwin also provided very illuminating talk one afternoon at the King’s Arms in Oxford; as has Kent, Ross Anderson, Deon Visser and Rassie Nortier on a more ongoing basis. My extensive intellectual debts to these gentlemen and the many others from whose work I have benefited are acknowledged in the list of sources.

I have also benefitted enormously by reading a number of good biographies, several of which fall outside the immediate scope of this study. In particular I would like to acknowledge debts to Derek Wilson (his biography of Hans Holbein), David Cecil (Jane Austen) and Chris Bryant (Stafford Cripps).

I must also thank the organizers of the Society for Military History conference convened in Madison, Wisconsin in 2002 as well as Johann Tempelhoff and Albert Grundlingh for providing opportunities to air three further papers at their respective events. They all gave an opportunity to order ideas and garner valuable comment from conference floors.

Finally I must express my love and deepest gratitude to my wife Noëlle and to our children Adam and Michaela. Noëlle must have at times felt that she was married to Wyndham. Adam probably remembers little of life before Wyndham. And Michaela has
never known life without Wyndham. To the three of you, thank you for your love, support and encouragement, and for knowing when to supply each of these and in just the right quantity.
CHAPTER ONE

Background: family, childhood and education

In 1877, the year of Hugh Wyndham's birth, the Transvaal was painted red on maps the world over. Theophilus Shepstone arrived in Pretoria that April with his twenty-five constables, hauled down the vierkleur and declared the South African Republic annexed to the British Empire. Additions were made elsewhere in the world too. This was the expanding periphery of an empire of which Disraeli remarked, 'No Caesar or Charlemagne ever presided over a dominion so peculiar.' It was larger and more diverse than any other and it contained about a quarter of mankind. But, no less metamorphic, though in another sphere, was the momentum of change at the hub. British society was becoming increasingly democratic and the British nobility more and more plebeian with the result that that part of the nobility, the old landed families, of whom the Wyndhams were representative, came under increasing social, economic and political pressure. What links an expanding empire and a changing Britain with the birth and childhood of a young Englishman is more than just a matter of dates.

1. A changing world

Hugh Archibald Wyndham was born on 4 October 1877, at Petworth House, Sussex, a property that had been in his family for more than 700 years. He was the fourth son of Henry, second Baron Leconfield, and his wife, Lady Constance Primrose. His stock was impeccable. He had numerous royal descents and was connected also to much of the core of the British nobility, including those who formed the governments during

---

2 The political and socio-economic change, gathering pace during the decades before 1914, but reaching a climax during and after the First World War, has been likened, in terms of impact and effect, to the cataclysmic fourteenth century. See, for example, J.W. Thompson, 'The Aftermath of the Black Death and the aftermath of the Great War', *American Journal of Sociology*, Mar 1920 and B.W. Tuchman, *A Distant Mirror: The Calamitous Fourteenth Century* (London and Basingstoke1989), pp xv-xvi.
the Georgian and Victorian eras. He was related to at least five Georgian prime ministers and, more recently, Lord Rosebery, Queen Victoria's penultimate prime minister and from whom he received his second name of Archibald, was his uncle. And numerous cousins, uncles and near kinsmen had served in various governments. One of them, Lord Carnarvon, inspired with his success in Canada, made an abortive attempt to federate the various territories of southern Africa in the decade of Hugh's birth.

The late Victorian and Edwardian eras were the Indian Summer of both the British Empire and the English landed elite, marked as they were by a period of gradual yet relentless decline in the social, economic and political power of both institutions. Several successive, largely overlapping forces set in motion in the late nineteenth century set the Wyndhams, and indeed most other British aristocratic families, on a steady decline. Their finances were rocked by changes in agriculture. The First World War decimated their male ranks and exacerbated their demographic failure. The quick succession of heirs, often (as in the case of the Wyndhams) several brothers in turn, brought the crushing effect of twentieth-century death duties to full effect. These forces, particularly since the passage of the Peerage Act in 1911, were seemingly out of their control. At the time Charles Masterman noted gloomily that '...estates are encumbered or falling into decay', while simultaneously, 'in exercise and enjoyment, in parties and pleasure gardens ... the decay passes almost unnoticed.'

Falling farm rents undermined the position of the country squire, who was forced to retrench or reinvest in non-agricultural concerns, so changing their traditional relationship with the tenantry. A whole series of legislative changes chipped away at the foundations of landed privilege.

For a land-based aristocracy this was of extreme concern. Land, with its almost mystical significance, had always been the basis of aristocratic fortune. Now an agricultural revolution, set in motion during the late 1870s, brought enormous financial losses upon large, land-owning families like the Wyndhams of Petworth. Farm rents began to fall, and the returns on agricultural investment decreased. The wheat crop, financial backbone of much of the English aristocracy was also under threat. Cold wet summers marked each of the five years following Hugh's birth and these came at a time when substitute wheat was

---

available from North America. Increased competition, including the development of market gardening, reduced prices everywhere and this was exacerbated by rail transport, a network that reached into the furthest corners of the country. But, if improved transport was transforming the face of agriculture, it was also toward the end of the nineteenth century rendering the empire more accessible.

The remoter parts of the empire were now, thanks to telegraph and steam, suddenly easier to reach. The empire was now linked by a network of strategic bases and coaling stations; and it was guarded by the most powerful navy the world had yet seen. The naval establishment at Simonstown, on the False Bay of the Cape peninsula, formed a vital link in the South Atlantic on the route to India. The British had permanently annexed the Cape in 1815 because of its strategic importance, but, here they had been frustrated by some twenty-seven thousand Boers, a people of mixed background united by their staunch Calvinism, overbearing sense of white racial superiority and intense resentment of outside interference. The attitude of the British authorities, often highhanded and tight-fisted, fuelled an explosive situation. The Great Trek was set in motion and a series of Boer republics were established in the hinterland. Bankrupt and facing possible annihilation, Shepstone, acting in concert with Carnarvon, annexed the Transvaal to the British Empire in 1877.

However, Carnarvon’s dream of South African federation came to nought at this point. The Boers of the Transvaal, no longer needing British protection against the Zulus and resentful of unfulfilled promises of local autonomy, rose up against the British. In 1880 and 1881 they inflicted a succession of defeats upon the forces under Major General George Pomeroy Colley; for their tactics were intelligent, taking advantage of the country to trap the British columns and isolate their garrisons. Once again the British granted the Transvaal independence in two ambiguously worded conventions signed in Pretoria in 1881 and London in 1884. The constitutional ambiguity remained largely academic until colossal wealth was discovered on the Rand and a horde of cosmopolitan capitalists, prospectors and fortune seekers descended on the country. The Boers – mostly deeply provincial and inward-looking - heavily taxed these detested uitlanders and denied them

---

political representation. Apart from the constitutional right to interfere in Transvaal politics, Britain had the inherent responsibility to challenge any oppression of her subjects. With an eye on the mineral riches of the Rand and perceiving a challenge to their supremacy in southern Africa, the British exploited the plight and vocalised the grievances of these Uitlanders to press for a South African federation under British aegis.⁵

Empire-makers, including Cecil Rhodes, who, through the British South Africa Chartered Company, had obtained vast concessions to the north, came to the conclusion that force would be necessary to achieve this goal. In 1895, a group of adventurous capitalists with at least Rhodes’ connivance attempted to bring down the Boer government.⁶ Although the Jameson Raid was a ‘miserable fiasco’,⁷ the arrival of Sir Alfred Milner, as the new pro-consul, in South Africa in 1897 brought matters to a head. He, with the support of two undersecretaries, Selborne at the Colonial Office and George Wyndham (yet another cousin) at the War Office, worked up the already volatile situation into a crisis.⁸ The resulting war (1899-1902), the greatest of British colonial campaigns, was won only through a severe logistic strategy and overwhelming resources. The last of the Boer republics were drawn into the British fold, ‘vital imperial interests’ were supposedly saved and British supremacy in southern Africa ensured.

As a governing aristocracy under threat, imperial concerns formed a staple debate for the Wyndhams and their relatives. In fact, the politics of empire had troubled them for some time and, although family currents were strong, close bonds remained between the Wyndhams, always staunch Tories, and Lady Leconfield’s family; Lord Rosebery’s politics being Liberal. For both the integrity of the empire – tacit proof that Britain was ‘Great’ and an inspiration for poets and a provider of jobs for colonial administrators and officials – was all-important.⁹ Although already under threat, the empire ‘confirmed their sense of

⁹ Hannah, Countess of Rosebery to Constance, Baroness Leconfield, 3 Jul 1886, WSRO: PHA 9680.
superiority, their authority, their mission, their purpose in life, their dearest and deepest values.\textsuperscript{10}

The fascination and significance of Hugh Wyndham lies in his striving in this changing imperial context to find and speak with his own voice. As a thinking man and writer of some repute, he had to grapple with old certainties, new revelations and fashionable scepticism, not merely for his own benefit, but so that he might express in his own way the superiority of the British race and the glory of the British Empire in which there were growing yet changing demands upon her sons. Everything about his life – his leaving of family at a relatively young age, his constant travels, his association with colonial officials, dominion politicians, scholars, soldiers, and statesmen, his involvement in political manoeuvre – has to be seen in this context. The age made the man, while the man expressed the age. To understand something of Hugh Wyndham we have to see him in relation to the people, ideas and events involved in the recasting of the Empire and the reshaping of British society.

Wyndham was born near the start of the diamond and gold mining industry in South Africa and at the time of the Transvaal’s first incorporation into the empire. He saw from afar the convulsions of the late nineteenth century; and witnessed first-hand the last years of the Anglo-Boer War, the bringing together of the four British colonies into Union, and the tortuous events of 1914-1918, leading to the metamorphosis from empire to commonwealth. And he lived long enough to live through the Second World War, to witness, again from afar, the rise and final blossoming of Afrikaner nationalism as well as South Africa’s exit from the Commonwealth.

Yet, to record that Hugh Wyndham was born on 4 October 1877, at Petworth and to an aristocratic family is an insufficient prelude to a consideration of his life and work. We have to grasp something of what it was like to be reared in a country house in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Petworth, and other houses like it, was a special place, with an atmosphere that – in 1901 at least - still gave a valuable start to a unique career.

\textsuperscript{10} M. Kitchen, \textit{British Empire and Commonwealth}, p 59.
2. Family: The Wyndhams of Petworth

Hugh's father, Henry Wyndham, succeeded in 1869 as the 2nd Lord Leconfield and to vast estates throughout England, and in Scotland and Ireland. His more than 110,000 acres made him one of the richest men in Britain. Yet, he was no plutocrat. His acres were inherited and were far older than his numerical position as the second baron in the Leconfield title indicated. His father, George, the 1st baron, had been the eldest illegitimate son, and ultimately the territorial heir, of George, 3rd Earl of Egremont. The latter not only inherited from an uncle the extensive Thomond estates in Ireland, but also, through his grandmother, Lady Elizabeth Seymour, the Yorkshire and Cumberland estates of the Percies together with the estate in Sussex clustered around Petworth House, the Stuart palace built there by Charles Seymour, 6th Duke of Somerset.

The biographers of another Wyndham suggest that normally a genealogy is no part of a biography: every man after all is 'the son of his own works.' Yet, for men like Hugh Wyndham, his brothers and their cousins, ancestry was of the utmost importance. As John Mackail and Guy Wyndham have noted:

'where a family has for many generations borne a prominent part in national life, and where its records have survived, the past influences the present, not only through inherited qualities, but through more direct impression. Successive generations are conscious of their ancestry, and follow known traditions in their principles and tastes, their actions and pursuits.'

Only a study of the strains which mingled in Hugh Wyndham provides an insight into his complex personality. Wyndham was descended on both sides from well-established families of the English and Scottish nobility. And it comes as no surprise that, informed

---

12 J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), *Life and Letters of George Wyndham*, vol 1, p 1. Hugh's cousin, George Wyndham (1863-1913), once noted that 'a visit to Petworth always confirms [his] intention to get office.' And he went on: 'I feel as if I was bound to play a return rubber against the Whigs and, still more strongly, that Sir William Wyndham would not approve of my standing out whilst Jesse Collins adorns the Treasury Bench.' See George Wyndham to Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 8 Aug 1898, in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), *Life and Letters of George Wyndham*, p 342.
by such genealogical knowledge, he consciously or subconsciously followed in the family tradition of conservative politics, a taste for the arts, a love of horses, and the pursuit of an amateur military and writing career.

There are, of course, many aspects from which one might consider the Wyndhams. One might ramble out over Sussex into Somerset, and to Orchard Wyndham, or over to Norfolk and across the fens to Felbrigg and Crowntorpe, to Leconfield, Wressle and Spofforth in Yorkshire and to Cockermouth and Egremont among the English Lakes. Britain is littered with their associations, from their iron and coal mines in Cumbria and Wales, to a wide scattering of Wyndham Arms pubs, marking the roads over which the Wyndhams travelled so constantly between their estates and other interests. But, most especially, does one feel this concerning Sussex and Norfolk. Norfolk, in fact, was their cradle long before they came into Sussex; and Felbrigg, which they had owned since the mid-fifteenth century, was at one time larger than Petworth.

The Wyndhams, a 'gentle' and honourable Norfolk family since Norman times, employed several strategies in the accumulation and preservation of their social power. These strategies may be categorised as follows: financial control (including capital formation, investment and succession strategies); political control; and social control (including upbringing and education, the making of marriage alliances, and the conducting of public relations). And, over the nine hundred years stretching from the Conquest, some four phases may be identified in the family history of the Wyndhams of Petworth. The first two embraced the original accumulation in which the senior and richest branch of the family developed from Norfolk gentry to statesmen (to 1750) as well as the period in which their power, social, economic and political, was consolidated (1750-1875). Hugh Wyndham was born as the period of struggle to retain power opened (1875-1914) and later witnessed the period of decline (from 1914). These phases correspond substantially with the development and decline of the European aristocracy as a whole and of their British counterparts more particularly. Yet, due largely to the

enormous Leconfield wealth, the changes affecting British noble families were still imperceptible at Petworth until at least 1914.

The original accumulation of Wyndham power rested upon commercial-agrarian activities. At the time of the Norman Conquest, the Wyndhams were Anglo-Saxon and had been associated with the Norfolk manor of Wymondham, from whence they took their name, for some time. Slowly, the descendants of Ailwardus of Wymondham commenced their ascent. The manors of Crowthorpe and Wicklewode were acquired in the reign of Edward II and John Wyndham purchased the manor of Felbrigg, which became their main place of residence, in around 1450. And this John Wyndham was sufficiently powerful to sit as one of the knights representing Norfolk in parliament. The deployment of political power, at this point at a regional level, followed shortly on their attainment of economic power. And the Wyndhams, like other families of the same standing, owed their financial increase and political ascendancy to ability, prudent marriage alliances, considerable ambition and, of course, a measure of luck.¹⁵

These factors came together and peaked with the marriage of Sir William Wyndham (1688-1740), the Tory leader in the Commons and a Secretary of State, to Lady Catherine Seymour, a daughter and eventual co-heiress of the sixth Duke of Somerset, who had transformed the crenelated manor house at Petworth into a palace.¹⁶ Stories of the Duke, who was both excessively wealthy in addition to being genealogically close to the throne, abound. Macaulay described him as ‘a man in whom the pride of birth and rank amounted almost to a disease.’¹⁷ His attitude and notions on superior breeding were reflected in his equine interests and mirrored over the centuries in his descendants.¹⁸ Hugh Wyndham, a

study, J. Aalbers and M. Prak (eds), De Bloem der Natie: Adel en patriciaat in de Noordelijke Nederlanden (Amsterdam 1987).


¹⁷ T.B. Macaulay, The History of England from the Accession of James the Second, vol II (London 1850), p 269. It is through this marriage that the Wyndhams of Petworth have a Tudor descent. On Somerset’s pride see G. Jackson-Stops, Petworth House (London 1978), p 42; and A. Foss, The Dukes of Britain, p 27.

¹⁸ Horace Walpole, for example, dismissed Charles Wyndham (1710-63), the second Earl of Egremont, with the words: ‘Son of the great Sir William Wyndham and grandson of the old Duke of
descendant in the sixth generation, was no exception and in later years produced a two-volume history of the Wyndhams.19

In addition to social standing, the Somerset marriage eventually brought the earldom of Egremont together with Petworth House in Sussex and the old Percy estates at Egremont and Cockermouth in Cumberland, and at Leconfield, Wressle and Spofforth in Yorkshire to the Wyndhams.20 The world of the nobility radiated around great houses such as Petworth and the interlocking and closely-woven marriage ties forged between landed families, ensured that vast country estates, enormous wealth and political influence were all strung together.21 Hugh's father, the 2nd Lord Leconfield, inherited Petworth in 1869 and moved there with his newly acquired wife, Lady Constance Primrose. Daughter of Archibald Lord Dalmeny and Lady Catherine Stanhope, she was, a grandson tells us, 'a wonderful and good woman. She was like a chapel in an eighteenth-century palace, un-profaned by what might go on around her.'22

Lady Leconfield was custodian of the rites of religion at Petworth, something which Hugh inherited to a limited degree at least. But the stories of the march of English constitutionalism and the expansion of a Greater Britain, centring upon titanic family figures of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, was the stuff of the Wyndhams' childhoods. This was reinforced by the ancestral heritage of Lady Leconfield's side. Her connections were as illustrious as those of her husband: her mother, following Dalmeny's untimely death, married the last Duke of Cleveland and she had very eminent cousins and relatives, including many statesmen and writers of note, all descended from the same Georgian oligarchs as were the Wyndhams. Her mother was the daughter of the 4th Earl Stanhope and, like the Wyndhams, related closely to the Temples, Grenvilles and Pitts.

---

19 Somerset, whose prodigious pride he inherited more than his father's abilities. See As quoted by J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), Life and Letters of George Wyndham, pp 6-7.
Intellectually, too, she was well-connected and she and her mother bore the marks of her kinship with these distinguished relatives and passed them on to the succeeding generations of Primroses and Wyndhams.

The Duchess wrote the *Life and Letters* of her traveller-aunt, Lady Hester Stanhope\(^\text{23}\) as well as the three-volume *Battle Abbey Roll*, published in 1889 and containing a great deal of sound Norman genealogy. The Duchess's brother, the 5\(^{th}\) Earl Stanhope, was the well-known historian who produced the *Life of William Pitt* (1861) and *History of England* (1870), and established the Stanhope Essay prize at Oxford. Imbued as they were with English history, together with a tremendous sense of the importance of family and public service, the Duchess's children and grandchildren excelled in the fields of politics and the arts. Her son (the 5\(^{th}\) Earl of Rosebery, Hugh's uncle and namesake, and yet another prime minister) was a copious historian too. He produced several works, including biographies of *Pitt* (1891) and *Chatham* (1910), prime-minister-relatives.\(^\text{24}\) With such a strong tradition in his family, to say that Hugh's family on both sides had a sense for history, politics and matters military and equestrian, is a gross understatement. The succeeding generations, which really fought the battle for power retention, followed in this tradition.

Everything that we know about the 2\(^{nd}\) Lord Leconfield and his lady suggests that they were both exceptional and, within their circle at least, likeable.\(^\text{25}\) Nine children were born to the Leconfields between 1868 and 1888: six sons and three daughters. The family resided for most of the year at Petworth House in Sussex, although they also maintained a house in London – 9, Chesterfield Gardens, Mayfair - and also on occasion travelled to their estates in Yorkshire and Cumberland in England, Dumfriesshire in Scotland and Limerick in Ireland. George (1868-1895), the eldest, was bright and handsome and the apple of their eye. The best tutors were engaged to encourage his undoubted ability, including Arthur Quiller-Couch, a future professor of English Literature at Cambridge. Years later Quiller-Couch related:

\(^{23}\) Duchess of Cleveland, *Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope* (London 1914).
\(^{24}\) Rosebery's other biographies were of *Peel* (1899), *Napoleon* (1900) and *Cromwell* (1900).
\(^{25}\) George Wyndham to his mother (Madeleine Wyndham), 15 Jan 1901 (p 414), and George Wyndham to his father (Hon Percy Wyndham), 30 Oct 1910 (p 670), in J.W. Mackail and G.
‘that George had seemed quite impervious to the exquisite surroundings of his home — yet a line of Virgil could move him nearly to tears, and his first glimpse of Plato affected him much as a child might be dazzled by the light of an unfamiliar doorway left half open and surmise the wonderful world within.’

George went on to Oxford, joined the Grenadier Guards and was returned to Parliament, but died of typhoid fever and so Hugh, at the age of seventeen, lost the brother with whom he perhaps had most in common. Charles (1872-1952), the second son, therefore succeeded their father as the 3rd Lord. ‘Uncle Charles’, as a nephew later recounted, ‘although the kindest of men, was taciturn and gruff.’ He dined each evening in white tie and tails, was master of the Petworth Hunt and, when in London, lunched at the Turf Club. Then came Reginald (1876-1914), a world adventurer, horse racer and big-game hunter, who, surviving several close calls, died in a blaze of glory on the Western Front. A nephew tells us that:

‘He kept his papers in an old leather hat-box which he used to take about with him, purposely annoying his elder brother, my uncle Charles, by calling it his estate office. Uncle Charles had three proper estate offices dotted about the country.’

Hugh (1877-1963) was the fourth, and least robust, brother and was followed by Edward (born 1883) and Humphrey (born 1888), both of whom served with the Life Guards. Humphrey retired as a brigadier general, was ADC to George VI and author of several volumes of official British military history. Mary (‘Tiny’), the eldest of the sisters, was married to Colonel (later General Sir Ivor) Maxse, who so distinguished himself on the Western Front. Maud married Vincent Yorke; while Margaret, never married, was woman of the bedchamber to Queen Mary and then Elizabeth II.


26 As told to John Wyndham, a nephew and the future 6th Lord Leconfield and 1st Lord Egremont; and recounted in Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, p 59.

27 Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, pp 60-61.

28 Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, pp 61-63.

29 Humphrey Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 10 Nov 1914 and 22 Nov 1914, and Lady Edward Cecil to Mary Maxse, 12 Nov 1914, WSRO: Maxse Papers 455. See also Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Jan 1912, WSRO: PHA.

30 Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, pp 67-68.
Well-connected, well-mannered and traditionally Tory, the Wyndhams, together with a vast network of family and connections, formed the inner circle of society. This involved them in a wild whirl of social activities, particularly during the London season, entertaining and being entertained on a grand scale, and then a steady but leisurely round of morning calls, dinner parties, evenings at the card tables; all varied occasionally by trips to the races, the activities of a local hunt or an expedition to other country houses, art galleries or beauty spots. Such seasonal movement and extravagant hospitality was a hallmark of aristocratic life and, in the face of new wealth, social exclusiveness did not break down and Petworth remained, unsurprisingly, one of the most selective country houses in the country.31

During the late nineteenth century distance still limited the range of social activities pursued by families like the Wyndhams. Until the advent of motorised transport this extended no further than the distance that could be traversed by horse and carriage. Yet this was far enough to include various families and their country houses and greatly extended following the adoption of the motor car as favoured means of aristocratic transportation. In January 1907 Lady Cobham and a daughter were at a country house party at Petworth: ‘a huge party 36 last night 40 tonight.’ The guests included the Wyndham sisters - Maud Yorke and Tiny Maxse - the Horners, Lewishams, a Bingham, Lord Stanhope, a Fane and a Schreiber, the Dartreys from Ireland, Cynthia Charteris and Lady Elcho, showing just how ‘the geography of country house visiting’ had grown as a result of the motor car.32 The Wyndhams, eccentric and status aware, seemingly held court at Petworth and made little effort to actually befriend neighbours of lesser status. The 1st Lord, we are told, forbade intercourse between Petworth House and town. His wife refused to travel in company and restricted the social activities of her daughters.33 Although Hugh’s parents were less cloistered, their guests and correspondents numbered

32 Lady Cobham to Maud Lyttelton, 9 Jan 1907, HHA 2/23/1.
far more relatives than friends and neighbours. Like much of the English aristocracy, by far the most important family to Wyndhams was their own.\textsuperscript{34}

Another traditional aspect of family relations in gentry households was the importance of the extended family. At the turn of the century ‘family’ embraced several clusters of persons: aunts, uncles, cousins, many close in consanguinity, some distant, and often members of families into which each of these categories of relatives had married. The serious biographer, noting the different names and hoping to disentangle their connection with his subject, grows anxious. Yet, he finds some satisfaction in the fact that the various contortions were often sufficient to confuse even family members.\textsuperscript{35} George Wyndham tells us that even he, at times, found it ‘rather hard to follow the relationships owing to the length of some of the generations.’\textsuperscript{36} Nonetheless, the sense of blood tie was very strong and they kept up in some degree with most of their numerous connections. Even if they did not meet for years on end, they wrote letters to each other and their visits, when they did occur, generally lasted for several days, sometimes weeks.

Hugh’s parents both belonged to large families. His father, we are told, had some fifty-eight first-cousins.\textsuperscript{37} There were Wyndhams and Blunts in England, north of the border there were the Montgomeries and Queensberry Douglas’s, and across the Irish Sea, the Mayos and Dunravens. His mother’s immediate relatives included the Rosebery’s and a range of Primroses, the Hopes of Luffness, as well as connections to the Grants and the Marquess of Crewe. On both sides there were connections with the Duke of Westminster, Britain’s richest peer, and the Grosvenor family. These clusters of people formed an inner circle of relatives, with whom the Wyndhams exchanged regular letters and visits. Naturally, with some of them they were more intimate.

\textsuperscript{34} Lord David Cecil, in his magnificent \textit{Portrait of Jane Austen} (London 1978), has laid bare the family and social connections of an early-nineteenth-century gentry family. This biography, the best I have read, has influenced me more than a few footnotes reflect.

\textsuperscript{35} David Cecil, remarking on the work of the biographer in laying out these relations, has noted: ‘His task is further complicated by the fact that people, especially women, died much younger than now, so that their widowed husband or wife generally married again, thus bringing yet another group of relations into the story. They often also produced a new crop of children which confused the generation level. Aunts sometimes turn out to be as young as their nieces and stepsons the same age as their stepmothers.’ See D. Cecil, \textit{A Portrait of Jane Austen}, p 28.


Percy Wyndham, Lord Leconfield’s brother, and his family stayed regularly at Petworth, particularly in the period prior to acquiring a country house of his own. In fact, when not in London, Percy Wyndham’s children, George, the future cabinet minister, and Guy and their three sisters were invariably at Petworth or at Cockermouth Castle, the Leconfield home established within the precinct of a partially ruined Norman castle in the English Lake District. George loved Cumbria and the lakes and to reminisce with his mother about his childhood and their visits to Cockermouth, where they browsed Wake’s curiosity shop, rummaged over the Norman remains at Cockermouth or the ruins of nearby Egremont Castle, and listened to ‘the sound of the weir and of the wind through the trees in the courtyard.

The Wyndhams were also intimate with the Rosebery’s, Lady Leconfield’s brother and his family. The Primrose siblings were close and remained so. Although a solid Tory, Constance took a keen interest in her brother’s political career. Rosebery, in her letters, was ‘My own darling Archie’ and the letters between Constance Leconfield and Hannah Rosebery reflect a close family bond too. This closeness carried into the next generation and the young Wyndhams often went to see ‘Uncle Archie’ at Mentmore Towers or at Dalmeny House, the main Rosebery estate in Scotland, or at the races in Newmarket. And, in turn, the Rosebery children spent time at Petworth. Although relations with some relatives had less importance, there are references to much familial visiting. These

39 George Wyndham to Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 12 Nov 1912, in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), Life and Letters of George Wyndham, p 728. See also George Wyndham to his mother (Madeleine Wyndham), 15 Jan 1901 (p 413); George Wyndham to Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 8 Aug 1898 (p 342); and George Wyndham to his mother (Madeleine Wyndham), 23 Dec 1903 (p 476).
40 Lady Leconfield to Lord Rosebery, 13 Aug 1892, NLS: Rosebery Papers MS10090, ff.120-21.
41 Lady Leconfield to Lord Rosebery, 24 Nov (no year), NLS: Rosebery Papers MS10089, f.93.
42 Hannah, Countess of Rosebery to Constance, Baroness Leconfield, 4 Dec 1879, WSRO: PHA 9680.
44 Maggie’s round of visits to country houses always included those of many relations. She also wrote from London in 1912 that: ‘I spent Thursday afternoon looking up relations, but all are away, even Aunt Constance.’ WSRO: PHA 1648, 1912, as quoted by P. Blackwell, “‘An Undoubted Jewell”: a case study of five Sussex country houses, 1880-1914’, Southern History 1981, 3, p 189. The Percy Wyndhams were for a long time avoided as a result of a dispute in the testamentary dispensation of the 1st Lord Leconfield and then they were also quite out of touch with their Bourke and Wyndham-Quinn cousins. John Wyndham relates how his wife, a Wyndham-Quinn cousin, had never before their marriage met Lord Leconfield or been to Petworth House. Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, pp 64, 135.
connections continued over several generations, so the young Wyndhams grew up in ‘a world peopled by aunts and uncles and cousins’ of varying consanguinity.\textsuperscript{45} Regular visits between Petworth and other country houses meant the Wyndhams were very aware of a wide range of cousins, many of whom they knew well and some of whom had considerable influence.

Home life at Petworth was affectionate, cheerful, untroubled. The wave of change striking other noble houses had not as yet reached Petworth, where the mode of living remained luxurious.\textsuperscript{46} Like its exterior, the inside of the house was exquisite and imminently suited to country-house entertaining. Hugh’s parents, between 1869 and 1872, had employed Salvin to make a number of alterations, including a new tennis court which replaced a sixteenth-century structure. Their entertaining was lavish and the hospitality at Petworth unstinting. According to the cellar records ‘in January 1889, 92 bottles of claret, 5 of port, 6 of sherry, 11 of whisky and 42 other wines, were consumed’ while at a ball in 1908, ‘the guests downed 62 bottles of gin, 8 of peach brandy, and 89 of claret.’ As a result, unlike their less-well-heeled cousins, the size of the households at Petworth and Dalmeny did not decrease: there were still thirty-two servants at Petworth in 1902 including such non-functional, status-enhancing domestics as footmen.\textsuperscript{47} Writing from Dalmeny in 1902, Maud Lyttelton, the perceptive niece of one of Britain’s more successful Boer War generals, recorded that one ‘could not drink or eat till a powdered glory of a footman had found time to help you’, which she noted was ‘very different from Holkham & Hagley.’\textsuperscript{48} In his memoirs published in 1969, Hugh’s nephew invokes the regal atmosphere of a dinner party in the Square Dining Room at Petworth just prior to the First World War, with the footmen in their blue Wyndham livery and silver crested buttons in the background, and all choreographed by a god-like butler.\textsuperscript{49} Such images, together with the household papers and letters written by visitors, suggest that country

\textsuperscript{45} D. Cecil, \textit{A Portrait of Jane Austen}, p 29.
\textsuperscript{48} Maud Lyttelton to Lord Cobham, 5 Oct 1902, HHA 2/31/37. Hagley Hall is the seat of the Lytteltons, Viscounts Cobham; while Holkham Hall is the seat of the Coke family, Earls of Leicester. Maud’s father was the 8th Viscount Cobham and her aunt, Georgina, was the second wife of Thomas Coke (1822-1909), 2nd Earl of Leicester.
\textsuperscript{49} Lord Egremont, \textit{Wyndham and Children First}, p 65.
life at Petworth persisted well into the twentieth century. Describing her stay there in July 1913, Maud, now married to Hugh Wyndham, thought it:

'all like a big country house life of 50 years & more back. ... One feels Lloyd George w[oul]d like to do away with it all – brute.'  

Yet, despite the perceived intentions of the prime minister, the Leconfield family were buttressed by enormous wealth and their attitudes and habits had no need to change as rapidly as the objective conditions affecting smaller landowners. Leconfield farm rents rose slowly between 1895 and 1900 and no major staff reduction was needed at Petworth before the war. Petworth was also refurbished, including the installation of a new plumbing system in 1906 and an electrical system in 1909, and Lord Leconfield maintained a pack of hounds for which Hugh’s father ‘employed six kennelmen and sixteen gamekeepers and assistants, a huntsman and two whippers-in’. Petworth remained well-equipped for country house entertainments.

The Leconfields were led by their social duties and mental and political interests and, like others of their class, left their children to the care of nurses and governesses. The children lived in suites of rooms on the top story, where they were raised in an atmosphere of young gentlemanliness and ladyhood with all the restrictions and taboos of the later Victorian era. The boys shot and hunted, while the girls embroidered and sketched and chatted agreeably with a vast range of people, from their parent’s visitors to the domestic servants. Growing up at Petworth meant for the children fun of all kinds in the palatial house, over the rolling lawns surrounding the pond, and in the glades of the pleasure park. However, their position of super privilege may have led to a more cushioned, secluded upbringing, deprived of much of the carefree fun and freedom of the less privileged. Nonetheless, within the cloistered walls at Petworth, they enjoyed the friendship of the large staff of servants, whose lives, according to Lady Tweedsmuir, one of Hugh’s Grosvenor relatives, appeared to them much more vivid and alluring than that of their parents. The upper servants presided over portions of the house and had favours to distribute by way of

---

50 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 27 July 1913, HHA 2/36/10.
treats; while Lord and Lady Leconfield pursued uninteresting things like philanthropy and politics.52

The Leconfields supported a variety of charities. Lord Leconfield himself assisted with the planning of the annual fête hosted for the Petworth Park Friendly Society in the gardens. He also maintained an almshouse at nearby Tillingdon and scrutinised personally applicants seeking admission; and, as part of his magnanimity towards his tenants, he provided pensions, Jubilee treats and special allowances for the needy.53 As Lady Leconfield later noted:

'... though social work was not organised as it is now, there was full scope for individual energy, especially in the country, where parish life was a continual round of activity.'54

Lord Leconfield, like the other Sussex magnates, was also an important Conservative organiser. He was deeply involved in the making and administration of laws in Sussex, for which country he also served for several decades as Lord Lieutenant and later as Chairman of the West Sussex County Council. And, in addition, he commanded the local Volunteers or Yeomanry. His influence depended 'simply upon the expectation that once his wishes were known, they would be respected by tenants and employees.'55 In the 1904 by-election Lord Leconfield saw to the election of Lord Winterton, an Irish undergraduate at Oxford, to the West Sussex seat. Clearly family tradition and the territorial connections and local political influence of the Wyndhams still meant something.56

3. Education: Eton, Oxford and the Empire

Writing to Hermione Hichens in 1943, Patrick Duncan remarked on the difference between English and Scottish education. 'In England' he said:

---

54 Constance Leconfield, Random papers (private 1938), p 75.
56 D. Cannadine, The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy (London and Basingstoke 1996), p 185.
‘until recent years, one might almost say that education was never taken seriously, and there was never anything in England corresponding to the country parish school in Scotland. England has been cursed by its class distinctions and the feelings of snobbery to which they give rise. In Scotland we had nothing of that kind. Every boy went to the parish school, no matter who his father was, with no thought that he was better than his neighbours, or if he had any such thought he very quickly lost it.\(^{57}\)

Hugh Wyndham never lost the remoteness and innate sense of superiority produced by his privileged background and aristocratic education. His education was a relic of the long past and ill-equipped him for a career in the twentieth century. Such ‘well-bred ignorance’ perpetuated the idea of the ‘educated amateur’.\(^{58}\)

3.1 Petworth

Education and initial socialisation for all Leconfield children commenced at Petworth where the works of art in the house, the park and stables, and the South Downs for backdrop, made a romantic setting for life in the nurseries. The children received mounts the moment they could ride\(^{59}\) and fished and punt ed on the pond in Petworth Park with the older generation.\(^{60}\) They were from a young age in the primary care of the care of a range of servants, who, in this period, had a tradition of service and many of whose families had been for many generations in the service of the Wyndhams. These people, many of whom, as Oliver Lyttelton noted, ‘were the trusted and loved friends of the family’, socialised the gentry in the values and norms of social differentiation.\(^{61}\) The nurses wore uniforms with caps and seldom had time off.\(^{62}\) They called the Wyndham brood ‘master’ and ‘miss’ – Hugh in the diminutive form of Hughie. There, in the

---

\(^{57}\) Patrick Duncan to Hermione [Hichens], 19 June 1943, UCT Libraries: BC 294 Duncan Papers, E40.18.


\(^{62}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 June 1918, WSRO: PHA.
evening, they played 'at honey pots or mulbebush' and Hughie apparently also 'played
dogs.'

Some of the siblings may have come to develop powerful emotional attachments
to one another and with their parents. Their letters reflect a reasonably close and
affectionate family. When away from Petworth, Lady Leconfield wrote almost daily to her
children's nurse, who, in return, reported comprehensively to her on their health and
activities. The young Wyndhams, as they grew older, began to write to their mother and
father. A young Charles, for example, wrote to their father saying that 'the house [was] so
very dull with out [him]' and, in 1881, the group of youngsters were in Paris, from where
Charles, writing to their mother, then in Spain, described the following charming scene:

'All the little ones roat to you all yesterday evening so the dressingroom looked moor
like a offise than what it really was.'

There is also a charming letter written by a four-year old Hugh to his parents, which
deserves quotation in full:

'Dear mother, dearest papa wee cooky brings our dinners. Hughie wants to send
mother great many kisses. [rest of page covered in x's]

They continued to write while at school and long after: Hugh, almost without interruption,
sent a weekly letter to his mother from South Africa. The nurse's charges, in turn, eagerly
awaited their mother's letters. The nurse reported in 1884 that:

'Mr. Hughie has been very busy printing a letter to your ladyship yesterday and
today ... he and Maggie received their letters tonight before going to bed, which
were a great delight.'

This family affection does not seem to have diminished as the children grew older. When
the eldest son, George, gave his maiden speech in Parliament, his mother wrote that it had
been read by the whole family 'with great joy and delight', and added that 'we are all

63 Charles Wyndham to Lord Leconfield, c.1881, and Hugh Wyndham to Lord Leconfield, 19 Nov
1881, WSRO: PHA 9681.
64 Charles Wyndham to Lord Leconfield, c.1881, WSRO: PHA 9681.
65 Charles Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Nov 1881, WSRO: PHA 9681.
66 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, c.1881, WSRO: PHA 9681.
looking forward to seeing you tomorrow, the house never seems the same when you are not in it. On another occasion, when Lady Leconfield was in Ireland and nursing her son Reginald, who had been injured while hunting, her daughter Maggie wrote: 'Of course, I need not say how dreadfully we miss you here, all the more now the boys are coming home.' Lord Leconfield also displayed a genuine and immediate interest in his children, not conforming to the archetype of the remote and severe Victorian paterfamilias. A letter written to his wife in 1899 is full of domestic detail: 'Bumps has returned [from school] looking very well and with a good report. Edward's is of course a very disappointing one. ... Maggie has immensely improved in her playing.'

Yet, with the passing of time, we find a growing distance between the siblings. From South Africa Hugh wrote weekly to his mother and occasionally to his eldest sister Tiny. Yet, no letters from him to his other siblings, during his first decade in southern Africa have been found. It is possible that, knowing that his letters to his mother would be circulated at Petworth, he thought it unnecessary to write to all eight siblings too. The exception here was Tiny, who, having married Ivor Maxse, no longer resided at Petworth. However, of all the siblings, Hugh was particularly close to Reginald, who was a year older than he. Reginald served with the Guards in South Africa and was there, recuperating from wounds sustained in battle, when Hugh went out to join Milner's staff.

Lord Leconfield, who in died 1901, when Hugh was but twenty-three, was kind if perhaps somewhat distant a father, although his benevolent influence was always felt, even when he was away in London or absent elsewhere. The Wyndhams were also very fond of hunting and racing. Lord Egremont tells us that 'there had been hounds at Petworth since the days of the proud Duke of Somerset, who had hunted in the reign of William III' and successive generations, including Hugh's grandfather, had been a great huntsman. He also had a good library and the children and cousins seemingly had free
use of it. George tells us that for his wedding in 1887 his uncle, Hugh’s father, gave him ‘the most princely present or rather magical treasure.’ He goes on:

‘I asked for any standard work, histories in particular, to start a library and found to-day a complete library of history, at least a hundred volumes!!! All beautifully bound, all the works of Burke, Macaulay, Prescott, Motley, Green’s History, Merivale, Lord Mahon, Milman, Hallam, Freeman, etc., etc.’

Reading became a great pleasure for Hugh too, something that remained with him, although he seldom read novels. He, like other members of his family, found enormous enjoyment in reading history and the memoirs of near and far relatives and wading through the voluminous archival holding at Petworth. They revelled in the intrigues, chiefly political, of ancestors.

Here at Petworth a young Hugh in particular, was imbued with a sense of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of the Glorious Revolution and the Whig interpretation of history, of the continuous, generally uninterrupted and glorious march of English constitutional progress. This was very much the story of the family too – of Sir William Wyndham and Cobham’s Cubs – and substance for much family writing, particularly in the field of English history and family biography. ‘Uncle Archie’ (Lord Rosebery), their grandmother (the dowager Duchess of Cleveland) and her brother, the 5th Earl Stanhope, personified the amateur tradition of aristocratic history writing and between them produced vast volumes for the consumption of the younger generations. All were icons to Hugh. His grandmother, in addition to her multi-volume Battle Abbey Rolls, produced a manuscript history of the Stanhope family. And Lord Stanhope, who

---

76 George Wyndham to his mother (Madeleine Wyndham), 15 April 1887 (italics is his), in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), Life and Letters of George Wyndham, p 209.
77 See, for example, Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, p 15.
78 George Wyndham noted on one of his visits to Petworth that ‘There is much at Petworth which ought to be published, or at least described: Bolingbroke’s letters and the journal of a Col.Percy, for example, who was in the first Virginian expedition. But my uncle will not hear of it.’ See George Wyndham to Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 8 Aug 1898, in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), Life and Letters of George Wyndham, p 342.
80 MS. History of the Stanhope Family by the Duchess of Cleveland, CKS: Stanhope of Chevening Manuscripts (ref. U1590/C511/1-3).
had not only been a trustee of the British Museum and a president of the Society of Antiquaries, but also founder of a National Portrait Gallery and the Historical Manuscripts Commission, produced several substantial works, including a *History of the War of Succession in Spain* (1832), largely based on the 1st Earl Stanhope's papers; a *History of England* from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles (1836—1853); a *Life of William Pitt* (1861—1862); and a second volume to his *History of England* (1870), covering the period from the reign of Queen Anne to the Peace of Utrecht. Stanhope therefore both preserved and used historical materials, and rendered materials in aristocratic possession accessible to the public. In this tradition Hugh Wyndham would follow.

These texts, focused on a familiar and comfortable past, were a powerful nostalgia for those faced with the unease of an increasingly strange social order, something Lord Rosebery described as early as 1874 as 'approaching social revolution.' He went on:

'The night is dark and troubled; we can but labour steadfastly, hoping for the dawn, united by the sympathy of the living, and animated by the example of the dead.'

This steadfast labour Hugh later embraced, although, if animated by the spirit of the dead, he was to experience greater difficulty in gaining the sympathy of the living.

Stories of imperial adventure galvanised the young Wyndhams. Ancestors, uncles and cousins left as captains, entrepreneurs and adventurers to distant shores to further both their own cause and in the process that of an expanding empire. A Thomas Windham (1510-53), one of founders of Barbary Company, was one of the first English explorers in the gulf of Guinea. A Grenville ancestor had been governor of Barbados and through the Roseberys they were also descended from Reynold Alleyne and others of the first group of English settlers on that Caribbean island. An earlier namesake, Lt Gen Hugh Wyndham, commanded the 6th Dragoon Guards (1692-1706). General Sir Henry Wyndham, commanded the 11th Hussars (1847-1860), was MP for the family borough of

---

81 Presidential address at the Social Science Congress, Glasgow, 30 Sep 1874 in Anon., *Lord Rosebery's Speeches* (London 1896), p 38.
82 Presidential address at the Social Science Congress, Glasgow, 30 Sep 1874 in Anon., *Lord Rosebery's Speeches*, p 41.
Cockermouth and a son-in-law of Lord Charles Somerset, who when governor of the Cape raced horses called Wyndham and Egremont. 84

In these circles, the late-nineteenth century was the apogee of English confidence and pride of achievement. The enthusiasm of Victorians and their historians ran riot despite early signs of imperial unease. Charles Kingsley, professor of modern history at Cambridge, espoused the cause of a worldwide civilising mission, whereby new growth points of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism could take root all along the imperial peripheries; while Kingsley’s successor, J.R. Seeley, in his Expansion of England (1883), described the empire as being united by blood and religion. 85 Lord Rosebery spoke to the Social Science Congress at Glasgow in 1874 of ‘the nurture of this race of kings.’ 86 Superiority in terms of class and race permeated his nephews, the six Leconfield boys, who, in terms of social power and influence, sat at the very pinnacle of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism.

Aware of their position and possible future roles, Hugh and his brothers were ready if not eager consumers of the contemporary stories, which, recounted from letters and official memoranda, also filtered into the nursery and schoolroom at Petworth and later at Eton. There was the news of their grandmother, the dowager duchess, dancing with the German emperor at Bad Garstein. 87 And more frequently of the contemporary activities of relatives who either governed portions of Her Majesty’s dominions or fought extending her frontiers. Their first cousin, George Wyndham (1863-1913), who preceded Hugh at Eton by little more than a decade, had served through the Suakim campaign of 1885. He later became private secretary to Arthur Balfour and eventually entered the Salisbury cabinet, losing office with Balfour in 1905. 88

83 His account of his voyage to Morocco (1552) was printed by the Hakluyt Society.
86 Presidential address at the Social Science Congress, Glasgow, 30 Sep 1874 in Anon., Lord Rosebery’s Speeches, p 37.
87 Hannah, Countess of Rosebery to Constance, Baroness Leconfield, 25 Jul 1880, WSRO: PHA 9680.
And so, in their different ways, the Leconfields were appropriate parents for the young brood of Wyndhams. From their father they could acquire a love of hunting and a penchant for the military, from their mother a sense of history and more importantly of their role in the history of Britain; from both that natural confidence of knowing they were of the ancient established ruling classes and had to be treated with respect and deference. The atmosphere that permeated life at Petworth imbued a young Hugh with a strong sense of the importance of his family, socially, politically and imperially. A too serious and certainly dour youngster, with a firm impression of his social superiority, Hugh, one feels, was preternaturally old. In addition to the aloofness, like the young Paul in *Dombey and Son*, tuberculosis and a wheezing chest marked his youth and it is not too fanciful to see in Dicken’s description something of the young Hugh Wyndham:

‘He was childish and sportive enough at times, and not of a sullen disposition; but he had a strange, old-fashioned, thoughtful way, at other times, of sitting brooding in his miniature armchair, when he looked (and talked) like one of those terrible little Beings in the Fairy tales, who, at a hundred and fifty or two hundred years of age, fantastically represent the children for whom they have been substituted.’

3.2 Eton College

Although his childhood passed in the princely surroundings of Petworth, Hugh would have to find his own way in a world, where his success would depend on the exploitation of family ties and on his own exertion. At the end of the nineteenth century few viable career options were open to younger sons, like Hugh, who, in a society that was preferentially primogenital, were barred from a stable niche within the aristocracy. Throughout the eighteenth, nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the Wyndhams packed most of their younger sons off into the armed forces, with one in each generation sitting in the House of Commons. The armed forces – time-honoured home for the more extrovert and less intelligent – did not have the stigma of trade, were financially more rewarding than the Church, and, as Charles Wyndham’s (1796-1866) father pointed out, they also held the

---


prospect of 'tailors & uniforms & all the pomp of war.'\textsuperscript{91} Once in the armed forces, Wyndham sons tended to rise to colonel with half passing through to general's rank. Of the younger brothers of the 1\textsuperscript{st} Lord Leconfield, Henry (1790-1860) was a general, and Charles (1796-1866), who served in the Peninsula wars and India, a colonel. The younger brother of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Lord was a member of the Commons but held a captaincy in the Coldstream Guards.\textsuperscript{92}

Yet, while the impecunious gentleman of leisure was something of the past, Hugh, an introvert with tubercular troubles, seemingly did not want to follow his brothers into the forces. And, his family shunning both trade and the Church, the first being socially repulsive and the second financially unrewarding, he had only two acceptable options. These, open normally to brighter and more ambitious younger sons, were the opportunities offered by government, either in the United Kingdom or in one of the colonies, or the post of private secretary to a statesman, politician, or bureaucrat.\textsuperscript{93} Either way Hugh's only status was that of a gentleman, albeit one with connections, and he could rely on little more than an education and a financial leg-up into a career.

Hugh and his brothers were educated at Eton College, one of England's great public schools, founded by Henry VI in 1440 and through whose portals many of their Wyndham and Stanhope ancestors and close relatives – including Lord Rosebery – had passed before them.\textsuperscript{94} Gloomy at the end of the nineteenth century, life at Eton was more an exercise in what passed for character development than in nurturing intellectual talent. Edmund Warre, the outstanding example of the scholar-athlete then so much in vogue, was headmaster. Enormous importance was attached to sport and religion and the classics, with a smidgen of mathematics, geography and history. A rigid, often brutal, disciplinary regime was the usual fare, tempered only, if at all, by the disposition of the headmaster.

\textsuperscript{91} Earl of Egremont to Colonel Charles Wyndham, undated (c.1828), Wyndham MSS, Lilly Library, University of Indiana, Bloomington.

\textsuperscript{92} There was also a Colonel Percy Wyndham in the Union Army during the American Civil War. See R.W. Donnelly, 'Mosby Re-activated in 1951', \textit{Military Affairs} 15(2) 1951, pp 114-17; and George Wyndham to Wilfred Scawen Blunt, 8 Aug 1898, in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), \textit{Life and Letters of George Wyndham}, p 342.


\textsuperscript{94} Lady Leconfield to Marquess of Crewe, 26 Feb 1930, NLS: Rosebery Papers MS10195 (f.301); and George Wyndham to Mrs Percy Wyndham, 25 Apr 1877, in J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), \textit{Life and Letters of George Wyndham}, p 128.
Dr Thomas Arnold of Rugby, put it plainly: 'What we look for here is, first, religious and moral principles; secondly, gentlemanly conduct; thirdly, intellectual ability.'

Hugh arrived at Eton in 1891 at the age of thirteen and remained there until 1895. He boarded in the house of Mr Donaldson, who probably prepared him for confirmation, too. His day-to-day routine was spent with his tutors and housemaster, but Hugh did not excel at Eton. His March 1895 report records that he attained only 444 out of possible 1200 marks, doing best with languages (86 percent for Greek and German Grammar).

Hugh and his classmates were expected to acquire a loosely defined manliness based on a proficiency in blood sports and the lust for adventure, all of which, it was thought, would do them well in the furthest corners of the empire where they would settle, create new markets and establish new sprigs for this race of princes. The masters at Eton did not expect 'plums of praise from the boys': according to George Lyttelton, a master at the turn of the century, 'You can't say a worse thing of a master than that he's popular with the boys.' Often the boys were flogged and in later years Hugh recalled how, in his day, they were always whipped until they bled.

Yet, despite its popularity with the upper classes, Eton probably contributed little to a gentleman's education. In 1874 Rosebery lamented the absence of a school 'to educate men for government or statesmanship.' Eton, he noted, was alma mater of a substantial number of legislators - both in the Lords and Commons - and yet he doubted whether the college equipped them for their duties. 'It is expected and assumed that a peer shall take to politics as a duck takes to swimming.' What legislators required, according to Rosebery, was an education in political history and political economy.

---

96 Unfortunately only a single school report for Hugh survives in the PHA (vide WSRO: PHA 1700 and 1701, Eton school reports for Hugh and Edward Wyndham, 1895-1901). Eton College did not keep copies of the individual reports. Personal information from Mrs Penny Hatfield, Archivist, Eton College, 15 Dec 2003.
97 School Report for March 1895, WSRO: PHA 1700.
99 As quoted by his sister, Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Mar 1917, WSRO: PHA.
100 Recounted by Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Apr 1917, WSRO: PHA.
101 Presidential address at the Social Science Congress, Glasgow, 30 Sep 1874 in Anon., Lord Rosebery's Speeches, pp 23-24.
Hugh Wyndham, destined by now for a political career, achieved 35 percent for ‘History and Geography’ and, perhaps if only in terms of interest, failed by his uncle’s grading. ¹⁰²

3.3 Oxford

Yet Rosebery, himself an Old Etonian, was an ostensible success – he set three goals in life and achieved all three – and was seemingly a model for his nephew and godson, Hugh, who like his ‘Uncle Archie’ went from Eton and to Oxford. This decision may have been influenced by the dowager duchess as her Stanhope relatives had all studied there and it was closer to her house at Battle as well as Petworth.¹⁰³ However, Neville Lyttelton, Rosebery’s contemporary at Eton, who visited Oxford and Cambridge frequently during the interval between his leaving the school and joining the Rifle Brigade, was unimpressed by Oxford, and particularly Christ Church, where there were many Old Etonians as well as ‘little pretence of work.’¹⁰⁴

Yet Oxford, with its strong links to the empire, held the promise of an imperial vocation. With such a career in mind, Hugh went to New College and read history and the classics, and made the acquaintance of John Buchan, Robert Brand, Philip Kerr and others, all of whom were later drawn to South Africa by Milner. Hugh was particularly close to Buchan. In London they spent time together going to the theatre, art galleries and spots. Buchan, for example, records that he and Hugh went with Lady Leconfield and Maggie Wyndham to the Rembrandt Gallery.¹⁰⁵ Their friendship may also have been strengthened by Buchan’s admiration for Lord Rosebery, which dated back to his boyhood. Buchan first met Rosebery during his Oxford days – perhaps through an introduction by Hugh.¹⁰⁶

This was something of a golden age ‘when [according to John Buchan’s widow] life held out pleasant and even glittering prizes for young men.’¹⁰⁷ Oxford life, even for a

¹⁰² School Report for March 1895, WSRO: PHA 1700.
¹⁰³ Lady Leconfield to Marquess of Crewe, 26 Feb 1930, NLS: Rosebery Papers MS10195 (f.301).
¹⁰⁴ N. Lyttelton, Eighty Years: Soldiering, Politics, Games (London 1927), pp 31-32.
¹⁰⁶ After returning from South Africa in 1903 Buchan and the old statesman pursued a friendship. Buchan holidayed in the Borders, walked with Rosebery on the Moorfoot Hills, near the old castle called Rosebery; and dedicated The Northern Muse ‘To Lord Rosebery, in memory of the green lands of Tweeddale and Lothian.’ J.A. Smith, John Buchan, pp 239-40.
¹⁰⁷ S. Tweedsmuir, John Buchan, p 20.
relatively poor man like Buchan, 'was not clouded by anxiety for the future.' Those with
health and even only medium intellect were confident of not only making a living, but also
of having a varied and interesting life. This security, together with the relative isolation of
the university, gave rise to careless enjoyment and created time to cultivate friendships and
'go in for exuberant rags' and start clubs and discussion groups.\(^{108}\) This was a time and
place to savour and enjoy, and this, according to Susan Tweedsmuir, Hugh and his circle of
friends did to the full.

However, one has the impression that Hugh, unlike Buchan and some of the others,
who 'took University honours and prizes apparently in their stride,' again performed poorly
academically. Nonetheless he was part of a circle with a reputation for lustre. Susan
Tweedsmuir tells us that:

'John's fame had reached me before we met. The set of young men of which he was
a member came down from Oxford with an awe-inspiring reputation for brilliance.
This was matched by another group of young men nearly all killed in the 1914-1918
war. It has been my fate to meet a cross-section of undergraduates at Oxford since
1919. Many of the young men who came to our house have made their mark in the
world, but never since then has there been that galaxy of talent contemporaneously
at Oxford.'\(^{109}\)

This may have been the case for the luminaries of the circle, but the image one has of Hugh
at Oxford is a superior-feeling, myopic young man of no particular elegance or even well-
dressed.

Numerous relatives and friends went to South Africa from 1899 to fight in what
became Britain's greatest imperial war. Reggie served with the 17\(^{th}\) Lancers and Ivor
Maxse commanded the transport for Ian Hamilton's column.\(^{110}\) Guy Wyndham, brigade
major to the three cavalry regiments in Natal, was invested in Ladysmith, from where he

\(^{110}\) Maxse was one of the first to enter Johannesburg, which he thought 'an odious place to live in for
more than a week or at least rate up of wage than £10,000 a year for a year. The treeless veldt is
preferable on a pittance.' Ivor Maxse to Violet Cecil, 2 Jun 1900, BLO: Violet Milner Papers 19,
C62/15.
reported that he was at least ‘with lots of friends now all snug together.’ Later, for the march into the republics, Guy Wyndham had command of 380 mounted troops, 3 guns and a machine gun; while Lt Col W.P. Wyndham, of the 17th Hussars, saw action at Aliwal North and another cousin, Major Rupert Carrington, commanded the 3rd New South Wales Imperial Bushmen. And to these may be added several Primroses, Stanhopes, Bourkes and Windham-Quinns. Letters from the theatre of war were circulated within the extended family in Britain. News from the front delighted those at home and particularly reports of the actions and bravery of relatives. George Wyndham’s stepson, the young Duke of Westminster, was an ADC to Milner and was therefore in a unique position to scoop information passing through Government House on the whereabouts and actions of members of the family. George Wyndham, having listed the relatives at the front, remarked ‘that we have no relations left in this country.’ Lavinia Talbot, wife of the Bishop of Winchester, could truly proclaim ‘what a tremendous war it has become!’ Hugh soon joined the list of family in South Africa.

Conclusion

In Hugh’s final year at Oxford tragedy struck. His father died on 6 January 1901 and his brother, Charles, succeeded titularly and territorially, as the 3rd Lord Leconfield. As a result Hugh’s mother, now the dowager Lady Leconfield, moved from Petworth House to London, where she set up house at 12 Great Stanhope Street. Then, a little more than four months later, news came that Hugh’s maternal grandmother – the dowager Duchess of Cleveland – had died at Wiesbaden on 24 May 1901. This old lady, who had been a

bridesmaid to Queen Victoria, seemingly played an enormous role in matters concerning 'family interest.' Her passing seemed to signify the end of an era, and, combined with the death of his father and the ending of his studies at Oxford, pointed Hugh to a new start.

As a younger son, Hugh's fortune had to be mostly of his own making and he could rely on little more than what was considered a good, public school, education and an annuity to make his way in the world. Here, as Lawrence Stone notes, his success would depend on either 'exploiting his family ties by making himself indispensable to more fortunate relatives and connections, or on his making his way by his own exertions, either by marriage to an heiress, or in a trade or profession.' Wyndham in fact went through both steps in succession. First, a well-placed cousin eased his appointment to Milner's staff in South Africa and then he married Maud Lyttelton, who, although no heiress, was from what has described as an 'establishment family' and this provided connections that could be worked. Yet, like others in his position, he soon found that, in South Africa, where he hoped to make his fortune, his status could, at times, be both a help and more often a hindrance.

117 For example, when Rosebery refused office in 1880, his poor countess had to 'write to the duchess.' Hannah, Countess of Rosebery to Constance, Baroness Leconfield, 27 Apr 1880, WSRO: PHA 9680.
119 D. Cannadine, The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy, p 237.
120 Illiquid case for Damages, Hugh Archibald Wyndham versus the Wallach's Printing and Publishing Company Limited, 1907, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907.
CHAPTER TWO

‘Devilling’ for Milner, 1901-1903

And so, at the age of twenty-three and starting as an unpaid official in the High Commissioner’s Office in Johannesburg, Hugh Wyndham set out to seek his fortune in South Africa. Milner, the British proconsul, had much work to do. ‘A middle-aged man in a hurry’, he could not afford to dither. He had got his war and now he wanted to reshape the sub-continent, and for this he required energetic staff with unconventional minds. ‘I mean to have young men’, he told Sir Percy FitzPatrick: ‘There will be a regular rumpus and a lot of talk about boys and Oxford and Jobs and all that ... Well, I value brains and character more than experience. First-class men of experience are not to be got. Nothing one could offer would tempt them to give up what they have ... No! I shall not be here for very long, but when I go I mean to leave behind me young men with plenty of work in them.’

The men drawn by Milner had three things in common. In the first place, as Milner designed, they were all young, with little experience between them. Secondly, many, like Wyndham, were also younger sons or the sons of younger sons of gentry, with no fortunes of their own and needed to make their own way in the world. They therefore went out to South Africa to assist Milner in the exciting task of the reconstruction of the former Boer republics, but knowing that they had to make a success of their work there in order to move up in the imperial service. And, thirdly, they were – with almost no exceptions – like Milner, old Oxonians: nine of the eleven Kindergarteners were graduates of New College and four were Fellows of All Souls. They had studied together at Oxford and whenever the opportunity arose they returned there for dinner in a college common room, for discussion with a warden or to meet academics and like-minded Empire builders or play piquet. They were truly, as a contemporary poet wrote, men ‘Sent forth as rulers from the banks of the Thames.’ Their friendship and college bon amis, as Milner probably intended, also

---

3 D. Cannadine, The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy (London and Basingstoke 1996), p 426.
4 Diary, 26 Jan 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year appointed</th>
<th>Schooling</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Method of Recruitment</th>
<th>Post(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>J.F. (Peter) Perry</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Haileybury</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Lord Welby</td>
<td>Imperial Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lionel Curtis</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Haileybury</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Town Clerk, Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Patrick Duncan</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Geo Watson, Edinburgh</td>
<td>Edinburgh and Balliol, Oxford</td>
<td>Milner</td>
<td>Colonial Secretary, Transvaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geoffrey Robinson</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>Magdalen College, Oxford</td>
<td>Assistant private secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hugh Wyndham</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>George Wyndham</td>
<td>Assistant private secretary (unpaid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lionel Hichens</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Richard Feetham</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Curtis and Hichens</td>
<td>Town Clerk, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>John Dove</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Rugby</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Sir William Anson, Warden of All Souls</td>
<td>Town Clerk, Johannesburg, Secretary to Rand Water Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Robert Brand</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Milner</td>
<td>Secretary to the Inter-Colonial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Philip Kerr</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Oratory School Birmingham</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Robert Brand</td>
<td>Secretary to the Inter-Colonial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dougal Malcolm</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Eton</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
<td>Lord Selborne</td>
<td>Private secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals |                           | 5              | 4                         | 1                            |

Table 2.1: Milner's young men: recruitment and composition

Note: The Kindergarten was a loose term used broadly for the young men recruited by Milner to serve him in South Africa. A final listing is therefore difficult. The eleven included above are listed as 'the kindergaten in the introduction to 'The Papers of Lionel Curtis and the Round Table' (Bodleian Library). However, in a letter to Milner, Curtis listed 'the members of New College who have served under you in South Africa' and added two further names (Bourne and Craik) and omitted Wyndham (whom he did not like). Leonard Bright in a series of articles in the Rand Daily Mail in July 1943 named several others: Herbert Baker, John Buchan, J.C. Vaughan, Cecil Rodwell (later Imperial Secretary) and Lord Basil Blackwood (Assistant Colonial Secretary of the ORC). And, without pushing the point too far, to these may be added Hon George Peel, Major Hon William Lambton, Captain Henley and Lord Brooke, Osmond Walrond, Lord Basil Blackwood, the Duke of Westminster, and Gerard Craig-Sellar. Regarding method of recruitment, it is also perhaps most accurate to check more than one box in several cases.
facilitated their work in South Africa. Yet, while undoubtedly similar, Hugh Wyndham, in many ways, broke the mould.

1. Recruitment

In South Africa, as elsewhere in the empire, the quality of government depended on individual governors, their skeleton staff of Britons and 'a few trusted natives.' Little support generally was had from London. Such a hands-off policy normally appeased the locals and, as long as they were placated, the colony enjoyed relative peace. Yet, in South Africa matters were rather different in 1901. The country was still in the throes of a devastating war and neither the officials of the former ZAR nor the Jo’burgers – whether Anglo-Saxon miner or Jewish plutocrat - were attractive as civil servants for the new state. As Lionel Curtis (one of Milner’s first recruits) noted, South Africa was ‘not a land where ability grows on every tree.'

This was Milner’s double dilemma: finding administrative assistance and then having full trust in the staff appointed. The first without the second, no matter how unbearable the work pressure, meant that he would still have to undertake all ‘the absolutely confidential work.’ Moreover, as he noted to Lord Selborne, ‘men hastily recruited, even if quite trustworthy,’ would be of little use. What he required was a staff of educated and capable men, willing to throw themselves into the work with great energy and whose loyalties were beyond question.

New College, Oxford, proved the breeding ground for the membership of the Kindergarten and later its offshoot, the Round Table. While other colleges intruded, none rivalled. There were, according to Norman Rose, two compelling reasons for such unparalleled New College primacy. In the first place this ‘was a classic example of how the old-boy network operated [where] one chum drew in another.’ Lionel Hichens, who wanted to establish a ‘little New College ambary’ in Egypt, eventually received an opening on

6 Lionel Curtis to Owen Fleming, 8 Feb 1901, BLO: Ms Curtis 1, ff.70-75.
Milner's staff created for him by Curtis. They drew in Richard Feetham and, with the assistance of the Warden of All Souls College, John Dove. Secondly, there 'was the forceful personality of Lord Milner, a Fellow of the College', who actively sought out young alumni. Milner also raided the South Africa Department of the Colonial Office for staff that were abreast with developments in South Africa and intimate with his aspirations there. These men included Gerard Craig Sellar and Geoffrey Robinson (afterwards Dawson) and later Dougal Malcolm, who was appointment as private secretary to Lord Selborne in March 1905. Patrick Duncan, although from Balliol, had known Milner for several years and was also head-hunted by the proconsul.

David Cannadine notes that Milner, although a self-made man, preferred a patrician staff. The evidence might seem to support this view for the staff accommodated a number of noble climbers and hiders. The Hon. George Peel became his assistant private secretary in December 1899. Colonel Hon. William Lambton, a younger son of Lord Durham, who had served with the Nile Expedition before coming to South Africa, was now military secretary to Milner. Lord Brooke, the eldest son and heir of the Earl of Warwick, after serving in South Africa, was appointed as aide-de-camp to Milner in 1901. The other ADC was George Wyndham's stepson, the Duke of Westminster, who, to see more action, later moved to Roberts' staff. Lord Basil Blackwood, a younger son of a Viceroy of India, was Deputy Judge Advocate of South Africa in 1900, secretary to the High Commissioner in 1902 and assistant colonial secretary of the Orange River Colony in 1903. These were

---

9 Hichens to Curtis, 27 Nov 1900, BLO: MS Curtis 1, ff.57-60; Lionel Curtis to Owen Fleming, 8 Feb 1901, ff.70-75; Hichens to Curtis, 9 Jan 1902 - 'the worst of it will be that you will want much the same people as I shall' - ff.134-37.
11 N. Rose, The Cliveden Set, p 47.
12 Diary, 29 July 1901, 24 to 26 Sep 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
13 Diary, 9 March 1905, BLO: Mss Dawson 11.
14 Milner to Duncan, 14 Apr 1897, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.28.1; H. Bertram Cox, Colonial Office to Duncan, 25 Jan 1901, D1.30.3; Sir Montagu Ommancey to Duncan, 6 Feb 1901, D1.30.4.
15 Extracts from Diary, 26 Dec 1899, in C. Headlam (ed), Milner Papers, II, p 22.
17 C. Headlam (ed), Milner Papers, II, p 11.
18 D. Cannadine, The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy, p 426; Marquis of Ruvigny, The Titled Nobility of Europe, pp 601, 1545. Cannadine gives Hugh Wyndham as the 'future fourth Earl of Leconfield.' This should of course be Baron (or Lord) Leconfield.
mostly patronage appointments, overseas postings, of limited duration, and available for the ‘youthful adventure (and misbehaviour)’ of the sons of the nobility.\textsuperscript{19}

And so, to the reasons offered by Rose to explain the constitution of Milner’s staff, must be added a third. While Milner, albeit sometimes under the influence of men already appointed to his staff, recruited most and was involved actively in the selection of the staff, even he, the forceful proconsul, had to bend to wishes emanating from influential social and political networks in Britain. Curtis in a revealing letter to Owen Fleming, yet another favour seeker, explained that ‘the inner workings of things are positively romantic but I dare not trust them to writing.’ Curtis dearly wanted to open a position for Fleming in South Africa and was confident that:

‘If it was all a question of H.E. all would be well. But there are now intervening layers. I can’t say more …’\textsuperscript{20}

The influence of these ‘intervening layers’ was potent. Over centuries, families with social power formed part of the most influential segment of British society. They not only belonged to the most esteemed and refined class of the nation, and created local, regional and national policy, but the members of these families also enjoyed a ramified network of influential relatives, friends and associates.\textsuperscript{21} These resources were also brought to bear on Milner to secure staff appointments in South Africa for younger sons. The prime example must be the appointment of Hugh Wyndham.\textsuperscript{22}

The Wyndhams, with their extensive family network and ramified marital relations, had many connections to exploit.\textsuperscript{23} George Wyndham was the chief of these. He himself had

\textsuperscript{19} Philip Kerr, the assistant secretary to the governor of the Orange River Colony, a man of undoubted ability, is one who breaks the mould. He was a son of a younger son, who, only through the accident of demography, eventually succeeded as the eleventh Marquess of Lothian.

\textsuperscript{20} Lionel Curtis to Owen Fleming, 8 Feb 1901, BLO: Ms Curtis I, ff.70-75.


\textsuperscript{22} Working of the family network had of course happened before. Hugh’s brother-in-law, Ivor Maxse, had his sister, Violet Cecil, who was Milner’s mistress, enquired after the possibility of his being appointed ‘secretary to any Peace Convention that may be formed later on’ or alternatively to the command of the Transvaal police force. Ivor Maxse to Violet Cecil, 3 Jun 1900, BLO: Violet Milner Papers 19, C62/16; Violet Cecil to Leo Maxse, 29 Aug 1900, C24/7.

started as an ADC to a kinsman and was now Chief Secretary for Ireland. 24 George was a former chairman of the South Africa Association, the principal jingo pressure group in England, and one-time leader of the Milnerites in the Commons, and, as Parliamentary Under Secretary for War, he had helped Milner bring on the Anglo-Boer War in 1899.

Milner, taking a break from the war to address criticism and select a staff, arrived in London on 24 May 1901 to a tumultuous welcome. George Wyndham was there to collect him at Southampton. Milner’s diary testifies to a hectic official programme that allowed few distractions: one of the first was on Saturday 15 June, when he gathered with a party of ‘Souls’ (a high-minded, high-spirited groups of friends centred on the Wyndham, Charteris, Tennant and Grenfell families) for a weekend at Taplow, the home of the William Grenfells. There he joined, in his words, ‘a large party’, which included Arthur Balfour (the deputy prime minister), Lord and Lady Cranborne, the Edgar Vincents, and Lady Curzon. A large portion of the Wyndham family, all key Souls, was there too, including George Wyndham who was ready to tap Milner for a post for Hugh. 25 Here at Taplow, away from frenzied London, George, in age-old country house tradition, tried to influence Milner to take on his young, newly-graduated cousin. George, as he later told Hugh, ‘explained all about you to him’, stressing Hugh’s usefulness rooted in the ‘great need of men of education & independent means’ in South Africa, where ‘they are’, George went on, ‘wretchedly poor in politicians of any ability’. 26

Having already provided a billet for one of George’s well-connected relatives, Milner gave no immediate answer, other than agreeing to meet with Hugh. 27 George, therefore, did not immediately succeed with his mission and he returned by train to London on the Monday 17 June in the company of Milner, the Asquiths, and Lady Curzon, 28 from where he wrote to Hugh. But Hugh had other aspirations, focused on England and including a place on the green benches of the Commons. Yet George, both patient and a realist,

24 As ADC to Lord Connemara who was then Governor of Madras. See J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds), Life and Letters of George Wyndham (London n.d.), p 35, and George Wyndham to Madeleine Wyndham, 22 Aug 1886, p 189.
26 George Wyndham to Hugh Wyndham, 17 Jun 1901, WSRO: PHA.
27 In 1898 George pressured a reluctant Milner to take on Westminster, his ducal stepson, as an ADC. George Wyndham to Milner, 9 Aug 1898, BLO: Alfred Milner Papers, MSS Eng. Hist. 205, ff. 245-8; George Wyndham to Milner, 5 Oct. 1898, ibid, ff. 290-1.
28 Diary, 15 to 17 June 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
suggested that Hugh 'could do not better' for the moment than first work for Milner and 'then strike into S.African politics on [his] own account.' This, he reckoned, was 'the best way now into Imperial Politics at Westminster.' George saw the Empire as a political unit and told his young cousin that 'the men who first grasp this idea & act on it will have most to say to the political questions which are bound to rise in the course of the next 5 to 15 years.'

Seeing Milner's reticence to take on Hugh, he primed his cousin in advance of the proposed interview. He warned him that Milner would, as he did to Westminster, lay down obstacles in an attempt to discourage the young applicant. These included the lack of space in his own house and as well as the difficulty in keeping English servants in South Africa. Hugh was to attach no importance to these hurdles: he had the means to have his own villa in Johannesburg as well as his own servants, which would give him 'greater detachment & in no way hamper [him] in working for [Milner].'

George Wyndham remained close to Milner for the duration of his stay in England and Lord Rosebery, a Liberal leader and Hugh's much-respected maternal uncle, was at hand to introduce Milner to editors and other power brokers. Milner also spent several days with Hugh's Maxse relatives and he linked up with Reggie Blunt, another Wyndham cousin, in mid-July 1901. The penultimate weekend of July saw another gathering of The Souls: on this occasion they met at Mells, home of Sir John and Lady Homer, where Hugh's brother, Lord Leconfield, 'bent on restoring the political influence of his House, no doubt pushed the case of his brother's employment with vigour.

There is no reference in Milner's diary to a meeting with Hugh during either June or July. Hugh, it would seem, relied on his name and the influence of his family to avoid the queues of 'young place hunters.' He wrote instead. Milner responded immediately, offering Hugh the position of assistant private secretary and 'plenty of work' on the

---

29 George Wyndham to Hugh Wyndham, 17 Jun 1901, WSRO: PHA.
30 George Wyndham to Hugh Wyndham, 17 Jun 1901, WSRO: PHA.
32 In early July Milner visited Lady Edward Cecil, the Leo Maxses and Olive Maxse. Diary, 3 July to 18 July 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
34 Diary, 21 July 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
35 Diary, 7 Aug 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
condition that the position was unpaid and that Hugh would have to find his own accommodation.\textsuperscript{36} This was very much as George had predicted. Milner, against his wishes, accepted Hugh, who would be unsalaried - something Hugh seemingly did not mind as he was a remittance man and saw the posting as a steppingstone and little more. He was offered independence and a free hand to ‘devil’ for Milner and, after a year or two, he would, as cousin George suggested, strike into South African politics on his own account, from where he might be able to move to Westminster.\textsuperscript{37} Milner left England for South Africa on 10 August 1901 and George Wyndham, the eminence grise, went on board at Southampton to see him off, happy in the knowledge that he had secured employment for his cousin.\textsuperscript{38}

Hugh Wyndham was the very antithesis of Lionel Curtis, who was already a seasoned civil servant.\textsuperscript{39} There were others with administrative experience, too. Geoffrey Robinson served at the Colonial Office with Dougal Malcolm, who received an appointment as PS to Selborne in March 1905.\textsuperscript{40} They sat at the other end of cypher system receiving long telegrams from Milner and were therefore abreast with developments in South Africa and intimate with Milner’s aspirations there.\textsuperscript{41} This dexterity and considerable knowledge of the country was something that Hugh Wyndham did not have. He was really an untried quantity, suffering from tuberculosis, and thrust upon Milner by his cousin in the Cabinet, to whom Milner had owed so much and from whom much was still expected. Hugh was duly gazetted as ‘Assistant Private Secretary (unpaid).’\textsuperscript{42} William Carter, then Bishop of Zululand, noted to a cleric-friend in England that ‘the State has sent of its very best.’\textsuperscript{43} While this may have been true generally, this was certainly not the case with Wyndham.

\textsuperscript{36} Milner to Hugh Wyndham, 1 Aug 1901, WSRU: PHA.
\textsuperscript{37} George Wyndham to Hugh Wyndham, 17 Jun 1901, and Milner to Hugh Wyndham, 1 Aug 1901, WSRU: PHA.
\textsuperscript{38} Diary, 10 Aug 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71; and diary, 10 Aug 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
\textsuperscript{39} Curtis had served as private secretary to Lord Welby (the chairman of the London County Council) before joining Milner after a short service with the C.I.V. in the war. Although still young, Curtis was already a seasoned civil servant: Welby, hearing of Curtis’ appointment, considered ‘the Government in South Africa ... lucky.’ See Lord Welby to Curtis, 11 Sep 1900, BLO: MS Curtis 1, f.56.
\textsuperscript{40} Diary, 9 March 1905, BLO: Mss Dawson 11.
\textsuperscript{41} Diary, 11-12 Jan 1901, BLO: MS Dawson 7.
\textsuperscript{42} Private Secretary to Secretary to the Transvaal Administration, 16 Sep 1901; Secretary to the Transvaal Administration to Private Secretary, 20 Sep 1901; and Private Secretary to Howard Gorges, undated, NASAP: CS, Box 35, file 4786/01 Assistant Private Secretary to Lord Milner. William Carter to Rev Algernon Lawley, 13 Feb 1902, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Papers.
2. **Reasons for immigrating**

Geoffrey Robinson left Southampton aboard the SCOT on 26 October 1901 and noted the next day in his diary:

‘Lovely day. Ate all my meals with gusto & retained them, shaved with impunity, dressed with deliberation, & smoked with unutterable pride.’

Aboard Robinson read *The New South Africa*, Clough’s *Botha* as well as two books of *The Odyssey*, and wrote letters and walked about to retain a measure of fitness. While most of the Kindergarten had the same sense of purpose, they individually had a mix of reasons for migrating, at least on the short term, to South Africa. Some migrated for a vocation, others for health reasons, the few with independent means attempted to re-create vanishing lifestyles elsewhere. Yet, for the Wyndhams of Petworth the process of aristocratic decline was until 1914 almost imperceptible. Hugh, in 1901, had no reason to leave England, other than for health and imperial adventure.

Milner diarised his perceptions of Hugh’s reasons for migration, which, combined with other information including the clues given by George Wyndham, provide a picture of why Hugh went out to South Africa in September 1901. In the first place, he came from a family of travellers, for whom the world provided both opportunities for employment as well as for pleasure. Some travelled extensively, to the continent, to Africa, India. Hugh’s departure was therefore part of a broader pattern. He had a need for travel and a boyish-romantic wish to see the world.

Yet Hugh’s desire to assist Milner in establishing British ascendancy in a new outpost of the Empire was at least as important. He was, as Milner noted, eager to serve the

---

*Diary, 27 Oct 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.*


*For example, his uncle, Lord Rosebery, visited the German spa towns regularly, purchased a Neapolitan villa in 1897 and spent much time sailing among the Aegean islands; while his grandmother, the Duchess of Cleveland, visited Spain, Tangier, Algeria, Denmark, Russia, Tenerife, Las Palmas, and India. See the photograph album of the Duchess of Cleveland, WSRO: PHA 9918; as well as D. Cannadine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy*, 370-3, 382-3; Hannah Rosebery to Constance Leconfield, 25 July 1880 and 18 Aug. 1880, WSRO: PHA 9680; R. Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century. 1815-1914* (Basingstoke 1993), chapter 5; R. Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester and New York 1991), chapter 4; Coloniale Secretaris Kaapstad Verzoekt dat permit verleend worde aan zekere Heer Wyndham om zijne revolvers binnen dezen staat mede te bregen, 1896, CR 6353/96, NASAP: KG; and J.W. Mackail and G. Wyndham (eds.), *Life and Letters of George Wyndham*, pp 60, 297-306.*
Crown and like other 'young men [Hugh was no doubt] dying to serve under Milner.' The making of a new country was bound to be interesting and in the process he could enjoy the company of fellow aristocrats, both the noble climbers on Milner's staff and the noble hiders in the colonies. Furthermore, thirdly, suffering from tuberculosis, Hugh's posting to the Transvaal, described by Buchan as 'one of the healthiest places in the world,' allowed him to escape the rigours of the English climate.

3. South Africa: 'quite a little Oxford community'

Wyndham arrived in South Africa at the height of the guerrilla phase of the Second Anglo-Boer War and took up his appointment on Milner's staff with effect from 13 October 1901. He arrived in Johannesburg on Wednesday, 16 October 1901, in time for dinner with Lord Milner. After dinner Henley, Rodwell and Duncan played bridge with Milner. Wyndham, tired after the trip up from Cape Town and not feeling the need to ingratiate himself with the boss, sat out. Wyndham was a guest at Sunnyside, Milner's official residence, until his move, two days after his arrival, into The Generies, a house in close proximity to Sunnyside, found by Curtis for him. Here Hugh performed his first real service to Milner, making his home available for the accommodation of other members of the government staff. Curtis noted in his diary on 19 October 1901:

'I went with Buchan, a very able young Scotchman from B.N.C. to a house close by where we have located him, Craig-Sellar, Rodwell and a charming New College man called Wyndham, so now we have a quite a little Oxford community.'

John Buchan, who later (1903) dedicated his African Colony to Hugh Wyndham and their housekeeping, knew Hugh (nicknamed Algy) from Oxford days; while Blackwood,
although of an older generation, knew many of their Oxford friends. Craig-Sellar, another Balliol alumnus, was intimate with Buchan and sent to South Africa from the Colonial Office. Rodwell, after a short time, was succeeded by Blackwood. Wyndham and Craig-Sellar were, as Buchan noted, 'very well-off', whereas he and Blackwood were poor. Yet, all four were 'simple and economical people, and shall do well together.' On Saturday, 16 November 1901, Milner tells us, he dined at The Generies — 'the “chummery” which Craig-Sellar, Rodwell, Buchan & Wyndham have established."

An old housekeeper of Craig-Sellar's cooked for them. They also had an English maid and a valet, in addition to 'some black boys to attend to the horses.' Hugh, soon after his arrival, bought a horse: the other kindergarteners depended upon the Remount Depot for their steeds. There were more mundane things to attend to as well: for one 'household troubles.' He and his housemates were 'obliged to part with [their] housemaid' which he thought 'not much of a loss.' Yet this meant that they were shorthanded and this led to complaints from the cook, who said she was overworked. Craig-Sellar, Hugh noted, 'battles with these troubles, & has all my sympathy.' Horses were their only transport and, as 'the only way of getting fresh milk and eggs,' they also kept a cow and some fowls. Hugh was also proud of his success in the garden. The house was set among the pines and blue grasses. It had 'a view over 40 miles of veld to a great range of jagged blue mountains [the Magaliesberg].'

Hugh furnished the house and had shipped out the bequests he received from the estate of his grandmother, the Duchess of Cleveland. These included her collection of caricatures and autographs, a large Ormolu clock and a large rosewood bureau that had belonged to the last Duke of Cleveland.

57 Diary, 16 Jan 1901, 15 Mar 1901, BLO: MS Dawson 7; J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 113.
58 Buchan as quoted in J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 113.
59 Diary, 16 Nov 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
60 Buchan as quoted in J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 113.
61 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
62 Buchan as quoted in J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 113.
63 He told his sister, Mary Maxse: 'We have had a great success in the garden, by the flowering of a Rhodesian plant, which we planted some 3 months ago. I hardly hoped it would flower this year & curiously enough, those that are planted in one bed show no sings of flowering, but the others, which were planted quite close by are covered with buds.' See Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 1 Mar 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
64 Buchan as quoted in J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 113.
Wyndham moved to a new house in Queen Street in May 1902. This, too, had a good garden, 'with some first class peach trees.' He took some time to collect seeds from the plants at The Generies in order to plant them in his new garden. More difficult, much as Milner had said, was obtaining good English servants. With a wave of his cheque book he enticed the parlourmaid at Government House in Cape Town, probably much to the chagrin of Milner, to join him. And then, like other well-heeled Johannesburgers, he used the South African Expansion Committee to obtain a cook. A certain Mrs Franklin was selected and interviewed in London by Mrs Alicia Cecil, and shipped at Hugh's expense to Cape Town, where, upon arrival, 'she was discovered to be such a low character' that it was found inadvisable to allow her to proceed to Johannesburg. 'The result is', Hugh complained to his sister, 'I am still, after considerable trouble & expense, cookless. ... But how can it succeed if the people at home send out the very scum of the earth. It seems to me it would be better to say at once that a good woman is not available to sending out women who only turn out to be blackguards. ... I shall certainly not deal with them again.' He never did.

Although the names of his housemates varied as the composition of Milner's group of assistants changed, Wyndham, until his departure from Johannesburg, shared his house with several of his colleagues. His house grew into a 'little Oxford community [that] dressed for dinner and - till their work became too exacting - sat in the drawing-room afterwards, as if they were in England, carrying on something of the old Oxford talk and jokes, even if the world outside inclined to think them rather brash and rather superior.' The others teased Buchan for his enthusiasm and optimism and ragged him for nearly buying a farm between Johannesburg and Pretoria, where there was no water

66 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 1 Mar 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
67 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 17 May 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
68 Alicia Cecil, who was on the central committee of the Victoria League, visited the Transvaal with her husband Evelyn, a Conservative MP, in the late summer of 1899. They conversed with Kruger and Smuts before rushing to the coast in a train packed with refugees just as the war was declared. After 1902, Alicia Cecil was actively involved in the collaboration between the Victoria League and the South Africa Expansion committee of the British Women's Emigration Association. See Evelyn Cecil, *On the eve of war* (London 1900) and E. Riedi, 'Women, Gender, and the Promotion of Empire: The Victoria League, 1901-1914', *The Historical Journal* 45(3) 2002, pp 573, 584.
69 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
supply. Beyond this inner circle orbited a number of journalists, agriculturists, Randlords and a wide variety of soldiers of all ranks, including Julian Byng, Douglas Haig, Lord Kitchener, Neville Lyttelton (who described them as ‘singularly capable and pleasant’) and a young Lieutenant Ironside. Most of the Kindergarten knew nothing of military matters when they arrived in South Africa. Buchan admitted that this was how he ‘acquired an interest in military history and the art of war which has never left me. “Shop”, the talk of an expert on his own subject, has always seemed to me the best kind of conversation, and my appetite for military ‘shop’ was prodigious.’

The kinder often discussed weighty matters over dinner, which was sometimes followed by cards. Such nightly discussions normally took the form of local politics; although on 20 Dec 1901 Robinson tells us he and his housemates at dinner had a ‘long philosophical discussion on what constitutes happiness.’ Wyndham was present on many such occasions, although, if we are to believe Curtis, his presence was not always valued. Diarising the events of 24 October 1901, Curtis tells us that he ‘spent the evening talking to Buchan and Wyndham,’ whom he thought ‘a slender creature who sits in his chair saying little but looking interested.’ Curtis had clearly cooled to Wyndham, put off perhaps by Wyndhams airs and graces and the fact that he had received a position of patronage and therefore, unlike the others, was not deserving of his place on Milner’s staff.

Curtis’ prejudice did not hinder Wyndham from being landlord to some of the other kinder and, perhaps at times at least, something of an aristocratic encumbrance on the rest of the group. His housemate, Gerard Craig Sellar ‘got up’ an Oxford dinner at the New Club on 1 February 1902, which was attended by no less than twenty-one old Oxonians, including Milner and most of his staff: Perry, Walrond, Henley, Blackwood, Buchan, Curtis, Duncan,

---

72 J.A. Smith, John Buchan, 125; N. Lyttelton, Eighty Years: Soldiering, Politics, Games (London 1927), p 266; Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901 (for visit of “Kitchener & his whole staff” and a dinner at Lord Milner’s residence in honour of the King’s birthday), WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.

73 J. Buchan, Memory hold the door (London 1941), p 111.

74 Diary, 20 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7. Their work soon became too exacting for many such leisured activities. There are numerous references to hard work and extremely busy days. Buchan records a typical day: ‘Rise at 5 and ride till 7. Breakfast at 7.30. Office at 8 and straight on till 7. Dinner 7.30. Back to the office from 8 to 10. A pretty heavy day considering how full of responsibility and worry the work is.’ See Buchan as quoted in J.A. Smith, John Buchan, pp 119-20.

75 L. Curtis, With Milner in South Africa, p 323.
Monypenny, and Chaplin, the ‘memory of William of Wykeham was ... in the hands of Wyndham.’ And ‘every man [drank] his Founder’s health in solemn silence afterwards.’

4. Work

Sunnyside, Milner’s official residence, where the kinder all worked in an administrative warren on the ground floor, was but a short walk from The Generies. They normally lunched at the office ‘in a sort of mess establishment on the ground floor.’ Wyndham went to the office on his first full day in Johannesburg, and joined Milner, Brooke, Gould Adams (up from Bloemfontein), Henley, Lambert for a short walk after tea. The staff, when Wyndham reported for duty as assistant private secretary, were Major William Lambton (military secretary), Captain Henley and Lord Brooke (military attachés), Osmond Walrond (private secretary), Lord Basil Blackwood (assistant secretary for the Orange River Colony), J.F. Perry (Imperial Secretary – ‘i.e. for Rhodesia and the wilder parts’). Geoffrey Robinson was assistant private secretary to Milner. Buchan, who received his appointment shortly before Wyndham, was political secretary.

Wyndham’s work, as Milner promised, was independent. Milner needed ‘somebody who can take up a subject or subjects, with only very general instructions, keep himself thoroughly informed without being constantly looked after, and be prepared to coach me when called upon.’ Milner had written on: ‘There are at present many important matters not sufficiently attended to for want of somebody to “devil” for me. Indeed, I could find work enough for two or three men, if they were able and willing to work by themselves with only a general line given by me.’

‘The State,’ as Bishop Carter noted, was ‘in the process of restarting.’ Much hard work was required and the kindergarteners were mostly only too eager to work hard at it and

---

76 Diary, Saturday, 1 Feb 1902, BLO: Ms Milner dep 73; diary, 1 Feb 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
78 Diary, Saturday, 1 Feb 1902, BLO: Ms Milner dep 73; diary, 1 Feb 1902 BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
79 Diary, 19 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
80 Diary, 17 Oct 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
81 Hugh, on 12 September 1901, two days before Buchan’s departure for South Africa on the BRITON, gave Buchan a farewell dinner. See J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 108.
82 Milner to Hugh Wyndham, 1 Aug 1901, WSRO: PHA.
in doing so they enjoyed what Patrick Duncan described as ‘a beautiful freedom’ of action. They worked at all hours and often sacrificed weekends. Robinson tells us, for example, that, after a Sunday service, he, Buchan and Wyndham went into the office to check the mail. The diaries of Geoffrey Robinson are littered with references to hard work and doing ‘a good deal of business.’ Robinson, just arrived, was put to work immediately, settling by the end of November 1901, ‘the Natal boundary question.’ He then moved on to the working of the uitlander committees, ‘genuine & bogus’, and the wages for native labour throughout South Africa; while Perry plied the road to Lourenço Marques, settling native labour questions with the Portuguese. John Buchan was placed in charge of the arrangements for the relief of British refugees. Even Curtis wanted primarily to help the Boers. On 27 December 1901 Robinson looked ‘at Canadian & Australian Federation’ with a view to a memorandum for Milner. Milner was the hub, distributing tasks as they came in during the day. When Milner was out the kinder sized the opportunity to ‘read bluebooks & write letters.’

Wyndham’s first official engagement was attendance at the memorial service for President MacKinley held in Johannesburg on October 20. Curtis thought the eulogy was ‘an eloquent and vulgar oration ... in glorification of America.’ That evening Curtis spent the evening at The Generies with Craig Sellar, Buchan and Wyndham, no doubt discussing the rhetoric and apparent lack of dignity of that morning’s service. America would be, as one of Hugh’s cousins noted, ‘a nice place to live in in about 500 years when the people have got civilised and when they have built up a few traditions of conduct and manners.’ For Wyndham, working for Milner drew no great interest, although he was forced to the

---

84 Patrick Duncan to Leo Amery, 4 Jan 1903, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, E.41.1.1. This freedom of action would not last. In 1903 Milner warned Curtis that ‘official positions will then be less influential than they are now.’ See Milner to Curtis, 17 Sep 1903, BLO: Ms Curtis 1, ff.143-46.
85 Diary, 22 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
86 See, for example, diary, 2 Jan 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
87 Diary, 25 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
88 Diary, 6 Dec and 12 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
89 Imperial Secretary to Secretary to the Transvaal Administration, 21 Nov 1901, NASAP: CS 48, file 6460 Assistance to returning British refugees.
90 Diary, 27 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
91 Diary, 28 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
92 Diary, 27 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
93 L. Curtis, With Milner in South Africa, p 323.
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forefront on occasion. For example, in November 1901, during Walrond’s absence, he acted as private secretary and assisted Milner with the ‘very worrying telegram from home about Concentration Camps, etc.’ This and other matters, including the prevention of prostitution in Johannesburg and the administration’s estimates and expenditure, kept Wyndham busy over the following months.

While he found the work uninteresting generally, Hugh seemingly enjoyed the social contact, both at the office and during dinner parties. He met up with many near and distant relatives and other Etonians. In November he attended ‘a big dinner at Lord Milner’s residence in honour of the King’s birthday.’ This he attended as private secretary and ‘had a good time, sitting between Major O’Meara, the Mayor of Johannesburg, & Col Macdonald, the OC Rand Rifles.’ Dining at Government House he met a wide variety of military and political figures, in Johannesburg for the military and financial palavers. Here Hugh relished the opportunity to meet past heroes and the stuff of which legends were made, including ‘Long of Colenso fame’ and General Neville Lyttelton, thought by most as one of the few competent British generals. Lord Chesham and Lord Methuen were there on 22 November 1901 and at the end of January 1902, Ian Hamilton and Sir George Taubman Goldie. The New Zealand prime minister arrived in Johannesburg on 20 May 1902. Yet, as Geoffrey Robinson recorded in his diary, some of the kinder, some of the time, tried to ‘escape a dinner of generals & lieutenant governors.’

During these encounters the staffs were assessed by the visitors. Carter, the Bishop of Zululand, who dined with Milner and his staff in April 1902, thought Milner very pleasant, but seemingly had less time for his staff. He told Algy Lawley that Milner ‘has a lot of young, mostly Balliol men, in his office’ and he went on:

95 Diary, 5 Nov 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep. 71.
96 See, for example, Milner to Secretary of the Transvaal Administration, 28 Jan 1902, NASAP: GOV 595, file PS 346 Removal of White Prostitutes; and Colonial Treasurer to Hugh Wyndham, 22 Jul 1902, NASAP: CT 294, file JL 429/02.
97 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 17 May 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
98 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
99 Diary, 14 Feb 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
100 Diary, 10 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
101 Diary, Friday, 22 Nov 1901, BLO: Ms Milner dep 71; diary, Sunday, 26 Jan 1902, BLO: Ms Milner dep 73.
102 Diary, 20 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
103 Diary, 3 March to 5 March 1905, BLO: Mss Dawson 11.
'Sir Godfrey Lagden told me that they are called the “kindergarten.” I fancy that men of Sir G’s stamp, who knew the country well and its ways look upon these young men as rather theoristy – you would like Lagden – straight & practical.'

There was undoubtedly something in this criticism. Even Curtis felt that his successor, when the time came, should have certain qualities – ‘I feel the importance of a man being found who is familiar with the personalities on the Rand.’ Carter later mentioned that Lagden thought ‘Lord Milner’s staff very young & inexperienced.’ Yet even Carter, who was being courted to fill the Pretoria see and preached on several occasions in Johannesburg, owned up to being rather terrified at working close to Milner. He reckoned that ‘with the sort of people one gets in Church in these parts one has to think carefully’ – something he recognised should always be the case – ‘But with men like Lord Milner & Lord Kitchener, with generals galore sitting just under the pulpit one feels a bit screwed up.’ Capt Jack Lyttelton, who had opportunity to view Government House at close quarters, thought his life in the blockhouse line an ‘infinitish (sic) nicer life than that of the staff at Jo’burg.’

Soon after arriving on the Rand, Wyndham acquired a horse and, as expected of all able-bodied men, joined a volunteer regiment. Having a horse, a basic expectation of any gentleman, Hugh enrolled in the mounted infantry section of the Rand Rifles, together with Geoffrey Robinson and others of the staff, and went and did ‘the goose step’ on November 16 apparently for the first time. On Saturday 28 Dec 1901 there was a ‘great review of the Rand Rifles’ by Kitchener, yet, it would seem, the glamour faded quickly and on 12 March 1902 a drill was cancelled due to a lack of interest: only 17 men out of a squadron of 97 turning up. The mounted battalion of the Rand Rifles drilled on the golf links on 26 March 1902, which, according to Robinson, was a ‘rather perilous performance’.

The Government House set favoured outdoor pursuits. Polite applause emanated from the Rand Polo Grounds, where the sons of the gentry used every opportunity for a

105 Curtis to Milner, 18 Aug 1903, BLO: Ms Curtis 1, ff.160-64.
109 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
110 Diary, 28 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
111 Diary, 12 Mar 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
112 Diary, 26 Mar 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
chukka: the Ascension Day weekend in 1902 or the visit of the Duke of Westminster, Hugh’s cousin, that November 1902. They also enjoyed morning rides through Saxonwold, sometimes farther a field. On occasion they rode with Milner, although far more often in the company of ladies. The last were either visitors to Government House or the spouse of an associate. Wyndham accompanied them on some occasions, although he was never a regular companion. Over the following months he acquired further mounts, possibly with a view to establishing a stud, and soon received a reputation as having a fine stable.

The war ended on May 31, which surprised Hugh (‘I can’t get out of my head the thought that the war is still going on’). He was also surprised at the number of Boers that were still in the field. He was correct in thinking that the British intelligence estimates before the war was hopelessly faulty. The close on twenty thousand still in the field proved conclusively he thought that there were well over 100,000 when the war first began. Under these circumstances he thought that the British had finished the war very quickly. He was quickly surprised that the Boers, with twenty thousand fighting men left, had surrendered. A good many of them were boys, yet he thought ‘the Boer boy [had] proved himself just as efficient for the purpose of the late campaign as the Boer man.’

This was ‘a good peace’ and was received well both in Britain and in South Africa, although Milner did note ‘that the effusion with which the Boers salute the hoisting of the Union Jack is ridiculously exaggerated.’ Although Hugh worked the numbers correctly, his estimate of ‘the Boer’ was otherwise entirely incorrect: ‘Meanwhile every Boer that surrenders seems to be consumed with an overwhelming patriotism, & is prepared to place

113 Diary, 8 and 10 May 1902, 8 Nov 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
114 Diary, 21 Nov 1901 and 29 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7. On Sunday 29 December 1901, for example, Robinson and Perry were joined by Rodwell and Buchan for a ride from Johannesburg to Pretoria. The latter two however failed them ‘in the veld being timorous of blockhouses & desirous of breakfast.’
115 Lady visitors included Lady K and the Duchess of Westminster. Robinson records regular early morning rides with Mrs Drummond Chaplin. Diary, 20 Jan 1902, 15 Sep 1902, 8 Nov 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
116 Geoffrey Robinson and a certain Jardine, for example, admired one of Hugh’s polo ponies in October 1902. Diary, 10 Oct 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
117 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
118 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
119 Malcolm to Robinson, 19 June 1902, BLO: Ms Dawson 60, ff.27-34.
himself, body & soul, at the disposal of the new government.' This, he thought, was 'by no means the case with the Uitlander.'

5. Johannesburg: 'a select party’

Johannesburg, only fifteen years old in 1901 and founded on the gold reefs of the Witwatersrand, was populated by a mixed bag of drifters and strike-it-rich prospectors; it was a place where 'one meets every type of person imaginable.' Yet, by now, the town had its social pretensions. The shops were better supplied and there were even a few dressmakers in town for the growing number of women, particularly of more genteel background. An aristocratic circle grew around government house and the staff and there are frequent references to visiting lords and ladies, and hosts of titled relatives. They comprised a mixture of military officers, British and colonial politicians, and fashionable society. Robinson, out shooting on 23 June 1902, went over to Government House to collect cartridges, where he 'found a select party ... having tea.' On this occasion the group included the Chaplins, the Algernon Douglas-Pennants, the Tullibardines, the Fitzgibbons, and the Sandilands.

In late 1902, their number included Hugh’s mother and his youngest sister, Margaret, who arrived in South Africa in October 1902. Hugh, having ‘prepared a plan of campaign for them in Natal’, met them in Durban and for the next week they trampled the battlesites around Colenso and Ladysmith. They then followed the path of the British advance over the escarpment, reaching Johannesburg late in October, where they were touted at the usual events. The visit seemingly went off really well: the weather, as Hugh told Mary Maxse, was splendid, ‘which always makes things pleasant.’ The group went to Irene to visit the remains of the concentration camp and, socially, they had the company of Lady Sarah Wilson and Lady Howe, who were guests at Government House. They were soon joined by Milner, returned from his visit to the south eastern Transvaal early in

---

120 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
121 Frances Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 2 Mar 1907, HHA 2/23/10.
123 Regular visitors included Major Cavendish-Bentinck, the magistrate at Wakkerstroom and cousin of the Duke of Portland; the Leveson-Gowers, relatives of the Duke of Sutherland, moved through in April 1902. Diary, 29 April 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
124 Diary, 23 June 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
November, and the Duke and Duchess of Westminster, the Duke wishing to put forward a land settlement scheme. And so, as Hugh noted, there was 'no lack of Society.'

There was no shortage of social engagements either. All three Wyndhams went to a dance at the Ecksteins' house on Wednesday 19 November 1902, which Geoffrey Robinson thought 'very well done but singularly flat & tedious.' Robinson had already tired of the charms of the Rand nouveau riche and welcomed the opportunity to brush shoulders with gentry. Robinson took a particular interest in Hugh's sister, spending much time with the Wyndhams over the following days.

Amidst all the work, the ability of the kinder to 'find time for paper chases' and the like surprised their counterparts at the Colonial Office and elsewhere. The kindergarteners shared digs, but often dined out, together or as a small cluster of individuals. Such dining was sometimes at the Rand Club or New Club or at the home of a friend or associate. Robinson records the details of 'a great gathering' on a Sunday in May 1902 at the Perrys: Peter and Mrs Perry, Duncan, Wyndham, Craig Sellar, Sewell and Mrs Sewell, Court, Macdonnell, Hichens, and Amery, 'who photographed us all with a panoram.' On other occasions, the accompany was more select, with Robinson, Wyndham, Duncan and Craig Sellar dining in and playing Bridge, sometimes joined by John Buchan.

Sometimes they dined at the home of a socialite. In fact, soon after arriving, they were all introduced to the leading socialites, including Marguerite, wife of Drummond Chaplin, Mrs Sewell and Mrs Dale Lace. The Johannesburg *haut monde* were at first

125 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 4 Oct 1902 and 17 Oct 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
126 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 3 Nov 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
127 Diary, 19 to 23 Nov 1902, 2 Dec 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
129 Diary, 26 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7.
130 Diary, 13 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7; and diary, 24 Jan 1902, 5 Aug 1902, 22 Sep 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
131 Diary, 18 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
132 Diary, 1 Oct 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
133 Diary, 25 Nov 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7. Robinson notes that he on occasion 'sup[ped] tete a tete with Mrs Sewell, whose spouse had gone off shooting' (Diary, 28 Mar 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8). Or dined with Mrs Dale Lace at Northwards (Diary, 9 Jan 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8). Lunched with the Chaplins and Sewells (Diary, 29 April, 3 May, 4 May, 13 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8). Sometimes as happened to Sewell, who was 'also out bridging', the weather forced them 'to sleep where [they] dined' (Diary, 21 Dec 1901, BLO: Mss Dawson 7). Sometimes visited during the day with Mrs Perry or Mrs Chaplin, either for lunch or tea (Diary, 5, 6 and 18 Jan 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8). Robinson and Blackwood also went round after dinner to play ping-pong or bridge with various families, although ping-pong, a game decidedly of the middling
amusing, though this was something that paled quite quickly and those of genteel background tended to coagulate. These were sentiments shared by Selborne's ADC, Jack Lyttelton:

'The Villiers's are about the nicest pair out here, and Lady Kathleen is beloved by everyone which is saying an immense lot in a town like this – largely peopled by cats of the most cattish order and all divided up into factions.'

Dougal Malcolm, who came out to South Africa in 1905, found 'the Joh’burg people extraordinarily hospitable': he told Robinson that they 'clasped me to their bosoms & stuffed me with chicken & champagne.' He went to a huge dinner at Abe Bailey’s in July 1905 in honour of Jameson and left at midnight, leaving 'a party consisting of Abe, Dr Jameson, L. Reyersbach, Cray Nourse, Hull & Jim Leonard playing a ferocious game of poker - hundreds changing hands on every deal.' Lord Selborne's daughter lamented to Jack Lyttelton's sister (who was to marry Hugh Wyndham two years later), that

'no one here takes the faintest interest in anything outside what effects £.s.d. in the mines & shares etc. Everything & everyone turns on these 3 letters. I confess I don't think Johannesburg people are calculated to impress one imperially!'

Although the frequency of genteel visiting seemingly increased after Selborne's appointment as governor, the social fulcrum of Johannesburg was already shifting. Pretty country residences, fashioned on the English country house, were being built out of the town. As Marguerite Chaplin noted in her diary, anybody with any social pretence and the finance to match, aspired:

134 Mr Charles Villiers was a cousin of the Earl of Clarendon and his wife, Lady Kathleen, a daughter of the Earl of Enniskillen. Jack Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 2 Oct 1905, HHA 2/21/37.
137 Guests from 1905 included many members of the Cecil family and their connections, including Earl Grey, the administrator of Rhodesia, and his son, Lord Howick, whom had married Selborne's daughter. Diary, 22 Feb 1905, BLO: Ms Dawson 11.
138 J. Morris, Pax Britannica, p 92.
to get out of the town, & breathe the pure country air - to have peace & quiet, & not feel one is in the midst of a country where the gold scram(ble) is the definite & only object."^139

Bedford Farm, the residence of the George Farrars, reopened its doors in June 1900 and the visitors over the following months included an impressive array of military officers, colonial officials and, of course, aristocrats.^140 The war’s end increased the opportunity for visiting and entertaining. The news of the peace broke through the morning of June 1, a Sunday. Robinson heard it when he got down to the office at about 11 am and Rev Darvagh announced it from the pulpit. That afternoon he found Wyndham with a party, including Lambton and Colonel Rhodes, at Government House. Yet as he noted it was ‘an odious dusty day.’^141

Earlier that month the military secretary commenced the planning for an Eton dinner to be held in Johannesburg on Wednesday, June 4th. All Old Etonians in South Africa who thought, war permitting, they could attend, were requested to send their names and addresses, together with house and date of leaving Eton, to the Military Secretary at the High Commissioner’s Office, Johannesburg.^142 The war clearly drawing to a close, heaps of replies from Old Etonians ‘flowed in’ during the last week of May, both generals Lyttelton and Barton announcing their intention of dining.^143 Crowds of soldiers arrived in Johannesburg on or before June 3. The following day Robinson’s office was invaded by countless OEs, all of whom created a ‘fearful bother seating them all according to their wishes.’^144

The dinner was held in Johannesburg at the Rand Club with 106 present, including Wyndham and, of course, most of the staff. Peace, having just been declared, made it possible for a great many soldiers to come who would otherwise have been prevented. The names on the guest list were all printed as they used to be in the school list: General Neville

139 Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 20 Oct 1904, UCT: BC 831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.
140 A study of the visitors’ book shows that they included Girouard, Frank Rhodes, H.E. Hanbury Williams, J. Hanbury Williams, Lady Sarah Wilson, the Fiennes, Cicely Cavendish Bentinck, the Drummond Chaplins, the Solomons, the Marquess of Graham, the Goldmans, William Wyndham of the 60th Rifles, Alfred Milner, the Duke of Westminster on 10 Oct 1900, Lionel Hichens, Cecil Rhodes, and Alfred Lyttelton. See Bedford Farm Visitor’s Book, RHO: Farrar Papers 1011.
141 Diary, 1 June 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
142 Newspaper clipping from The Star, 8 May 1902, in diary, 8 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
143 Diary, 28 May 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
144 Diary, 3 June 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
Lyttelton, who presided, as Lyttelton ma. and the Bishop of Pretoria as Carter n.s. General Lyttelton, who 'made several speeches', tells us that 'everybody [was] in exuberant spirits, war over, home in sight for most of us, and our first decent dinner, altogether a great success.' They 'sang to Carmen & the Boating Song & all went to bed in our boots.' The public school spirit and the associated loyalties reinforced Milner's kindergarten and bonded them with other elite Britons.

6. Conclusion

Fired with the spirit of empire and eager to help recast the subcontinent in a British mould, they left the country houses and the palaces of Park Lane for a Johannesburg, which Buchan described as: 'a dusty road, some tin-roofed shanties, with a few large new jerry buildings humped above them: a number of struggling dusty pines and gums, a bit of bare hillside in the distance, and a few attenuated mine chimneys. Everything is new, raw, and fortuitous.' On arrival, most British officials were astonished at the amount of work they were in for. While they no doubt recognized the scale of their task, it was, as Milner thought, 'one thing to think that at a distance, quite another to arrive in South Africa, walk round, and see how absolutely vast and bewildering it is.' Perhaps Hugh could not take the stresses and pressures?

Wyndham, unlike Geoffrey Robinson, who Milner thought 'absolutely first-rate', did not perform well. Wyndham left Johannesburg on 7 January 1902 to take up a post with the Orange River Colony Administration in Bloemfontein. Here he was to work on Land Settlement with a man called Memé, who was chief surveyor to the various properties belonging to Ecksteins and had raised Memé's Scouts for wartime service. Geoffrey Robinson consequently migrated into the private secretary's room, where he found 'any
quantity of work.\textsuperscript{154} Milner sent for Robinson on 3 February and ‘said Wyndham mustn’t do much work.’ Robinson was to take over the private secretary’s room pro-tem. The next day, Robinson recorded: ‘Long day as Priv. Sec. in the office – alone & unaided.’\textsuperscript{155} This came at a bad time as Robinson tells us that Milner was ‘desperately busy.’\textsuperscript{156}

Yet, some weeks later, at the beginning of March, Hugh was still writing from the High Commissioner’s Office in Johannesburg, where he had heard of the bagging of some six hundred Boers near Vrede on 27 February, a date, he noted, ‘now of many anniversaries.’\textsuperscript{157} It was here, at the hub of events and exposed to a variety of experts, that Wyndham probably formed his first real ideas about warfare.\textsuperscript{158} All the while, Hugh awaited the arrival of Memé, from whom he hoped to learn much, but in the meantime had ‘rather a lazy time.’\textsuperscript{159}

Milner noted to Lady Edward Cecil in late 1902 that his staff members were rather astonished at the amount of work they were in for. While everybody knew this was a big job, it was, Milner thought, ‘one thing to think that at a distance, quite another to arrive in South Africa, walk round, and see how absolutely vast and bewildering it is.’ There was not a man in South Africa, ‘who is any good at all, that hasn’t six times too much to do.’\textsuperscript{160} Hard work no good for one’s health – ‘It is a year since I was out, and a year like this seems somewhat to reduce one’s physical condition.’\textsuperscript{161} Wyndham and Perry were hospitalised during the first week of April 1902.\textsuperscript{162} A severe cold, which always threatened pneumonia, was the most dangerous thing to get on the Witwatersrand, barring the plague. The weather was treacherous and ‘one must be very careful.’\textsuperscript{163}

\textsuperscript{154} Diary, 8 Jan 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
\textsuperscript{155} Diary, 3 and 4 Feb 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
\textsuperscript{156} Diary, 13 Feb 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
\textsuperscript{157} Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 1 Mar 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
\textsuperscript{158} Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 1 Mar 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
\textsuperscript{159} Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 1 Mar 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
\textsuperscript{160} Milner to Lady Edward Cecil, 18 Oct 1902, in C. Headlam (ed), \textit{Milner Papers, II}, p 381.
\textsuperscript{161} Milner to Lady Edward Cecil, 1 July 1900, in C. Headlam (ed), \textit{Milner Papers, II}, p 105.
\textsuperscript{162} Diary, 3 and 5 April 1902, BLO: Mss Dawson 8.
Hugh left Milner's service toward the end of July 1903. Wyndham did not remain on Milner's staff for long. Buchan found his work satisfying and exhilarating: Wyndham's position was an unpaid stepping-stone. Buchan could put his heart into his work because, on the whole, he liked the Boers and got on well with them. Wyndham did not share this admiration but instead, like Milner, saw their shiftiness and farming manners which were not those of polite society: he saw the unruly peasant instead of the republican farmer. And then there were the religious differences between the High Churchman and the Calvinist, a problem Buchan did not face. In Buchan's words: "I think a Scotsman is always more adaptable than an Englishman - he is more of a humanist." The time had come for Wyndham to strike out into South African politics. Yet, as he confided to his sister, Lady Mary Maxse, he was 'no friend with that strange conglomeration of nations known as the 'Uitlander population', who, according to the wife of a close friend, were 'ambitious for money, & society, pushing to a degree & knowing where & when to push.' He chose to settle in the country and explained to Lady Maxse in December 1902 that the labour question, which would never be satisfactorily resolved, was 'sure to wreck the political influence of Johannesburg from any Imperial point of view [and] as far as I can see the best thing to do will be to get out of it as soon as possible.' And this he did.

164 Wyndham recalled later that he had 'no doubt that at end of July 1903 [he] had ceased to be Lord M's private secretary. When I went to Kromdraai I think that I had ceased to be private secretary, but I can't swear to it.' Evidence, 21 May 1907, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.73/1907.
165 J.A. Smith, John Buchan, 122.
166 See the sentiments in Hugh Wyndham to Constance Leconfield, 29 July 1905 and 4 Aug 1905, WSRO: PHA. Also see R.H. Brand (ed.), The Letters of John Dove, pp 19 and 133.
167 As quoted by J.A. Smith, John Buchan, pp 125-6.
168 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
170 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Maxse, 15 Dec 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
CHAPTER THREE
‘Wyndhamsdorp’: Kromdraai, Standerton District, 1903-1914

‘Plain living & high thinking reigns – breakfast 7 dinner 12 high tea 6.’
Geoffrey Robinson on life at Kromdraai, 20 May 1904 1

1. Acquisition of Kromdraai

Return migration was the farthest thing from Hugh’s mind in 1903 and the years immediately after. He was, unlike most of the rest of Milner’s staff, independent financially and had always planned to launch himself into South African politics. Deciding to establish himself on the platteland, Wyndham applied in 1903 to the Commissioner of Crown Lands of the Transvaal to have a farm allotted to him.2 While still at the High Commissioner’s Office, he received a letter from H.C. Lister, the Recorder of Crown Lands furnishing him with the particulars of Kromdraai (Table 3.1), a farm recently lost by its pre-war owner, L.J. Erasmus, and transferred to the Transvaal government on 6 February 1903.3 Lister painted Kromdraai as an attractive proposition. Although the place was some eight kilometres southeast of Standerton by a road which was good in parts only and there was not much water, merely sufficient for stock, the farm could be transformed. Wells and tanks could be constructed easily, making practically all the land cultivatable. Kromdraai was also on the main railway line between Johannesburg and the colony of Natal, and with its own siding. As importantly, the district had a healthy climate, something which suited Wyndham, both for his personal health as well as for the horses he proposed to breed.4 The district had in fact been earmarked for horse breeding and the experimental farm and horse

---

1 Diary, 20 May 1904, BLO: Ms Dawson 10.
2 Plaintiff’s Declaration, 13 Mar 1907, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907.
3 Secretary for Lands to Secretary to the Law Department, 1 June 1906, and H. Tennant, Secretary to the Law Department, to Secretary for Lands, 12 June 1906, NASAP: LD335, file AG637/03 Farm “Kromdraai” District Standerton.
4 H.C. Lister to Hugh Wyndham, 10 Jul 1903, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.7/1907; and John Dove to Mrs Pinching, 18 Sep 1907, in R.H. Brand (ed), The Letters of John Dove (London 1938), pp 4-6.
depot at Beginsel, started by the War Office under the command of a Captain Charles Blackburne, was only fifteen kilometres away.\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Variable</strong></th>
<th><strong>Amount</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental, if leased @ 4%</td>
<td>£ 224-12-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase by instalment @ 5.75%</td>
<td>£ 224-17-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Terms of acquisition for Kromdraai, District of Standerton
(Source: Recorder of Crown Lands to Hugh Wyndham, 10 Jul 1903, TAD: ZTPD 5/634, f.73/1907.)

This, as it was clearly meant, drew Wyndham’s interest. He duly applied for and acquired the lease on 17 August 1903. John Buchan, who knew the farm,\(^6\) thought these fertile grassy plains at an elevation of over 1500 metres ‘magnificent breezy upland country.’\(^7\) To John Dove, another of Milner’s Kindergartners, they were ‘ugly but bracing and cold: the place for sheep and healthy children.’\(^8\) The Bishop of Pretoria, there in May 1905 for two confirmation services, thought Standerton ‘not a very interesting spot.’\(^9\) Yet here Wyndham would seat himself, establish a stud, plant crops, raise cattle and sheep and perhaps a family, and launch himself into Transvaal politics.\(^10\)

Some 1500 morgen in extent, Kromdraai was valued at £5 615 and leased to Wyndham under the Settlers’ Ordinance for £224-12-0 per year.\(^11\)

---

5. Director of Agriculture, Transvaal to Assistant Private Secretary to Governor, Transvaal, 30 Oct 1902, BPP: Cd.1463-1903. Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa, No.13; and Onslow to Milner, 7 Mar 1903, NASAP: GOV 490, file PS129/1 Purchases of Horses, Milner to Chamberlain, 17 Jul 1903, NASAP: GOV 498, file PS129 Stud Farms.


10. Wyndham, like the Marquess of Graham, who in 1903 was also in the market for a farm in the region of £6,000, were attractive propositions: they were of that ‘superior class’ Milner hoped to draw. They had independent finance and had been exposed to progressive farming methods in Britain. See Milner to Hanbury Williams, 27 Dec 1900 in C. Headlam (ed.), *Milner Papers, II: South Africa 1899-1905* (London 1933), pp 242-43; and W. R. Ball, Land and Estate Agent, to Michell, 8 Jan.1903, NASAC: Sir Lewis Michell Papers, vol 1A; as well as Wyndham’s evidence in his claim for damages against Wallach’s Printing and Publishing Company, NASAP : ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907.

11. H.C. Lister to Hugh Wyndham, High Commissioner’s Office, 10 Jul 1903, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.7/1907; Secretary for Lands to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 Oct 1906, NASAP: LD1343, file AG4647/06 Proposed purchase by Hon Hugh Wyndham of the farm “Kromdraai” No. 76 Standerton.
alienated for the establishment of a railway station, made transport extremely convenient to Kromdraai's new owner, who would be able to sell produce to easier markets and in turn acquire goods from the towns and imports through Durban more readily. This was of the utmost importance to a progressive farmer and very much in line with Milner's view of the interrelationship between railway and agriculture in the development of town and countryside.12 This was policy which Wyndham internalised. New markets, resulting from both better transport and the growth of the towns, brought wealth to the platteland and changed the structure of the agricultural sector. Farmers near railway lines, who had only produced for own consumption, now marketed their produce to the towns and even 'began to glimpse an overseas market within their reach.'13 Commercial farming became more established and the impact of international markets pushed the prices of land up rapidly.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>£5 615</td>
<td>Valuation when Wyndham acquired a lease for the farm, 1500 morgen</td>
<td>NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.7/1907; and NASAP: LD1343, file AG4647/06.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>£4418.6.4</td>
<td>Wyndham’s purchase, being the balance of the price, 1486 morgen</td>
<td>NASAP: URU 215, Minister’s Minute (f.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920?</td>
<td>£?</td>
<td>Wyndham’s sale price</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>£4500</td>
<td>Option to buy a portion of the farm, 162 morgen</td>
<td>NASAP: LDE 2103, file 43903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Land values, Kromdraai farm, No.76, District of Standerton, 1903-1961

The Central Land Board approved Wyndham’s application for the farm at the end of July 1903. He was exempted from the residential clauses of the Settlers' Ordinance subject to his placing a 'white representative', to be approved by the Commissioner of Lands, on the farm. Wyndham employed Robert Ruxton as his agent on Kromdraai, whom the

Commissioner's duly approved.\textsuperscript{15} Ruxton, an efficient, robust Scot from Aberdeenshire, was the first of a succession of agents, and entered Wyndham's service at the age of forty-one.\textsuperscript{16} This allowed Wyndham to travel, at times for extended periods, away from Kromdraai, happy in the knowledge that the farm was in capable hands, probably more capable than his own, and giving him the freedom to pursue diverse pleasures further afield.\textsuperscript{17}

Wyndham acquired Kromdraai some three decades after the closing of the frontier and the settling of the Transvaal highveld. Yet tenure was still contested in some areas, both by Africans, who had been dispossessed during the land wars of the nineteenth century, and also by the Boers, whose isolation and relative tranquillity had been disturbed by the 'rush of immigrants and capital' to Johannesburg and then, following the political upheavals this brought on the Rand, by the ripples of change that spread out into the countryside.\textsuperscript{18} 'No one,' warns Francis Wilson, 'who wishes to understand the history of South Africa in the century that followed the discovery of diamonds can ignore the platteland', which was home for most of the peoples of South Africa, and it was here that the central theme of South African history – 'the interaction between people of diverse origins, languages, technologies, ideologies, and social systems' – played out.\textsuperscript{19} The farms and farm land was one of the key zones for this interaction.

The early history of Standerton district was shaped by conflicts between Boers and local African polities over land and labour, which culminated by 1883 in the defeat of the last independent chiefdoms in the area. The Boers, pushing the remaining Africans into locations, occupied the land and soon their society stratified into landowners and

\textsuperscript{15} H.C. Lister to Hugh Wyndham, 31 Jul 1903, and extract from the Executive's Council Resolution No 690 of 17 Aug 1903; Lister to Wyndham, 31 Aug 1903; and handwritten note by Wyndham, 30 Sep 1903, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.73/1907.

\textsuperscript{16} Estate of the late Robert Ruxton, NASAP: MHG 49708.

\textsuperscript{17} Most aristocrats found their business affairs irksome and fatiguing. See also D. Cannadine, \textit{The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy}, p 490 et seq. Craig Sellar battled with the household 'troubles' when they shared accommodation in Johannesburg. Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.

\textsuperscript{18} Francis Wilson, 'Farming, 1866-1966', p 114.

\textsuperscript{19} Francis Wilson, 'Farming, 1866-1966', p 104.
bywonders.\textsuperscript{20} The problems presented by foreign agricultural competition, labour shortages and drought and pestilence culminated in the Anglo-Boer War and the social dislocation associated with the farm burning, the movement of men on commando and the herding and concentrating of refugees and enemy civilians in camps.\textsuperscript{21} The war, as Selborne noted, reduced the average farmer 'from lazy affluence to extreme poverty and misery.'\textsuperscript{22} However several wealthy, influential Boers remained relatively untouched. Of these, Louis Botha (1862-1919) was primus inter pares. Although his war losses may not have been inconsiderable, Botha commanded sufficient credit to reorganise his farming activities, which saw, too, the move of the Botha family to Standerton, where they established themselves on Rusthof, a farm two halts down the railroad from Kromdraai.\textsuperscript{23}

The five years following the war were favourable to farming and Louis Botha, as his biographer noted, used to praise Milner for his support of agriculture.\textsuperscript{24} State aid was rolled out on a large scale to transform agriculture into progressive and surplus-producing farming.\textsuperscript{25} A scientifically-geared Department of Agriculture, under F.B.Smith, was established with directorates for surveys, irrigation, forestry, entomology, veterinary services, agrostology and botany. Experts and specialists were appointed and placed at the government experimental farms to facilitate the provision of scientific advice to the farming community. Laboratories were established to combat animal sicknesses and plagues, where chemical and bacteriological research took place.\textsuperscript{26}

In 1906, Wyndham hoped to extend his hold on Kromdraai. Erasmus, the previous owner, who had retained certain mineral rights, was unable to make the annual payments,

\textsuperscript{21} Wilson, ‘Farming, 1866-1966’, pp 115-17, 126; and T. Pakenham, \textit{The Boer War} (London 1995), chapters 37 to 41.
\textsuperscript{22} Lord Selborne to Joseph Chamberlain, 24 Feb 1908, in D.G. Boyce (ed.), \textit{The Crisis of British Power}, p 344.
\textsuperscript{24} F.V. Engelenburg, \textit{Botha}, p 117.
\textsuperscript{25} R. Morrell, ‘Competition and Cooperation in Middelburg, 1900-1930’ in Beinart et al, \textit{Putting a Plough to the Ground}, p 377.
lost these on the 31 May 1906 and, in that October, Wyndham applied to relinquish his farming license and to be allowed to purchase the land outright under section 5 of the Crown land Disposal Ordinance of 1903. This was no simple matter, however, and the Executive Council of the Transvaal Colony assented on condition that there was no legal obstacle. The Commissioner of Lands was willing to accept the surrender of the licence and to dispose of Kromdraai to Wyndham under the Crown Land Disposal Ordinance; while Hugh undertook not to claim compensation for the improvements he made. Yet, when the matter was referred to the Attorney's General's Office in Pretoria, the latter opined that the arrangement was 'entirely contrary to the spirit' of the legislation. The legal process extended over several years and only in 1914 did Wyndham receive a Crown Grant together with mineral rights at the cost of £4418.6.4, which was the balance of the purchase price.

2. Farm administration

Wyndham now owned land. Yet much work was required and a house, commensurate with his perceived status had to be built. He had the resources and was spurred on to do so as a visible means of confirming his status as a member of the local elite and, he hoped, if he maintained a presence on the farm and spent money in the district, he would secure the farming vote when the Transvaal received responsible government.

Wyndham and Ruxton set about the task of transforming Kromdraai in earnest. Wyndham was abroad when he heard of the allotment to him of Kromdraai and building commenced while he was still in England. He spent his first week on the farm in March

---

27 Secretary for Lands to Secretary to the Law Department, 1 June 1906, and H. Tennant, Secretary to the Law Department, to Secretary for Lands, 12 June 1906, NASAP: LD335, file AG637/03 Farm “Kromdraai” District Standerton.

28 Secretary for Lands to Secretary to the Law Department, 16 Oct 1906, NASAP: LD1343, file AG4647/06 Proposed purchase by Hon Hugh Wyndham of the farm “Kromdraai” No. 76 Standerton.

29 E.L. Matthews to Secretary to the Law Department, 18 Oct 1906, NASAP: LD1343, file AG4647/06 Proposed purchase by Hon Hugh Wyndham of the farm “Kromdraai” No. 76 Standerton.

30 Ministers' Minute 3448, 1914, NASAP: URU215.

31 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.

32 Lister to Wyndham, 31 Aug 1903; and handwritten note, by 'HAW', 30 Sep 1903, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.73/1907.
1904, indicating that the house was now habitable, although Robinson, who spent a weekend at Kromdraai in May 1904, thought the house a 'small ugly stone affair.'

Ruxton, of course, was not without assistance. Wyndham had to court labour, which in 1904, due to the post-war resettlement and the draw of the mines, was scarce. Yet, due to his command over land, Wyndham seemingly had few difficulties. Away from the house the servants had their quarters. In May 1904, he announced that he had just 'obtained 2 native families to come & squat on the farm & work' for him. Their first act was to erect dwellings: 'one out of turf sods with a rush roof, which looks very appropriate - the other family, however, very proudly brought along with them some corrugated iron, which I fear will result in a fearful eye sore being erected.' Africans did not enter Wyndham's daily life except as servants or labourers. They were mostly perceived in their occupational role, a one-dimensional perception that denied their human feelings and needs and their having thoughts and opinions.

The recreation of Kromdraai was gradual and eventually profound. In Wyndham's circle, ownership of a country house was still an essential qualification for membership of the local elite and to join their number he had to establish at Kromdraai an outward symbol of his dignity and authority. He needed a device for living the life of an English country gentleman, even if in another part of the world, and this he created as the 'small ugly stone affair' grew into a village-like farmstead. A collection of stables, service buildings and servants' quarters grew around the residence. This complex or 'Wyndhamsdorp' as he referred to it in several letters to his mother - represented a sort

Diary, 21 May 1904, BLO: Ms Dawson 10.


Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1904, WSRO: PHA.


This is discussed in I. van der Waag, 'Hugh Wyndham, Transvaal Politics and the Attempt to Create an English Country Seat in South Africa, 1901-14', Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History 31(2) May 2003.
of village.38 The service buildings included an electric plant – installed in July 1905, the workings of which ‘much engrossed’ him39 – stables, laundry, dairy, barn and stores to supply the household and provide transport, repairs, food and drink. These ancillary buildings took up a significant amount of the total cost of house building and maintenance.40 The pursuit of pleasure, giving of hospitality and proclamation of importance did not come cheaply.

A new settler with independent finance, Wyndham was one of the first in the district to undertake large-scale agricultural operations. Kromdraai was fenced, fields were put under crops and stock was acquired. His wealth allowed him to sell his first crop of oat hay at three pennies below his competitors and still ‘pay very well.’41 Oblivious to the plight of Standerton’s poor, he farmed on a prodigious scale and Kromdraai was transformed into a showplace of progressive agriculture. He invested capital. The estate was developed in several stages, at a cost of some £43,000, ‘on bare veldt’, and inhabited in a manner that would impress visitors.42 Roads were diverted, sometimes to run closer to the railway line, sometimes to open up the prospect.43 When neighbours objected Wyndham simply remarked that ‘the whole thing [would] blow over.’44 He was playing the lord of the manor. His dealings were often high-handed and he did not bother to nurture friendship with people from ‘the backveldt’, whom he, in any case, believed should be excluded from the suffrage: bywoners and carpetbaggers were ‘uninteresting’, ‘ignorant’ and ‘dependant.’

Wyndham seemingly could not be bothered with the day-to-day running of Kromdraai. The allotment of the farm had been approved by the Central Land Board with exemption from the residential clauses of the Settlers’ Ordinance and in Ruxton, Spiller and

---

38 See, for example, Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA. See also Trapido, ‘Landlord and tenant’, pp 26-57, for a good introduction to rural class relations in colonial Transvaal.
39 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Jul 1905 and 29 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
40 In May 1904, he wrote to his mother that he was ‘very busy here just now, as [he was] now taking steps to get [his] stables & buildings up, & [was] employed in marking out the ground.’ Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 May 1904, WSRO: PHA.
41 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Mar 1904, and 7 May 1904, WSRO: PHA.
42 See Wyndham’s evidence in his case against Wallach’s printing company, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907; Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 March and 9 June 1906, WSRO: PHA.
43 Robert Ruxton to Secretary for Lands, 2 Dec 1904, Secretary for Public Works to Robert Ruxton, 20 Dec 1904, NASAP: PWD, Box 272, file 6718/04 Lands Mr Ruxton.
J. de Mestre, he found a succession of competent and honest agents. Spiller was perhaps too efficient. Their thoroughness enabled Wyndham to pursue interests that drew him away, sometimes at great distance, from Kromdraai: to Johannesburg for politicking, to Durban for the races, for extended social flits across the Transvaal or ‘stamping the country a good deal’ in anticipation of the 1907 election.45 His correspondence is full of such references.46 Poorer farmers lived a vastly different life. The Adelaide-born poet and farmer, Leonard Flemming, who took up his ‘thousand acres of treeless, birdless veld’ in the Orange River Colony in 1903, ‘had no manager, no assistant, no one here to advise me or to relieve me.’47

3. Farming: production and destruction

Yet this is not to say that Wyndham took no interest in Kromdraai. A visitor in 1910 described him as ‘wildly energetic’, planting trees all the afternoon while his guests trailed after him with watering pots.48 The creation of an English landscape was a major interest. English-style gardens and orchards were laid out. During her visits, his mother, an avid gardener, who had carried out imaginative plantings in Petworth Park, set up a garden of bushy-green privets.49 Possibly at her prompting Wyndham experimented with horticulture and set out avenues of trees and planted an orchard in front of the house together with ‘a lot of other trees besides.’ In June 1906 he planted 470 fruit trees and a month later ‘got in’ some oaks, walnuts and mulberries.50 These were later joined by

44 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Jan 1904 and 4 Aug. 1905, WSRO: PHA.
45 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Sep 1905 and 21 Jul 1906, WSRO: PHA.
46 See, for example, Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Mar 1904, WSRO: PHA (‘I have had a busy week attending the Potchefstroom Agricultural Show, & going over the Govt Experimental farm there’); Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1904, WSRO: PHA (‘I came up here [Parktown, Johannesburg] for a few days on Sunday...’); Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA (‘Tomorrow afternoon I go down to Natal to look at some mares, & again next Saturday, so I shall be travelling a good deal next week’); and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Jun 1906, WSRO: PHA (‘I went over to Pretoria on Friday to lunch with the FitzClarences’).
50 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 June 1906, 15 Jul 1906 and 21 July 1906, PHA, WSRO.
some elms. 51 Many of the saplings were acquired from the government experimental farm at Potchefstroom, which Hugh visited for the first time in March 1904 and thought ‘a most interesting place.’ 52

However Wyndham, in search of livestock, was less impressed with the Agricultural Show, which he attended during that same visit to Potchefstroom. This, he reckoned, ‘absolutely rotten, except for the Government exhibition.’ 53 His extensive social and political connections were now worked and, in particular, his contacts in the Transvaal Agriculture Department. In July 1904, its director, F.B. Smith, facilitated access to the cattle herds of the Repatriation Department, which were running in the Bushveld along the Crocodile River. Reckoned the best Afrikander cattle in colony, Smith suggested that Wyndham write to Hughes, the Secretary Repatriation Department and with whom Wyndham was clearly familiar, and that he arrange with him that he ‘have the offer of a certain number of the best of these animals before the herd is dispersed.’ 54

Yet Hugh’s main focus at Kromdraai was his stud. His first recorded social activity in Standerton was attendance of a race meeting there in March 1904. 55 He enjoyed the pleasures of the racecourse (he took visitors to Kromdraai regularly through to Johannesburg ‘for more races’ 56) and the stud at Kromdraai and the improvement of his breeds undoubtedly took much of his time. Judging from his correspondence with his mother, he bought several mares, mostly from Natal, between 1904 and 1908. 57 Within a few years his stud was self-sustaining. On his return from Britain in November 1907, for example, he ‘found 20 foals, all of them looking well & prosperous.’ 58 Many horses were named after members of the family or visitors to Kromdraai. 59

Wyndham was soon a horse breeder of some repute in the Transvaal. In 1906 his chestnut stallion, Narhillah, drew the attention of correspondents in the Transvaal

51 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
52 Hugh Wyndham to his mother, Lady Leconfield, 25 Mar 1904, WSRO: PHA.
53 Hugh Wyndham to his mother, Lady Leconfield, 25 Mar 1904, WSRO: PHA.
54 F.B. Smith to Hugh Wyndham, 15 Jul 1904, NASAP: TAD 417, file G1248 Hugh Wyndham re Cattle.
55 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Mar 1904, WSRO: PHA.
56 Rachel Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 3 Oct 1910, HHA 2/5/2.
57 See for example Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1905 and 7 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
58 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
Agricultural Journal — a vehicle of the Agriculture Department to keep farmers abreast with agricultural developments — and Wyndham provided photographs as well as thorough details of the horse’s breeding.\(^{60}\) He made a scientific study of their pedigrees and monitored the breeding programmes closely, and this led to the publication in 1924 of his early history of the thoroughbred horse in South Africa.\(^{61}\)

His horses were also doing well on the racecourse. One of his mares finished second in one of the principal handicaps in Durban in July 1905. In fact Hugh was confident that ‘she would have won had she been properly handled.’\(^{62}\) From this point he raced horses regularly, chiefly in Durban and Johannesburg. On Saturday, 13 March 1909, he won a race with a two-year old, which had been bred on Kromdraai.\(^{63}\) That April he won two races with two horses bred on Kromdraai, which ‘pleased [him] very much’\(^{64}\): one with Adair, a two-year-old, and another horse, Courtier, came in second. Buyers were in the market and Hugh established a further stream of income from the sale of his horses. Sir George Farrar was after buying Vivandière, who ‘wasn’t well so did nothing at the races’, and other interests wanted Courtier and Adair, after their good starts.\(^{65}\) And, in the same month, Lord Selborne bought Coke of Norfolk as a shooting pony.\(^{66}\) Such sales also made ‘room for the ones coming on.’\(^{67}\)

---

\(^{59}\) See, for example, references to horses named Rachel, Miss Nan and Lady Mabel in Rachel Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 3 Oct 1910, HHA 2/5/2.

\(^{60}\) Smith to Wyndham, 8 May 1906, Wyndham to Smith, 11 May 1906, Director of Agriculture to Editor Agricultural Journal, 11 May 1906, and Smith to Wyndham, 15 May 1906, NASAP: TAD 574, file G1517/06 The Hon Hugh A. Wyndham Application for Africander Cattle & miscellaneous correspondence. In 1909 Wyndham offered the horse to the Transvaal government, but the offer was turned down. Botha, both prime minister and minister of agriculture, thought the price too high and the animal too old. Smith to Hugh Wyndham, 7 Dec 1909, NASAP: TAD 574, file G1517/06 The Hon Hugh A. Wyndham Application for Africander Cattle & miscellaneous correspondence.


\(^{62}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.

\(^{63}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Mar 1909, WSRO: PHA.

\(^{64}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.

\(^{65}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.

\(^{66}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.

\(^{67}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
Wyndham had for some time wanted to establish a flock at Kromdraai (Smith had been unable to assist him in 1904\textsuperscript{68}). This he achieved in 1906.\textsuperscript{69} Wyndham established a syndicate with Lionel Phillips, Thomas Cullinan, and his neighbours at Kromdraai, the Rogers brothers and together they imported, through ‘The South African Pastoralists’, an agricultural agency run by Alfred Dufrayer and Dalgety Campbell,\textsuperscript{70} 500 high-quality merinos from Australia. Wyndham had hoped that the Transvaal government would commit to a further 500.\textsuperscript{71} However the Selborne administration was for several reasons uninterested.

In the first place, several civil servants had taken a dislike to Dufrayer, who had much to their irritation approached them repeatedly in the past.\textsuperscript{72} Smith, irate, noted that Dufrayer, like other sheep importers, had to learn ‘to live by his wits.’\textsuperscript{73} The government plainly could not give preference to a particular agent and, in any case, as far as he was concerned, it was better for the colony if private firms took the matter up and the further growth in the sheep industry was left to private enterprise.\textsuperscript{74} Not satisfied at the rebuff of his agent, Wyndham wrote to Lord Selborne directly, informing the governor of their plan to import the merinos and inviting the government to join the syndicate. He also invited Selborne to attend the shearing exhibition to be held at Kromdraai after the sheep had arrived and recovered from the journey.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{68} F.B. Smith to Hugh Wyndham, 15 Jul 1904, NASAP: TAD 417, file G1248 Hugh Wyndham re Cattle.
\textsuperscript{69} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA - 'I am making a start with sheep now, and am importing a few really good ones from Australia, which I hope will do well, & form the foundation of a good flock.'
\textsuperscript{70} Dougal Malcolm to F.B. Smith, 8 Aug 1906, NASAP: TAD 619, file G2500/06 Mr Dufrayer re Interview with Lord Selborne re Scheme. See also D.G. Dalgety Campbell to Lord Selborne, 31 Aug 1906, NASAP: GOV 931, file PS8/19/06 DGV Dalgety Campbell Importation of Sheep.
\textsuperscript{71} Hugh Wyndham to Lord Selborne, 24 Aug 1906, NASAP: TAD 619, file G2500/06 Mr Dufrayer re Interview with Lord Selborne re Scheme. Reference to Lionel Phillips and Thomas Cullinan is made in Dufrayer to P.V.S., Veterinary Department, Pretoria, 19 Oct 1906, NASAP: TAD 134, file A2293/06 Dufrayer, Johannesburg re Importation of sheep from Australia.
\textsuperscript{72} See for example the correspondence on NASAP: TAD 611, file G2402/06 Supply of livestock from A.H. Dufrayer Australia.
\textsuperscript{73} F.B. Smith to Malcolm, 10 Aug 1906, NASAP: TAD 619, file G2500/06 Mr Dufrayer re Interview with Lord Selborne re Scheme.
\textsuperscript{74} F.B. Smith to Malcolm, 10 Aug 1906, NASAP: TAD 619, file G2500/06 Mr Dufrayer re Interview with Lord Selborne re Scheme.
\textsuperscript{75} Hugh Wyndham to Lord Selborne, 24 Aug 1906, NASAP: TAD 619, file G2500/06 Mr Dufrayer re Interview with Lord Selborne re Scheme.
Jack Lyttelton, Selborne’s private secretary and Hugh’s friend, referred Wyndham’s letter to the Agriculture Department for comment. The Director’s response was predictable. Smith advised that it would not be wise to join the syndicate. Yet, to mollify the farmers purchasing the sheep he arranged for a reduction of half the railway rates from the coast to Kromdraai and, possibly to satisfy Wyndham, Smith advised Selborne to support the exhibition as ‘the farmers would appreciate such an action very greatly, and I do not think Mr Campbell even if he so desired could make unfair capital out of it.’ And herein lay a second reason for governmental caginess. Both Wyndham and Campbell intended standing in the forthcoming Transvaal election. Wyndham had not as yet entered the lists but Campbell had informed Smith that he intended contesting a constituency on behalf of the Progressives.

Agricultural politics had changed entirely over the two years since Smith had assisted Wyndham with the acquisition of cattle. Now, simply stated, the Selborne administration could not associate too closely with the ‘British sector’ of the farming community. With the Transvaal government seemingly less co-operative, Selborne was ‘accused in some quarters of being a Pro-Boer.’ But he had little choice. Wyndham’s stress that the government’s share in the merinos not ‘fall into bad hands’, but sell only ‘to approved and progressive [i.e. British] farmers’ naturally had no appeal. Sale by private treaty and not by public auction would open Selborne and his administration to severe criticism and alienate the Dutch population.

---

76 J.C. Lyttleton to F.B. Smith, 25 Aug 1906, NASAP: GOY 1025, file PS73/14/06 Stock Importation of Sheep Hon Hugh Wyndham.
77 F.B. Smith to Lord Selborne, 27 Aug 1906, NASAP: GOV 931, file PS8/19/06 DGV Dalgety Campbell Importation of Sheep; and handwritten note by Lord Selborne, 29 Aug 1906, NASAP: GOV 1025, file PS73/14/06 Stock Importation of Sheep Hon Hugh Wyndham.
78 F.B. Smith to Lord Selborne, 27 Aug 1906, NASAP: GOV 931, file PS8/19/06 DGV Dalgety Campbell Importation of Sheep.
79 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1905, WSRO: PHA.
The sheep (twenty percent were lost on the voyage) were inspected at Durban and then again at Volksrust and landed on Kromdraai during the middle of November 1906. Wyndham was clearly pleased with the undertaking. The sheep, he told his mother, seemed ‘really ... a very good lot’; and he and his labourers starting shearing on November 19 with new machine shearers specially-imported. The ‘big demonstration’ – his shearing exhibition – was held on Wednesday, 21 November and Wyndham hoped for ‘a great success.’ He expected between five and six hundred people and proposed to make his first attempt at a short oration in Dutch: ‘a grand opportunity to do a little quiet politics.’ The exhibition went off very well, although ‘a shower in the afternoon rather brought it to a premature end.’ However the machine shearers worked well and impressed everybody present. The clip kept Kromdraai a buzz for the rest of the week. The result was a satisfactory 14 bales from about 350 sheep.

Wyndham was broadcasting his success and leadership as a progressive farmer in the community. He clearly used the exhibition as an opportunity for political gain, although his legal team, who ‘earnestly scanned’ the corrupt practices act, were of the opinion that it would not lead to his being unseated if elected. His speech, focussed appropriately on husbandry, seemingly followed a line shown in the past by George Farrar. The farmers of Standerton were of course ‘above all things stock producers.’ Wyndham therefore emphasised the point that some £3,000,000 was spent annually in importing meat, which could be produced locally in a district like Standerton, which was ideally suited to stock farming. It was therefore important to increase stocks to supply the meat requirements of the colony. This he reasoned was a clear case for protection, which would break the cold storage rings which, he argued, had complete control and were ‘just as hurtful to the consumer as to the producer.’

Wyndham also wanted to diversify into pig farming in November 1906, and went to Potchefstroom to attend the sale of some government stock. Despite the rain, the crowd

81 Assistant Principal Veterinary Surgeon to Dufrayer, 22 Oct 1906, NASAP: TAD 134, file A2293/06 DuFrayer, Johannesburg re Importation of sheep from Australia; and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
82 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
83 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
84 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
85 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA.
'bid bravely' and the price proved 'quite prohibitive.' He also lagged behind in the change to intensive maize production. Maize, a traditional staple of African people, was South Africa's most important crop and South Africa produced 8.6 million bags (of 200 lb each) in 1911, with exports reaching record levels during the First World War. Yet the output varied greatly due to climatic conditions. No rain or too much rain brought instability and caused the prices to fluctuate dramatically. And, as Hugh no doubt saw, falling world prices meant ruin to the South African maize farmer. Wary of the vicissitudes of different crops, he diversified.

Although his first four years on Kromdraai were generally good, Wyndham faced the normal 'vicissitudes of agriculture' — drought, horse-sickness, locusts, redwater, scab, rinderpest, large price fluctuations. Water availability naturally dictated agricultural success to a large extent. The natural water supply on Kromdraai was not good. Sufficient at first for stock farming only, it prevented any ambition Wyndham might have had for the creation of an English wood. Good rains however fell, though sometimes late, and although good precipitation made the country 'look at its best', in 1904 he lost half of his potato crop due to excessive rain and this prevented him from making a profit that year. Too little rain was of course as bad.

This lack of predictability led Wyndham to tackle the problem of water supply in earnest during the winter of 1906. With the help of a diviner, he sank another bore hole.

---

86 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA.
87 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906 and 19 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
88 D. Hobart Houghton, The South African Economy, pp 50-51. The early frost in 1906 killed most of the crops, including half of the maize crop. See Hugh Wyndham to his mother, Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1906 and 22 Apr 1906, WSRO: PHA.
89 See F. Wilson, 'Farming, 1866-1966', pp 115-17.
91 Hugh Wyndham to his mother, Lady Leconfield, 25 Mar 1904, WSRO: PHA.
92 He complained of this to his sister just six months after the good March rains. 'We are terribly short of rain here, as we have had none up to the present, & so are quite six weeks behind hand. All farming operations are practically at a standstill, & a great deal of time is being wasted. None of the boers have been able to do any ploughing at all up to date, & though I have managed to get some done with my two spans of mules, we have been obliged to give it up as a bad job.' Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Oct 1904, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50. In 1905 the summer rains were late again ('another fortnight’s drought, & I should have exhausted all my feed' Hugh Wyndham to Constance Leconfield, 11 Nov 1905, WSRO: PHA.) and in mid-1906 Wyndham employed two labourers, 'a water cart, and 4 mules doing nothing else than water trees, which is a serious business but which will have to go on until the rain comes.' Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Aug 1906, WSRO: PHA.
This provided 'a fair amount of water in a convenient place' and this was developed to include a windpump and cement dam. From here much of Kromdraai was irrigated and the scheme most impressed the Secretary of the Irrigation Commission who visited the farm in November 1906. The summer rains that followed were 'splendid.' Wyndham registered five inches that October, which represented 'quite the best beginning to a season' he had experienced in South Africa. He had fortunately 'got over 40 acres of seed in' by the time the rains fell and, as he noted to his mother, the lovely summer days that followed made everything, including her privets, grow visibly. The magnificent rains of that summer filled the dams on Kromdraai and elsewhere, providing some relief to farmers who were living mainly on overdraft. Such rain, as the Bishop of Pretoria noted to a cleric in Britain, was 'better than any boom.' And, of course, there were political considerations too. Heat waves and late rains meant a good deal of trouble for a government intent on bolstering of the farming sector, and keeping the Dutch farmers content and migrant Britons on the platteland.

Wyndham planned to build another dam during the winter of 1909 with a view to bringing a further 100 acres under irrigation. Yet, while he could, to some extent, manage the water supply and solve the problems associated with drought, other pestilence visited Kromdraai over which he had less control. In 1905 and 1907 the Transvaal was devastated by enormous swarms of locusts. In 1905 the entire Standerton district was ravaged. A progressive farmer and no doubt wanting to contribute to the base of scientific knowledge, Wyndham had Ruxton record 'the facts' appertaining to the visitations on Kromdraai and forwarded these to the Government Entomologist for study purposes. The standard action was the making of fires and beating of tomtoms. The

---
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102 Diary, 22 March 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.
next locust plague (as 'thick as hail again'\textsuperscript{103}) struck in March 1907. Wyndham noted that 'motoring between Johannesburg & Vereeniging all the crops have been entirely destroyed, & the country looks most depressing.'\textsuperscript{104}

All in all, farming throughout the Transvaal was in rather a bad way all through 1907. In addition to the 'phenomenal flight of locusts, which [Hugh noted] happily [had] not yet visited Kromdraai', other pests and widespread animal diseases accompanied the onset of a depression. Horse sickness broke out in April, the Government studs losing several mares, and Kromdraai was saved only by the onset of the frost.\textsuperscript{105} Then there was concurrent blue tongue amongst the sheep\textsuperscript{106} and that November 'a new grub ... appeared to eat the mielies',\textsuperscript{107} which were under attack two years later by cut-worms and stalk-borers.\textsuperscript{108}

Wyndham's prize flock of merinos gave much concern too. Sheep diseases, which were of major concern to the government (the settlers simply would not remain on the land if their sheep kept on dying\textsuperscript{109}), struck farms across the Transvaal and Kromdraai was not immune. In July 1908 a number of merinos died mysteriously and, anxious to get to the bottom of the trouble, Wyndham approached the Principal Veterinary Surgeon in Pretoria. He again used influence to force action as the Principal Veterinary Surgeon immediately ordered the Government Veterinarian at Standerton, a certain Mr Tate, onto the case.\textsuperscript{110} Yet, despite all the precautions taken at Kromdraai and veterinary advice, the sickness continued. In March 1909 Tate was called out again. Several sheep had fallen lame with symptoms ranging from dullness and disinclination to walk to lying down and 'head shaking.' And Tate, considering the influx of dip into the lungs, was still at a loss.\textsuperscript{111} That July he was back at Kromdraai: the sheep were dying, all soon after the

\textsuperscript{103} Diary, 24 March 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.
\textsuperscript{104} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{105} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907 and 15 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{106} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{107} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{108} D. Gunn, Acting Entomologist to R. Ruxton, Kormdraai, 14 May 1909, NASAP: CEN 51, file EE. 3114 R. Ruxton Kromdraai St.
\textsuperscript{110} Principal Veterinary Surgeon to Government Veterinary Surgeon, Standerton 29 July 1908, NASAP: TAD 202, file A.4218 Hon H. Wyndham Kromdraai Sickness in Sheep.
\textsuperscript{111} Tate to Principal Veterinary Surgeon, 1 Mar 1909, and Principal Veterinary Surgeon to Tate, 2 Mar 1909, NASAP: TAD 202, file A.4218 Hon H. Wyndham Kromdraai Sickness in Sheep.
Tate remained 'at a loss, not having experience of an outbreak of this sort before to account for the cause of this disease.' The Government Bacteriologist at Onderstepoort, to whom the cases were referred, eventually diagnosed 'Gouw-ziekte.' Yet, as research into this disease was continuing, he, too, was unable to provide definite instructions for treatment, other than to keep the lambs stabled. The stabling of the lambs and the substitution of easily digested foods brought a decrease in mortality. By August 1909 no further deaths occurred. However, as Veterinary Surgeon Tate noted, domestic animals were sometimes poisoned when farmers or their agents had had a row with local Africans and this, seemingly, was a possibility he did not want to exclude.

Although absent from Kromdraai for long periods, Hugh enjoyed farming and, it would seem, talk to fellow farmers. Kromdraai was now also a model estate and Wyndham a landowner of repute. At the Johannesburg Show, in May 1907, one of his thoroughbred stallions, Narhillah, took third prize, while the Kromdraai Stud also took second and third prizes for thoroughbred mares, and second prize for a Merino ewe. Other successes followed regularly. Neighbouring farmers visited Kromdraai to observe new farming methods and prospective farmers, such as 'young Philips (Lionel Philips' son)', came 'armed with a notebook', to observe, learn and emulate.
4. County House living and the politics of patronage

Life at Kromdraai was mostly busy. Between Hugh’s interests further afield, volunteer camps, the races and the agricultural shows, he did a large amount of entertaining. Yet this was not always so. Out on the highveld, some 160 kilometres from Johannesburg, Wyndham initially felt cut off from society and with little access to fashionable society and ‘a farmhouse on the veldt’, as he noted to his mother was ‘not a place to pick up political information’. He would have to establish Kromdraai as a centre of hospitality, useful for the making of political alliances, and providing him with the right kind of people to talk to and play with.

Kromdraai was gradually transformed from an isolated cottage into a centre of hospitality. Wyndham’s letters show, quite clearly, that he also liked to entertain ‘interesting’ people, mostly the working of business and political connections, sometimes met on one of the return voyages, though often reinforced through Kindergarten and family ties. Milner put off his May 1904 visit ‘owing to the stress of work’: an opportunity missed that was ‘never easy to say when it [would] occur again’. Lord Methuen visited Kromdraai in April 1909: Hugh thought him restless (‘We almost ran round the place, & then he hurried away’). Wyndham also received fellow kindergarteners (Geoffrey Robinson stayed at Kromdraai after Whitsuntide 1904) as well as members of Lord Selborne’s staff: Jack Lyttelton, Selborne’s ADC, first visited Kromdraai in 1905 and occasionally thereafter: Lyttelton and his mother, Lady Cobham, stayed over in March 1907, on their way to Natal. Within months of this visit Wyndham was engaged to Jack Lyttelton’s sister. Truly, hospitality, as Lawrence Stone has observed, was ‘in part a function of sociability, in part a method of displaying generosity and authority, and in part a way to make useful political and matrimonial contacts.’ After his marriage on 25
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125 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
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February 1908, fresh connections were made, old ties reinforced and the flow of visitors to Kromdraai increased.

Visiting came essentially in two kinds: short-term, when hosts and guests were constantly together, and long-term, when life resumed its normal patterns and the guests were treated as part of the family. Since Transvaal roads were bad — muddy and rutted — and visitors, without motorised transport, could only travel at the speed of a horse-drawn carriage, guests from almost any distance often had to be put up for the night. Plenty of spare bedrooms were therefore needed as well as rooms for the servants of the visitors, and special space and kitchen staff to feed them all. Some guests even brought pet animals. Short-term visiting would be for the day — usually for dinner — or for one or two nights at most. The duration of the visit probably depended on the distance travelled and the status of the guest. On the whole, visits of between five days and a fortnight were limited to close friends or associates. It is very clear from Hugh’s correspondence that it was very common indeed for relatives and friends of the family to pay extended visits, lasting from a few weeks to a few months.

The development of ramified road and line networks and the arrival of the motor car on the highveld made Transvaal farms less isolated. Visitors to Kromdraai seemingly enjoyed the stay, although Robinson was somewhat taken by the ‘plain living.’ He and Hugh, having taken the evening train for Kromdraai, ‘dossed down’ in the Kromdraai station master’s spare room at 2.30 a.m. and started from the station on foot early the next morning. They were met two miles from their destination by a cape cart and taken to the house, which Robinson thought a ‘small ugly stone affair’, which at this time was inhabited by both the Ruxtons, Wyndham’s Scottish agent and his wife, as well as by Wyndham himself. Robinson recounts:

131 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Nov 1905, 8 Apr and 31 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA. June 1906 marked Wyndham’s first ‘attempt’ to journey from Johannesburg to Standerton by motor car.
132 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 July 1914, WSRO: PHA.
133 The process was mirrored in the United Kingdom. In January 1907 Lady Cobham and Frances Lyttelton were at a country house party at Petworth. The guests (‘a huge party 36 last night 40 tonight’) converged from all corners of the country, Lord and Lady Dartreys arriving from Ireland. This, as Lady Cobham noted, showed just how ‘the geography of country house visiting’ had grown as a result of the motor car. See Lady Cobham to Maud Lyttelton, 9 Jan 1907, HHA 2/23/1.
We walked & rode round the farm all morning, inspecting the crops & kaffir families. & walked north with a gun in the afternoon in search of Korhan but saw nothing except a small herd of springbucks & some geese far overhead. Back to haggle with one P.P.Grobler over a contract for well-sinking & to tea & sit over a fire & bed by 9.

Rachel Lyttelton, Hugh’s affectionate sister-in-law, on a visit in 1910, found the earthiness of farm life more attractive:

It has been great fun down here, the simple life with a vengeance. The day is filled up by going to see the orphans – the two little foals whose mothers are dead – watching the sheep shearing, which is rather fascinating tho’ smelly, looking at all the horses, & then returning to the house for rest & refreshment.

Long-term guests and members of the family in particular, were pressganged into assisting with chores. In October 1910 the house guests helped with the laying out of avenues of trees and gardens. Rachel Lyttelton records how she and the other guests, ‘trail[ed] after [Hugh] with watering pots, occasionally sitting down on the edge of the stoep to gossip generally about the Coke family or the Albus.

Although expensive, hospitality was a hallmark of a gentleman and, in any case visitors did help to break the tedium of country life. Hugh in March 1907, for example, very much looked forward to the visit by the Cobhams, which, as he noted to his mother, provided ‘a change from the ordinary society of Klip River Ward.’ He was seemingly in good form when surrounded by society and talk from home; and on one of her visits, Rachel Lyttelton noted that she, Hugh and Maud, ‘have goaks most of the time.’ Yet, not all visitors fell in with the daily routine. Guests requiring constant attention were less entertaining and at times Hugh was happy to ‘return to our normal existence, for which I shall not be sorry, after a fortnight’s ceaseless gaiety.’
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There were of course other diversions from the administrative responsibilities at Kromdraai. These included the local party circuit (less extensive than in England), the races and get-togethers in Johannesburg. Wyndham’s closest neighbour – on Kromdraai No 281 (the original farm had been subdivided before the war) – was appropriately a baronet: Major Sir William Codrington, Bart. Having served during the war with the imperial troops, Codrington remained in South Africa, acquired land and was detached until October 1906 to the newly-established Transvaal Volunteers. Codrington is however never mentioned in Hugh’s correspondence and his resignation from the Volunteers followed shortly after Hugh’s appointment as commander of the Eastern Rifles. And so it is possible that the two men did not get along. Codrington, who also laid out English-style gardens with quinces, raspberries and blackberries, gave up his lease at the end of 1910 and the holding passed to the Rogers brothers who had participated in Wyndham’s sheep importation syndicate four years earlier. There is no reference to Wyndham having anything to do with the Rogers on a social basis either. They, like the local Anglican priest, were ‘perhaps a trifle rough.’ Yet, his Afrikaans neighbours, sometimes accompanied by their daughters, were noted to visit him at Kromdraai, where they chewed the fat endlessly on his stoep in the vain hope that Hugh would take one as wife.

More alluring were the officers of the Imperial regiment garrisoned in Standerton. As visitors to Kromdraai, either socially or for military purposes, they provided Wyndham with continuous exposure to the British Army. Wyndham thought the presence of a cavalry regiment ‘splendid’: they would also provide equine conversation and riding

---
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144 This was related by Wyndham at a luncheon party in the House of Assembly. See Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 May 1916, WSRO: PHA.
companions. However, as the British garrison in South Africa was gradually reduced, so were some of the stations and Standerton was evacuated as a military base in February 1909.

When not occupied with administration, travelling and the giving and receiving of hospitality, the Wyndhams occupied their leisure hours in a variety of ways. The best recorded leisure activity of elites has been a variety of aesthetic and intellectual pursuits. Some collected - books, antiques or painting - while others devoted themselves to local antiquarian studies and patronised literary, philosophic and patriotic societies. Wyndham was a member of the St George's Society and the Transvaal Philosophical Society and, like his ancestors, he collected books (a library being 'an appendage which no man of rank or fortune can now be without, if he possesses or wishes to be thought to possess taste or genius') and, after his marriage, he, and Maud particularly, collected paintings and pieces of furniture for both Kromdraai and, from 1909, for their Parktown residence. They were also occupied with a good deal of reading. Hugh's reading was eclectic: he found a biography of Curzon 'absorbingly interesting' and he could 'hardly lay down' John Buchan's *Prester John*. He had a growing library of African books and a vast slave pamphlet collection, which Maud found 'wearying' and on one occasion declared an intention to dump it all on a London auction floor. Yet Maud enjoyed books and was always on the lookout for a good title and wished to fill her houses with 'books galore.'

---

145 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Jul 1905 and 30 Jul 1906, WSRO: PHA. The 19th Hussars were also stationed at Standerton from June 1902 to April 1903; and they were followed for short periods by various regiments of Infantry. A battalion of the Royal Warwickshire Regiment arrived at Standerton in July 1905 and No 10 Veterinary Section of the Army Veterinary Service was established there in the same year.
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Letter writing and the receiving of letters also took up much leisure time. A vast correspondence was kept up by the Wyndhams, with Maud doing most of the writing and receiving. Hugh dutifully wrote to his mother each week and received a letter from her on a weekly basis. Unlike Maud, however, he did not correspond regularly with his siblings and other relatives. Maud’s outgoing mail included two double sheets to one of her parents, addressed, it would seem, alternatively to her mother and father, a letter of equal length to her mother-in-law, and a number of letters to one or two of her siblings (normally her sisters Frances and Rachel), Hugh’s sisters Maud Yorke and Margaret Wyndham, and some Lyttelton cousins. She revelled in her correspondence. On one day in 1909 she received ‘12 mail letters wch was delightful’, including a letter later that afternoon. She was ‘always glad when the p.o. mislays them & they trickle in all day.’

Wyndham escaped to friends in Johannesburg or to Durban for the races when the tedium of Kromdraai and the Standerton circuit (even if less extensive than in England) became too much for him. The acquisition of a motor car facilitated this, although there is reference to the Wyndhams arriving very late at a dinner party given by Alec Balfour at the Carlton for ‘all the world & his wife’, as they ‘broke down motoring & came in after.’ Nonetheless, the state of Transvaal roads did little to stop their travelling. Racecourses, a priority in new colonies, drew them regularly, providing as they did an opportunity to monitor the stud’s performance and rub shoulders with their social equals in the privacy of their boxes. Moreover, the promotion of British sport and the creation of similar taste in amusement, according to Milner’s predecessor as High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson, would lead to ‘common sympathy in more important matters.’ Selborne, unlike Milner, attended the races regularly and in state, which Wyndham thought ‘a very good thing.’ Wyndham had his first victory on the turf in September 1905, which

---
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although 'a fluke ... was very satisfactory.' This was the British world as outdoor relief.

Without a professional occupation, Hugh had plenty of time on his hands. He, like his counterparts in England, found some contentment in the care of his labourers, the management (through an agent) of his estate, the pleasures of reading and collecting, some field sport, and the intimacies of family life, and the entertainment of friends. This still left him with a good deal of time for district and community work, which was expected of an English country gentleman.

5. District and community work

Hugh's ancestors had been very active in local politics and community work in the counties where they had interests and several had been lords lieutenant for Sussex (and later West Sussex). Hugh assumed a similar role in Standerton and the surrounding district. He headed first the Standerton Agricultural Association and then also became the burning light of the Transvaal Settlers' Union in addition to assuming duties as a justice of the peace and a member of the Standerton Liquor Licensing Court.

5.1 Agricultural associations and farming cooperatives

At the prompting of the state, the wealthy farmers of the district, both new settler and Boer notable, were at the forefront of agricultural cooperation. Their attempts saw gradual success as the farmers of the district 'became aware of the necessity for sinking their differences and developing organizations that could minister to their needs and

158 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA.
160 Hugh's brother Charles (3rd Lord Leconfield) was Lord Lieutenant for Sussex from 1917 to 1949 and before him several Wyndham, Seymour and Percy ancestors held the same position, commencing with the 4th earl of Northumberland in 1635.
articulate their interests.\textsuperscript{162} Two kinds of organizations were established. Firstly, there were farmers' associations, which were informal bodies and established by landed farmers and smallholders to address their common difficulties. Secondly, there were the cooperatives, which were statutory bodies instituted in terms of the \textit{Cooperative Agricultural Societies Act} of 1908 to provide services to farmers.\textsuperscript{163}

Although some landed farmers, particularly the very rich, shunned these organizations, Hugh Wyndham embraced the idea. He cherished his role of progressive farmer and the place Kromdraai enjoyed as a showplace of agricultural modernity, which he hoped would provide a platform to a political career. Although local agricultural shows were essentially non-political, they were also a high profile basis for Wyndham to exert influence. He helped form the Standerton Agricultural Association and soon assumed its leadership, organising an annual show. The 1906 event, which went down during the first week of April, was a great success. Wyndham not only received prizes for his horses and a first prize for hay, but there was 'a great crowd' and the Association 'cleared a profit of about £200.'\textsuperscript{164} This placed the Association on its legs financially and enabled better arrangements for the following year. In August 1906, Wyndham, at the head of a delegation of the Standerton Agricultural Association, petitioned that extra land be granted to allow for adequate agricultural shows.\textsuperscript{165} Twelve acres were granted to the Association within the area of the new recreation grounds for a term of 35 years at a lease rent of £10 per year.\textsuperscript{166} The Association and its apparent success gave Wyndham a good deal of publicity in the district.

The Standerton Agricultural Association was seemingly bilingual, apolitical and non-sectarian; Wyndham's fellow delegates to the Standerton Town Council in August
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1906 were A.H. Malan, W.J. Barnes and N.J. Grobler.\textsuperscript{167} However, the farmers of the district, in addition to differences in terms of personal wealth and scale of operations, were also divided by language and politics. Such distinctions caused Boer farmers and British settlers to seek, sometimes additional, membership in organizations catering for sectarian needs. In Hugh Wyndham's case this was the Transvaal Settlers' Union.

The Transvaal Settlers' Union was another Wyndham creation. Hugh, who had assumed the informal leadership of what he called 'the Transvaal settlers',\textsuperscript{168} hatched the idea during the visit to South Africa of the Ridgeway Commission, sent out by the British government to gather information, advise London on the Transvaal constitution, and arrange, if possible, 'a concordat among the Transvaal parties.'\textsuperscript{169} Although Ridgeway and his fellow commissioners seemed to Hugh 'to be giving every satisfaction – taking a fair view of the situation, & certainly not favouring the Boers with the view of conciliation, which was, of course, what we had to fear', he organized 'a deputation from all the Land Settlers to interview them.'\textsuperscript{170} However, Wyndham's impression soon changed: 'Lately we have been a bit nervous about them, as they seem to have got hold of some quaint idea of compromise.' As 'such an arrangement could never really work,'\textsuperscript{171} he met with Sir West Ridgeway and Sir F. Hopwood in Heidelberg and put the case for 'the Transvaal Settlers', soliciting the insertion of a clause into the Constitution 'protecting the settlers against the possibility of a Het Volk government boycotting them.' The attitude of the Commission pleased him very much. He lunched with them and 'to hear them talk' he told his mother, 'one would imagine that they were thoroughly sound on South African problems, & they make no secret of the fact that something ought to be done to protect the settlers.'\textsuperscript{172}

Wyndham concurrently planned to organise 'Milner's settlers' into a regular body, a sort of farmers' benevolent association and hatched the idea that the settlers might even 'depute one man in the coming Parliament to represent our interests' so

\textsuperscript{167} Minutes of Meeting of Special Committee, 22 Aug 1906, NASAP: MST 1/6/1 Standerton Town Council.
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ensuring that 'there will always be a definite expression of opinion on the part of Ld M's settlers here.' Wyndham most probably had himself in mind for this job. And, who on the surface of things was more suited. One of Milner's young men, Wyndham was not only a settler but also an acknowledged leader in matters agricultural. Yet, while some settlers were very keen, many, as he complained, were 'remarkably apathetic.' This was of great concern to him. This apathy was clear enough in June 1906 when Wyndham's memorial to Milner was signed by fewer than two hundred settlers (or 'about 2/3 of the British settlers' in the Transvaal).

Nonetheless, Wyndham surged ahead. He held a meeting of settlers in Pretoria during the following month, when they resolved to form themselves into an association. Yet, as he recognised, it would 'require a deal of pushing to get it through.' The first branch was established that September in Klerksdorp. During September at a meeting held at Leeuwdoorns, the question of placing land settlement under an imperial board was raised. Although approving of the proposal by which the management of land settlement would be taken out of the sphere of party politics, the meeting felt that such a board, ideally acquainted with individual settlers, would succeed better if the settlers had direct representation on it. Wyndham urged that there should be at least two representatives elected by the settlers and that the remainder of the board have experience of the working of land settlement 'from the Settlers point of view.' Wyndham questioned the impartiality of a Het Volk administration and at the same time positioned himself for a seat on the land settlement board. The meeting directed Wyndham, the éminence grise, to bring these considerations to the high commissioner's notice. This he duly did and in
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response received a polite letter from the High Commissioner’s Office noting his suggestions.\textsuperscript{180}

Although the progress was slow, Wyndham did not tire. In mid-October he went to Nylstroom, to see the settlers and establish a Northern Transvaal branch of his union.\textsuperscript{181} Two weeks later he went to Potchefstroom to attend the sale of some government stock and hold a meeting of the South Western Branch. The forces arrayed against him, including Sir Richard Solomon and the officials in the colonial department, were strong and their influence had to ‘be counteracted.’\textsuperscript{182} There was very little difference between Wyndham and the Settlers’ Union (in September 1906 he referred to ‘a branch of my Union’\textsuperscript{183}) and when in London in 1907, he attempted to convince the colonial under-secretary, Winston Churchill, to give the union political backing.

Wyndham’s travelling within the Transvaal Colony increased dramatically from 1905 as a result of not only his involvement with the Transvaal Settlers’ Union, but even more so his military service in the Transvaal Volunteers, which took him away from Kromdraai, for short but frequent periods.

5.2 Command of the Eastern Rifles

In September 1905, following the conversion of the Transvaal Volunteers to a district-based organisation, Wyndham was appointed with the rank of lieutenant colonel to the command of the newly-established Eastern Rifles, a British-styled colonial regiment.\textsuperscript{184} He retained command of the regiment, later, after amalgamation with the Western Rifles in 1907, re-established as the Southern Mounted Rifles, until 1912.\textsuperscript{185} Wyndham was an

\textsuperscript{180} Dougal Malcolm to Hugh Wyndham, 21 Sep 1906; and Lord Selborne to Lord Elgin, 24 Sep 1906, NASAP: GOV 200, file 195/06 Correspondence on subject of land settlement.
\textsuperscript{181} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Oct 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{182} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{183} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA. [My emphasis.]
\textsuperscript{184} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA. The Heidelberg squadron of the South African Light Horse, the Standerton squadron of the Johannesburg Mounted Rifles, and the Barberton section of the Northern Rifles were absorbed into the Eastern Rifles. See E. Jonker, ‘Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van die Transvaalse Verdedigingsmag, 1900-1912: Transvaal Volunteers’, Militaria 3(3) 1972, pp 18, 51-52. This is the published version of an MA dissertation (University of Pretoria, 1971), but sadly without the academic trappings.
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unlikely candidate. He probably knew something of warfare in colonial Africa, chiefly acquired through friendship. Yet, despite his enlistment with the Rand Rifles in 1901, he had little to no experience. He was also unlike his brothers. Charles and Reginald were active and sporty, enjoying particularly blood sports; while Edward and Humphrey were destined to follow the colours. Hugh, out of kilter with them and suffering from tuberculosis, escaped to South Africa from the rigours of the climate and social expectations in Britain. And indeed, as he no doubt knew would be the case, he thought his mother would find his appointment 'very amusing.' Revealingly, he also announced to her that his adjutant was a Colonel Corbet, 'who, no doubt, will be capable of looking after us all.'

Many of the men had had previous service, some with the colonial volunteer regiments raised during the Boer War, like the Johannesburg Mounted Rifles and the South African Light Horse. Others had imperial service with regiments ranging from the 19th Hussars to the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders and the 1st Shropshire Light Infantry. Some had experience in the colonial campaigns of the nineteenth century, in Afghanistan and India, Egypt and the Sudan, and southern Africa. Yet their commander was an inexperienced twenty-eight-year old. The enrolment book tells us that Wyndham had no 'previous service, medals and decorations' and no 'promotions, appointments and certificates.'

Yet, to some extent at least, the Boer-admission compromise meant that men like Wyndham would necessarily have key roles to play. Chamberlain and Milner had conspired to make the organisation of the force as British as possible and to keep the financial contribution of the government small, so that the burden had to be carried by the volunteers themselves, thereby not drawing the interest of 'the Boer', at least for several years. He was undoubtedly Standerton's most eminent 'Briton' and had the independent finance to support regimental activities. However, the implausibility of Wyndham's appointment did not stop him from commanding his regiment, in true gentlemanly fashion and, indeed, the regimental enrolment book gives his nationality and occupation as 'British, Landed Proprietor.'

---
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The Eastern Rifles comprised six mounted squadrons and three infantry companies, with a headquarters in Standerton. The recruitment area, embracing much of the eastern Transvaal, included the towns and districts of Barberton, Heidelberg, Standerton, Wakkerstroom, Piet Retief, Ermelo, Carolina and Swaziland. This made regimental concentrations difficult and, as a result, turnout was often not the best and Wyndham was frequently on the road. He undertook his first tour of inspection in the Eastern Transvaal in November 1905, accompanied by the Commandant of the Transvaal Volunteers.

For Wyndham, military service was clearly something to be enjoyed and war was a source of glory, another justification of the special status of the officer-gentleman, for whom command was both recreation and duty:

'It is really very good fun training the Boer in the methods of British Cavalry. They are immensely keen but have not the smallest idea as to what the object of it all is. Their turn out is also sometimes very remarkable. Generally spurs upside down & so forth.'

There were volunteer encampments and bivouacs, church parades and military balls. Musketry was practiced at the rifle range near Standerton, used formerly by the imperial garrison. Most other events were held at Kromdraai, the house serving as regimental headquarters and ad hoc officers' mess. Yet, the training was rooted deeply in European thinking about warfare, with lessons on the Franco-Prussian War and the Peninsular Campaign of 1811 to 1813. During a field exercise in April 1906, Wyndham was surprised when his mounted troops, instead of turning the left flank of the opposing force, 'hurled themselves as a frontal attack against as absolutely impregnable position.' And in May 1906, he hosted a mock battle, followed by a gymkhana, which registered no fewer than 39 competitors for tent pegging. Forty invited guests - and ten gatecrashers -
sat for lunch on the second day, many of whom entered the ‘smoking concert in the evening’ and all ‘went to bed much exhausted.'\textsuperscript{196} This practical work, which, to the mind of the Duke of Connaught, represented real training, was the strongest point in the Transvaal Volunteers and made them much better than the Cape Volunteers, which, to Connaught’s mind, were ‘too much for show.’\textsuperscript{197}

In 1906, the Eastern Rifles had a strength of 720 men including 46 officers and a mounted band.\textsuperscript{198} Of these men, thirty-three took part in the suppression of the 1906 Zulu rebellion.\textsuperscript{199} They served as part of D Squadron of the First Transvaal Mounted Rifles, a regiment which had been raised in April 1906 and formed part of the Zululand Field Force under the command of Colonel Duncan McKenzie of the Natal Militia.\textsuperscript{200} They assisted in the actions in the Nkandhla forest in May 1906, and played a cardinal role in the battle of the Mome Valley that June, which led to the defeat of Bambata’s warriors. The First Transvaal Mounted Rifles was disbanded on 1 August 1906.\textsuperscript{201}

Spurred on by initial successes achieved by Bambata, the troops in the Transvaal, both imperial and colonial, underwent training in asymmetrical warfare. In September 1907 Wyndham went on manoeuvres with the Pretoria garrison. Colonel (later Maj Gen Sir) H.T. Lukin’s pamphlet on ‘Savage Warfare’ was studied and then practised in the field.\textsuperscript{202} Wyndham complained that the week of his attachment would ‘be dull if they devote the whole of the five days to it.’\textsuperscript{203} While Wyndham may have preferred ‘a breastplate in the Life Guards,’\textsuperscript{204} here on the colonial periphery, as he no doubt recognised,
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\textsuperscript{199} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50; Commandant of Volunteers, Transvaal, to Assistant Colonial Secretary, 7 Dec 1906, NASAP: CS 2182/1905 Volunteer Returns Strength and Distribution; and ministerial minute, 8 Feb 1909, NASAP: PS 68/5/1909 Volunteers Reorganisation.
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\textsuperscript{202} P. Truter to Col Lukin, 10 May 1906, NASAC: CO 8310, file X5114 “Savage Warfare” by Col Lukin Requisition for 300 copies to be printed in cheap pamphlet form. See also H.T. Lukin, \textit{Savage Warfare: Hints on Tactics to be adopted and Precautions to be taken} (Cape Town 1906).
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he had the opportunity to progress beyond what he would have been able to achieve in
Britain.

While not always easy, military service implied a willingness to accept pain and
privation: particularly by the common soldier who it was assumed would serve and under
the command of social superiors. But the Eastern Rifles was certainly no easy command.
The enrolment books show that although the regiment was overwhelmingly ‘British’,
farming, as an occupation, predominated (table 3.3). The Boers of the district, many of
them republicans blooded during the 1899-1902 war, accepted the command of a relatively
inexperienced 28-year-old from England, with no apparent knowledge of African warfare,
with difficulty. And, familiar with horse and rifle and colonial warring from a young age,
they held British military doctrine in contempt. Being taught by people whom they
considered less habituated to arms in Africa was too much. Some, after a series of not
so subtle acts of insubordination, had to be booted out. For Wyndham, this sort of thing
eroded the fun value and, within only months of assuming command, complained to his
mother: ‘This volunteer business is really becoming no joke. I am up to the chin in rows.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsmen</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Composition of the Southern Mounted Rifles: town vs country
The enrolment books of the regiment are inaccurate - exact details are not recorded for each
volunteer - and this makes comparison and the statistical analysis over time difficult.

- Wyndham, who gave himself as a ‘landed proprietor’, is enumerated here with the farmers.
- Of the volunteers enrolled 153 or some 20.8 percent specified work identifying them as
townsmen. The largest single category here was for clerks (sixteen). However, to keep its
horses and therefore its troopers in the field as long as possible, the regiment had two
saddlers, a farrier and two shoeing smiths, and two veterinary surgeons in addition to ten
professional transport riders, a gunsmith and a bootmaker.

(Source: TAD: TVO 50B Enrolment Book of the Southern Mounted Rifles.)

---

205 This was an old perception and one that seemingly survived the South African War. See, for
example, Milner to Chamberlain, 6 Feb 1901, Milner Papers II, p 200.
206 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Apr 1906, WSRO: PHA.
Furthermore, although the district had not been devastated during the war, many Boers were struggling to re-establish themselves on the land. The white poor were many and the politics of discontent blazed. The wealth of their commander, who seemingly mixed his Volunteering work with Settler business, did not heal political differences within the regiment. Wyndham showed his colours with the Union and at the same time alienated the Dutch Volunteers of his regiment. At the end of August 1906, 'the whole of the Volunteers in Standerton rose against' him. Wyndham wanted to promote a certain man and the rank and file objected and threatened to resign. As a result he found himself 'up against a brick wall' and had to give way. 'It is no use' he noted, 'appointing a man to command a troop if the whole troop resigns.' What is interesting is that most of these objectors were English-speakers, objecting to the use of patronage in the face of military competence.207

Certain Boer officers taken up into the regiment also made matters difficult. Jan Kemp, a former Boer general and now serving in the Piet Retief troop of the Eastern Rifles, was the main thorn in Wyndham's flesh. He caused disciplinary problems, eroded Wyndham's authority, and refused to turn out whenever Wyndham attended a deployment.208 Eventually booted out after gross insubordination,209 Kemp joined the 'Boer Army' - formed by Louis Botha soon after his appointment as prime minister of the Transvaal in February 1907 - and was elected field cornet for the district of Piet Retief.210 Kemp and others did all they could to lure Afrikaners, who may have been willing to serve with the British-styled volunteer regiments, into the resurrected commandos.

These rifle associations appealed to Afrikaner nationalists, and after 1907 Wyndham had difficulty enrolling reserves.211 The mounted component of the Transvaal Volunteers was in July 1907 at 57.5 percent of its approved strength. The rural regiments were however

207 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA.
208 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Mar, 8 Apr and 16 Jun 1906, WSRO: PHA. In his memoirs, Kemp, himself born in 1872, refers disparagingly to Wyndham and other Kindergarteners as 'kereltjies': J.C.G. Kemp, Die Pad van die Veroweraar (Cape Town, Bloemfontein and Port Elizabeth 1942), p 66.
209 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Mar, 8 Apr and 16 Jun 1906, WSRO: PHA.
211 Compare the Annual Report on the Transvaal Volunteers and Cadets for the year 1910-1911, 84, with Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906 and 3 Dec 1909, WSRO: PHA.
considerably worse off. The Western Mounted Rifles being at only 23.4 percent of approved establishment. Wyndham’s Eastern Mounted Rifles was placed comparatively well at 63.3 percent (table 3.4). This difference may be attributed to the long-term political impact of the Boer War and the greater devastation that conflict brought to the Western Transvaal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Approved Strength</th>
<th>Actual Strength</th>
<th>Actual as % of Approved Strength</th>
<th>Deployed to Natal</th>
<th>Portion of 1st Transvaal Mounted Rifles in Natal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Light Horse</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>A Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Light Horse</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>B Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg Mounted Rifles</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>C Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Horse</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>C Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mounted Rifles</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>D Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Mounted Rifles</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Mounted Rifles</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>D Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5229</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: The strength of the mounted regiments of the Transvaal Volunteers as at 1 July 1907, and their participation in the Natal campaign of 1906
(Source: adapted from E. Jonker, ‘Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van die Transvaalse Verdedigingsmag, p 25.)

The Southern Mounted Rifles and other regiments of the Transvaal Volunteers undoubtedly cemented together the small, often isolated pockets of British settlers and formed a British presence in remote localities: in the Bethal troop ‘all except four [were] Boers.’ The Piet Retief troop was ‘very strong - numbering 150 - nearly all Boers - but all very keen & really very efficient.’ Many Afrikaners in exposed, isolated areas, particularly on the always-insecure borders with Swaziland and Zululand, rushed to the colours for reasons of personal security rather than any feeling of Britishness. Yet military training and socialisation fostered individual Boer-British relations and most probably consolidated at least some sentiment ‘in the general interests of the Empire.’

Wyndham’s district interests extended further. He, the British newsman, Vere Stent, and several others established the Eastern Transvaal Printing and Publishing

---

212 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
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Company Limited. Wyndham was also a justice of the peace and a member of the Standerton Liquor Licensing Court. School children received treats at Kromdraai: on 30 November 1907 seventy-five children from the Church of England school were kept amused and Wyndham was pleased to note the number of children in Standerton who were connected with the Church of England and were ‘being brought up on the principles of loyalty.’ This was all part of propagating empire on the platteland. Yet, in advance of the Transvaal elections, the Eastern Transvaal Printing and Publishing Company was liquidated in June 1906 and Wyndham lost what might have been a valuable mouthpiece for his candidature.  

5. Conclusion

The settlement dominions were established essentially for white migration, where the layered, ordered, hierarchical society of home, could be replicated. The open space and emphasis on agriculture presented disaffected nobles and gentlemen-at-leisure, men like Hugh Wyndham, with the opportunity to recreate on the imperial periphery a lifestyle that was vanishing at home. In Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, they became justices of the peace, founded British-style clubs and societies, and were much concerned with horses, the military, genealogy and family history, local politics and patronage, and similar genteel pursuits. They provided the social leadership in the towns and burgeoning cities. They controlled the local horse races – Wyndham was steward of the South African Jockey Club – gave lavish garden and weekend parties, and sat as lay members of the provincial synod. These migrant gentlemen established residences in town and country, the latter assuming the nature of country houses, set in parks, and as with the Wyndhams, often with real English lords and ladies in residence.

214 Milner to Chamberlain, 25 Jan. 1902, BPP: Cd.1163-1902, Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa.
215 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
216 Ex parte application H.A. Wyndham, Order ex parte Wyndham, 8 Jun 1906, NASAP: ZTPD 8/798, 527/1906. The notice was published in the Government Gazette, the Rand Daily Mail, and the Pretoria News, all on 1 June 1906.
Their estates gave scope for lavish entertaining, fishing, polo, and big game shooting – which Hugh’s future brother-in-law, Selborne’s ADC, described as being ‘of course own brother to hunting.’

A new settler with independent finance, Wyndham was one of the first in the district to undertake large-scale, post-war agricultural operations. Kromdraai was fenced, fields were put under crops and stock was acquired and bred. Seemingly oblivious to the plight of Standerton’s poor, Wyndham demonstrated ‘the aristocrat’s frequent indifference to the existence or feelings of anything outside his own charmed world.’ He farmed on a prodigious scale and Kromdraai was transformed into a showplace of progressive agriculture. Wyndham was interested in equestrian and agricultural pursuits, but also in intelligent, sophisticated and useful contributions to the artistic, military and political life of his community. Imperial security, hollow at the best of times, depended to a large extent upon men like him, whose lifestyles mesmerised indigenous collaborators with a display of British ‘energy, success, and apparent omniscience’ and reinforced the always thin red line.

The British farming sector looked to each other for both their social connections and business deals. Wyndham, who described himself as a ‘landed proprietor’, built strong links with the Standerton farming community and farmers further afield, coordinating their regiment and guiding a range of local initiatives. He developed a close relationship with some of the leading settlers with whom he engaged in a range of social pursuits. Yet as a set they were also always aware of alternative nodes of power in the district.

219 Robert Lacey, Aristocrats, p 22.
220 B. Vandervort, Wars of Imperial Conquest in Africa (London, 1998), 37-40; Hyam, Britain’s Imperial Century, 281-2.
CHAPTER FOUR
Transvaal politics

Unlike British East Africa, South Africa was in many ways not conducive to aristocratic settlement. While climate and terrain were good, the ‘natives’, black and white, were ‘unfriendly’ and, with a large European population, South Africa also held the danger of incompatibility in an egalitarian environment where the maintenance of geographical and social distance would be difficult. The Boers of the former republics, in particular, were mesmerised less easily by British grandiloquence and, as a result, the transfer of power to a responsible government had to be staved off until sufficient Britons had settled and a transfer of British values, constitutional, commercial and otherwise, had taken place.

Such was Wyndham’s position and his political opinion. The war was over and Britain, having prevailed in the struggle, won with it the opportunity to instil Britishness. Yet, success was soon shown to be temporary. Politically, the post-war years were a period of great turmoil, both in the towns of the Transvaal and on the veld, and were marked by the political reawakening of the Afrikaner and the constitutional questions relating to the grant of responsible government and the situation of Chinese workers on the mines. The Transvaal now eclipsed the Cape as the centre of political tumult and again witnessed a growing political consciousness among the English-speaking middling classes that seemed to threaten the very base of British supremacy in South Africa.¹

Milner and his Kindergarten, while visionaries, failed to grasp the realities of colonial Transvaal. They moved in relatively closed circles: working, living and playing in the cocoons of Government House and private residences like Kromdraai. Expatriates, according to Ronald Hyam, ‘behaved more swaggeringly, more grandly and unfeelingly than they would or could have done in Britain ... and this gave a touch of unreality and theatricality to all their lives.’² Social conventions and political ideas imported from Britain

² R. Hyam, Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914 (Basingstoke 1993), p 281.
produced a heady-mix of snobbery, pretentiousness and self-conscious class distinctions with notions that Britannia ruled the waves and more than a quarter of the world, that the British empire was impregnable, British values unassailable, Anglican dogma irrefutable, and the Royal Navy indestructible, and that 'an English peer was a great figure throughout the Empire and beyond.' None of this endeared Wyndham and his set to the broad Transvaal electorate, of whom even the English-speakers, as John Darwin has noted, had 'generally little sympathy for what they regarded as an over-rigid class system at home.'

1. The politics of identity and representation

Yet, while Wyndham and his set were out of step with the realities of colonial Transvaal, there was no necessary polarity between dominion nationalism and a Greater Britain. As Andrew Thompson has argued, 'a great deal of public feeling in the colonies was not readily classifiable as either.' Moreover, as he contends, 'an influential body of thought in the Dominion press regarded national self-consciousness and a wider imperial commitment as perfectly compatible ideals.'

It comes as no surprise that Wyndham was one such opinion leader, although there were times when he thought it 'difficult ... for Colonists to reconcile their ideas of local loyalty with the rightful demands of Imperial patriotism.' In a long letter written to Mary Maxse shortly before his leaving Milner's service, he addressed the apparent conflict between an embryonic South African nationalism and his place as an African colonist within a larger empire. 'To people who live at home', he reasoned, 'the Empire must always seem more real, they are at the centre of it, they can take a much broader view than can the Colonists, who represent, so to speak, the offshoots.' Although the colonies were dependant upon Britain strategically, the Royal Navy guaranteeing peaceful progress

---

5 A.S. Thompson, *Imperial Britain: The Empire in British Politics, c.1880-1932* (Harlow 2000), p 28. See also C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World' in C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich (eds), *The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity* (London 2003), p 6, where they note that 'the rise of colonial national identities did not contradict or undermine imperial Britishness.'
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and protection from other European powers, the connection was valued for reasons of sentiment too. Yet, for Wyndham, the advantages of empire were always more apparent to the United Kingdom than they were to the colonies and, living in Africa, he could not ‘look upon the Empire as half so advantageous to Africa as it appears to me to be to Great Britain, when I am in London.’ That these views existed on the imperial periphery – in Johannesburg, Ballarat and Auckland – seemed natural to him. Yet, at the same time, he thought them narrow-minded and ‘it is due to them that the Colonies suffer a good deal from “tête montée”.’

Supposing that Mary would think him ‘hopelessly Colonial’, Wyndham argued that whatever the advantages were for the colonies, they could not ‘be measured in definite contributions towards costs’ and, as British governments had usually done, it was best to look more ‘to indirect advantages than to direct payments.’ Although Britain financed the Royal Navy, the means to secure and protect trade, Wyndham argued that it was unreasonable to levy fixed naval and other contributions from the colonies. After all, ‘a very large proportion of the profits of South African Mining goes out of the country’: ‘The Millionaire spends his fortune in Park Lane’ and, although a 10% tax altered this to some extent, ‘the fact remains that large sums of money that ought by rights to be spent here, are spent in London, & [most of the large mining and other companies being registered in London] pay taxes in London.’ This, he reasoned, had to be taken into account when imperial contributions were debated, and furthermore the simple paying of contributions was ‘a very dull thing for the Colonies to do.’ The existing arrangements, whereby each of the South African colonies paid contributions, could therefore ‘only be

8 A.S. Thompson, *Imperial Britain*, pp 28-29. See also the diary of Lewis Michel, 1 Aug 1919, NASAC: A540 Sir Lewis Michel Collection, vol 10, where he records the following ‘very practical’ grace:

   Thank God and the British Fleet
   For what I eat;
   Thank God and the silent Navy
   For all this gravy;
   Thank God and the Lower and Upper
   Decks for my Supper.
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regarded as temporary' and some other 'more interesting & practical solution' had to be found. This he reckoned could 'only be worked out slowly, by means of Colonial Conferences, & the creation of an Imperial Army.'

Wyndham contended that his were moderate views. There had been a vast amount of 'virulent writing emanating from both sides' before the contribution paid by the Transvaal was fixed and 'one would have thought that the levying of any contribution at all would have raised a Revolution in the new Colonies.' 'And yet,' he continued, 'when the amount was agreed upon, it was passed with complete unanimity & without any conditions – the only discordant note being a wail from the Political Assn which nobody paid any attention to.' This showed, he argued, 'what moderate opinion can do at a pinch, even at a time of considerable excitement.' And, he continued, 'if such moderate opinion exists in a place like Johannesburg, which includes almost every nationality & creed, it will take a long time to persuade me it does not exist in other Colonies as well.'

However, Wyndham recognised, too, that the merging of imperial and local concerns, regarding migrant labour, the citizenship of non-British residents and the constitutional development of settlement colonies, matters taken both in London and on the peripheries for political opportunism, broke this accord. As a result some colonials were suspicious of links with Britain, while the majority of Afrikaners desired some cultural accommodation in terms of religion, education and language. Imperialists differed in their assessments as to how to accommodate Afrikaners. Amery in Britain and FitzPatrick and Phillips in the Transvaal were very optimistic and remained confident that Afrikaners would embrace a 'wider patriotism, blended with and yet transcending our several national patriotisms.' And the roles played by Botha and Smuts, particularly after 1907, showed such hope to be not entirely unrealistic.

---
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George Farrar, was more pessimistic. Afrikaners, he thought, would never accept the political and cultural supremacy of Britain and adhere, en masse at any rate, to what Thompson calls a 'Britannic culture' – 'constituted by liberal political ideals, respect for law and order, and a preference for self-government.'

Wyndham tended to a path between Amery and Milner, although, at times, he veered sharply toward Milner's position, even after union. In his view, although the war had been won militarily, the political struggle between Briton and Afrikaner in southern Africa continued. In 1903 the new war was being fought on two fronts. In the Cape the Afrikaner Bond, one time ally of Rhodes and branding Milner and his kindergarten as 'secret foes', demanded an enquiry into the administration of Martial Law, which, Wyndham thought, was 'not ... the best way of following their declared policy of forgetting the past, & being Imperialist in the future.' The Bond Congress in that year also passed a resolution that would effectively place control of the police in the hands of the district councils, the result of which, Wyndham was sure, 'would ... be to enable them to run the police on party lines & for party ends, in the same way as education is run through the medium of the district committees.' In the Orange River Colony the Dutch Reformed Church was the main protagonist in the field of education. Wyndham was convinced that control of education and the police could not be conceded.

The post-war years were also marked particularly by a struggle on the land, where farmers, with little in common, remained 'divided, between and within districts, on political lines.' The farmers in the district of Standerton, as was the case throughout the Transvaal Colony, were separated by a range of criteria including wealth and the scale of operations, as well as the distinctions between Boer and British settler, who pursued their
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political and economic interests through different parties and associations. Milner after the war had sought to smash the Boer veldtocracy and to break their hold on the land, and in its place create a class of commercial farmers. Economically, Milner’s policy brought large-scale state involvement in agriculture. He hoped that the new settlers would introduce new and progressive farming techniques. However, as he recognised, the settlement of Britons on isolated farms amidst purely Boer population was useless. Blocks of land had to be bought and Britons had to be settled sufficiently near to one another so as to offer mutual support, form a presence in the local community, and ‘consolidate South African sentiment in the general interests of the Empire.’

Politically, this policy involved the much-historicised process of anglicisation, the preservation of Boers as farmers but with the introduction of British settlers, as well as the suppression of the last African resistance. The platteland saw a flood of new agriculturalists, all British, some ex-soldiers, who were settled among the repatriated Boers to act as a kind of ‘leaven.’ In the end only 1256 British settlers, occupying over two million acres in 1907, were settled, approximately one-eighth of the figure for which Milner had hoped. This was too few to break the hold of the veldtocracy. Furthermore the settlers had to be protected both from the inevitable financial disasters and disappointments of the first few years, as well as from being ‘squeezed out’ either by neighbours or by a premature responsible government. Yet, those who manage to survive the climate, both natural and social, would, he thought, be ‘a most valuable asset.’

Boer discipline and organisation had not cracked under the stress of the war and war-time change. Instead, invigorated by the war, a new leadership had emerged, which, sensing the threat to their landed power after 1902, closed ranks and denied British access to

24 R. Morrell, ‘Competition and Cooperation in Middelburg, 1900-1930’ in W. Beinart, P. Delius and S. Trapido (eds), Putting a Plough to the Ground, p 381.
26 Milner to Chamberlain, 25 Jan 1902, BPP: Cd.1163-1902. Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa, No.22.
27 Milner to Chamberlain, 30 Dec 1901, BPP: Cd.1163-1902. Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa, No.20; J.A. Smith, John Buchan, p 119.
rural society. Louis Botha, the former commandant general, was the chief pillar of republican identity and farmed at Rusthof, a magnificent estate near Standerton. In the Standerton district, Botha was well-butressed by Coen Brits (1868-1932) and J.J. Alberts (1872-1947). Brits, whom Wyndham described as ‘a mere bully’, had served as a deputy to Botha during the war and in 1902 had had a run in with the Milner administration regarding the post-war restitution of cattle. Alberts, also of local farming stock, served under Brits during the war, where after he returned to farming, played a leading role in the creation of Het Volk and in January 1908, after the recreation of the commandos, was made field cornet for the Waterval ward of the district of Standerton. The new leadership organised the people soon after 1902 under the cover of agricultural societies and Milner’s loss of control over the countryside was signalled by the formation of a People’s Congress on 24 May 1904, chaired by Louis Botha. In January 1905, this Congress became Het Volk (The People), a political party representing the massed interests of Dutch-speakers of the Transvaal, which included self-government, cultural accommodation and economic progress and prosperity. Het Volk had an elaborate organisation, comprising a network of committees. This was the old commando system with the military component ostensibly removed: ward committees elected by the people; district committees elected by the ward committees; and all falling under an all-powerful head committee.

However if Het Volk hastened the tempo of self-government agitation, it had been started by the returned uitlanders – according to Wyndham ‘unattractive as a class’ – who

29 A major obstacle, as Milner informed the Colonial Secretary, was ‘the tendency of Boer owners to hold on to enormous estates, which they [were] unable to develop.’ Milner to Chamberlain, 30 Dec 1901, BPP: Cd.1163-1902. Further correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa, No.20. See also I. van der Waag, ‘Boer Generalship and the politics of command’, War in History 12(1) 2005, pp 15-43; and A.G. Barlow, That We May Tread Safely (Cape Town 1960), p 122.
30 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Feb 1907, PHA, WSRO.
31 See Daniel Grove to Louis Botha, 23 Aug 1903 (ff.8-11), NASAP: Preller Collection, vol 89.
32 C.J. Brits to Lord Milner, 17 Dec 1902; William Windham to Native Commissioners, 18 Dec 1902; and Geofffrey Robinson to C.J. Brits, 2 Jan 1903, NASAP: GOV 615, file PS 383 Restitution of Cattle to Boers by Natives and vice versa.
34 ‘Statues of the People’s Union’ (Pretoria, 1905), UNISA: United Party Archives, Transvaal.
considered themselves the real victors and entitled to the spoils of the war, which included government office. They thought the Milner administration expensive, wasteful, aloof, and over-regulating; according to one 'neglected colonial' they were brusque novices, 'young men imported from England.' In 1902 a group of former uitlanders, including Frederick Cresswell, H.C. Hull and E.P. Solomon formed the Transvaal Political Association. Their lobbying led to the draft constitution designed by Alfred Lyttelton, the Colonial Secretary, to give representation but with executive power remaining in the hands of British officials. The Lyttelton Constitution provided for a qualified franchise – residence on premises worth £100 or producing £10 rental a year, or receipt of £100 salary per year. This had the effect of disfranchising approximately ten thousand bywoners and adult sons on farms, the loss of whom as Smuts noted Het Yolk could ill afford.

Two further British parties were formed in 1904, the Transvaal Responsible Government Association, formed by self-made men of the middling sort and led later by the Solomon brothers, and the Transvaal Progressive Association, under the chairmanship of J. Roy and including Charles Leonard and many of the old Reform Committee, although, as Mawby has argued, not solely, the political embodiment of Milner and the Chamber of Mines. Richard Feetham, a Kindergarten, who had been approached to become the organising secretary of the Progressive Association, described the new political organisation as 'the Imperialist Party here.' The Progressives at first opposed immediate responsible government and called instead for representative government as an essential
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36 Hand-written notes by Lionel Curtis, 3 March 1903 (or 1904?), BLO: Mss Curtis 1; Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 Jun and 15 Dec 1902, Maxse Papers 50, WSRO.
40 J.C. Smuts to J.X. Merriman, 13 Apr 1906, in P. Lewsen (ed), Selections from the Correspondence of J.X. Merriman, pp 17-18.
41 Transvaaler (non de plume for Geoffrey Robinson), 'Political parties of the Transvaal', The National Review, 45 (May 1905) and A. A. Mawby, 'Capital, Government and Politics in the Transvaal, 1900-1907: a revision and a reversion', Historical Journal, 17 (1974), pp 409-410. See also BLO: Ms Dawson 11, diary, 10 Jan and 23 Feb 1905. Yet, despite this revision some subsequent writers persist with the notion that the TPA was 'the party of the mine-owners.' See for example J. Hyslop, The Notorious Syndicalist: J.T. Bain: A Scottish Reel in Colonial South Africa (Johannesburg 2004), p 170.
42 Feetham to his Mother, 16 Jan 1905 (ff.92-93), RHO: Feetham Papers, Box 2, file 3.
intermediate step. They were unionist, pro-British, a proponent of provisional self-rule and supporting the principle of 'one vote, one value' or equal votes for English and Dutch-speakers on a qualified franchise. Manhood suffrage would admit bywoners who, according to Wyndham, were 'poor & of no sort of influence or independence [and] will be led like sheep.' He, like many of his class, thought that national affairs were best left in the hands of 'great families' - like the Cavendishes, Cecils and Wyndhams - many of whom believed in parliamentary government but one representing landed (and later moneyed) interests. To Lord Salisbury, democracy was a threat to individual liberty - the 'right of the majority to impose its will on others...for the majority represented tyranny rendered confident by superior numbers.' To such patricians, political equality was meaningless, short of allowing an inevitably ignorant majority the right to elect those few, who ought to have made politics their profession. Within British ranks, the Responsible Government Association, formed by self-made men of the middling sort who branded the Progressives as 'no more than a capitalist cabal', provided their greatest competition.

The Labour Political League was formed in 1905, by F.H.P. (later Colonel) Cresswell, to represent working class interests. Cresswell, a mining engineer in Turkish Syria before coming to the Witwatersrand as manager of the Village Main Reef Gold Mines, led the attacks against Chinese labour and the movement to replace it with white labour on the mines. Although Merriman, in April 1906, thought Cresswell 'a typical Englishman of the best type', Wyndham did not share this sentiment. Cresswell and Myburgh preached what Wyndham thought was 'practically the confiscation of the unearned increment on the Gold Mines, & yet at the same time attempting to repudiate the idea that they are

---

Socialists.' While their debates were ‘really quite interesting to follow,’ Wyndham, again misreading the political situation on the Rand, was convinced that they led nowhere.\textsuperscript{49}

The so-called Chinese question and the Lyttelton constitution at first demarcated the differences between these parties. However, with the stopping of Chinese labour and the grant of self government, both issues were removed from the table and little was left to distinguish between the parties. In 1906, English-speaking colonial nationalists attempted to shore up a front to oppose the Progressives, when the Transvaal Political Association together with a splinter from the Progressives merged with the Transvaal Responsible Government Association to form the National Association.\textsuperscript{50}

Wyndham knew the Transvaal would receive responsible government. It had, after all, been promised in the peace treaty. And, as Charles Leonard noted, despite Het Volk’s opposition (‘the fire of burning scorn’), they were still confident that they were ‘strong and skilful and well-captained enough to carry [Milner’s policy] to the finish without their aid’.\textsuperscript{51}

While this may have been true in February 1905, a series of serious setbacks over which they had no control was soon to rock their surety. Milner, who Wyndham hoped would remain in South Africa until the Lyttelton constitution had been implemented,\textsuperscript{52} was succeeded in April 1905 by Lord Selborne, whom Wyndham complained ‘concedes too much to the Boers’\textsuperscript{53}, and early in 1906 the British Liberals, swept to power that January, promised immediate responsible government. This Wyndham lamented, ‘would make no difference to the inimitable attitude of the Boers, & would enormously weaken the Imperial position.’\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{49} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Oct 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{52} Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Oct 1904, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
\textsuperscript{53} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Nov 1905, WSRO: PHA. Lord Selborne annoyed Wyndham. He was always away touring the platteland and ‘interviewing the Boers’, of whom he made ‘a little too much’ and took ‘too much trouble to go into every little trumped up complaint they bring.’ He wanted to see Selborne ‘snub them a little, when, as it generally happens, their charges are absolutely unfounded.’ (Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Sep 1905, WSRO: PHA).
\textsuperscript{54} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
Wyndham did not favour the immediate introduction of responsible government. Although inevitable, it was ‘much to be regretted.’ Still some of the kindergarten continued to serve under Selborne, either formally at Government House or informally as a group of opinion leaders. The grant of responsible government they felt, while in hindsight the right thing to do, held the risk of bringing the former republics into collision with the Cape and Natal colonies and resulting in another war in South Africa. The South African War, Wyndham felt, had been ‘fought to obtain equal rights for the two white races,’ something he felt both Englishmen and Afrikaners had enjoyed since peace was signed in 1902. He was convinced that the early introduction of responsible government would make no difference to ‘the inimicable (sic) attitude of the Boers’ and ‘enormously weaken the Imperial position.’ ‘You really must not forget the Boers’, he warned Lady Leconfield:

‘After all the war is only just over, & like any conquered nation, they would naturally take any opportunity (sic) that offered to have a fling at their conquerors. Living here one can see only too well that things are not going perfectly, but to say that, to break the Vereeniging Treaty & grant Responsible Government at once, would be a panacea for all these evils is to shew a lamentable ignorance of the Boer character – for it would only lead to a still larger increase in their demands. The great mistake we have always made is to be continually changing our policy, & I do trust we are not going to start at it again. I cannot myself see why both parties should not abide by the Terms of Peace, & then let us have full Responsible Government when we are even more settled down than we are at present, & when we are ready for it.’

Wyndham was concerned too that the grant of responsible government would solidify the Boer phalanx. He claimed to know many moderate Boers in the district, who, disliking Het Volk, had told him that ‘they [would] not support Botha & his crowd.’ It was with them – the ‘moderate section of the Boers’ – that Wyndham pinned his hopes.
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55 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jan 1906, WSRO: PHA.
56 ‘The only way to avoid this catastrophe was to unite all four colonies under one Government. We decided to start a movement for South African Union.’ L. Curtis, With Milner in South Africa, p 345.
57 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
58 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
The best way to strengthen their resolve, he argued, was not to compromise matters of principle – 'like the Responsibilities have done' – as this would only push waverers 'to join the other side in the hope of further concessions from us.'

For these reasons, Wyndham called for strict adherence to the letter of the Vereeniging Treaty and for much the same reasons he thought it a mistake for the British government to send a judicial commission to the Transvaal, as his uncle, Lord Rosebery, proposed. The commission, which would only be used by Het Volk, would 'have to listen to endless trumped up charges of breach of faith against the British Government, & if it found they were groundless it would add another grievance to Het Volk's catalogue, & the Commission would be described as being entirely in the hands of the Capitalists.'

However Wyndham's mood was soon buoyant. He welcomed the idea to increase the representation in the Transvaal Assembly from 30 to 60. It suited the liberals as increasing the popular vote, and, while in no way affecting the balance of parties, it would, he thought, make his election certain. Responsible government he recognised, no matter how undesirable in 1905, could not be stopped and he now decided to embrace immediate self-government 'in order to prevent the country being made the plaything of parties at home.' There was no purpose in 'flogging dead horses, mumbling the formulae of the past.'

The preliminary census returns were published in May 1904. The result Wyndham found 'rather surprising.' There were not only 'a great many more white people than was expected', but the country population practically equalled that in the towns. Johannesburg alone accounted for twenty percent of the white population. However, as he noted, the proportion of Dutch to English was not released and this 'would be the most interesting return.' He knew of course that there were insufficient British settlers on the platteland, scattered across the Transvaal, and that they were divided
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59 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
60 Lord Rosebery, leader of the liberal unionists and a former British prime minister, was Lady Leconfield's brother.
61 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Jul 1905, WSRO: PHA.
62 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Dec 1905, WSRO: PHA. This was seemingly triggered by the Elgin telegram.
64 Hugh Wyndham to his mother, Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1904, WSRO: PHA.
between three political parties: the Progressives, the Responsibles (from 1906 the Nationalists), and Labour.

In Standerton, the English vote was divided chiefly between the Progressives and what Wyndham called ‘a curious sort of half way party’ – the Responsible Government Association, which formed the most important Transvaal British political opponent of the Progressives. If you say you are an Imperialist’, Wyndham wrote to his mother, the Responsibles ‘will answer that Imperialism means interference from the Colonial Office [and] if you say you are a Progressive they say the Progressive Assoct is an intrigue on the part of the Capitalists to get control of the Country. Some Standerton farmers even complained that the Progressive Association was run purely for the benefit of the towns. Wyndham thought them ‘very suspicious & very difficult to talk round or impress in any way’, but nonetheless hoped to secure their vote mainly because he lived on his farm and spent money in the district.

However Wyndham was not the only Englishman in the district to have political aspirations. His chief contender was W.H. Walden, a municipal councillor and proprietor and editor of a small local newspaper, who by late June 1905, had ‘been induced to retire’ in Wyndham’s favour. Yet, instead of supporting Wyndham’s candidature, he assumed ‘an attitude in favour of nothing being done at present’ and wrote leading articles in his paper to that effect. Wyndham thought Walden ‘very unpopular’ and he did not think Walden would do his candidature much harm. However, in addition to being ‘an infernal nuisance’, Wyndham could ‘ill spare even his vote.

Wyndham, with the support of Simmonds, the chairman of Standerton Progressive Association, was adopted as the Progressive candidature for the coming election. Walden, whom local Progressives though ‘unsound’ and could command little
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support, was eventually convinced to stand back for Wyndham. Walden, duly appointed as the Progressive agent for the Eastern Transvaal, dropped his candidature and pledged his full support to Wyndham, declaring that he could command the votes of three to four hundred Boers, something which Wyndham very much doubted. ‘Boer promises’, he complained to his mother, were ‘very frail things’ and it was ‘quite within their moral code to promise one thing & do another.’ Even those promises of support from Boers Wyndham had secured himself (including ‘old Kieser’, who had been resident magistrate in Standerton before the war), made him ‘feel inclined to be suspicious as to what their motives are.’ Hoping to get ‘a good many Boers to vote’, Walden devoted time to them, while Wyndham undertook to provide him with the necessary transport to ‘get about the country.’ However, some months later, when Wyndham commenced his campaign in earnest, he appointed no agent, only an informal committee, as there was much disagreement as to who should be chairman of his election committee and he thought it best to leave the problem unsolved.

The wider Progressive Association also had its troubles. George Farrar, ‘one of the best of the Rand Magnates’ according to Richard Feetham, led the party but his leadership was contested, sometimes undermined, by both Percy FitzPatrick and Lionel Phillips, who differed with Farrar both in personality and policy. F.D.P. (Drummond) Chaplin, junior Joint General Manager of Consolidated Gold Fields, was a key party organiser, but his wife, the indomitable Marguerite Chaplin, did not esteem him and at times undermined him. And then, as Maud Wyndham (who seemingly managed to remain out of the fracas) noted,
‘Mrs Phillips dislikes the Chaplins & hates Lady Farrar like poison – more than Lady Farrar hates her ... there’s no love lost & much jealousy.’

The Transvaal British in addition to their division, both within and between parties, were also apathetic. The Standerton Progressive Association had 214 registered members, of whom ‘only 25 turned up’ for a meeting in June 1905. The meeting had to be adjourned. This Wyndham thought ‘really very typical & very discouraging.’ ‘Had it been a Boer meeting’, he told his mother, ‘probably every Boer in the country would have attended.’ British indifference was also apparent during the process of voter registration. ‘The Englishman’, Wyndham complained, ‘seems unable to register his vote unless actually led by the hand to the registering officer.’ As the Bishop of Glasgow, Wyndham’s guest that weekend, opined in his sermon on Sunday 3 September 1906, the ‘Englishmen when in a minority did not possess the stiff back they used to.’ This was certainly a statement Wyndham could support.

Although the elimination of Walden from the Progressive candidature in Standerton was a victory, Wyndham did not enter the field immediately (‘those things seem to require the most careful handling’), but decided to await the publication of the constitution and the proclamation of the boundary delimitation commission. Wyndham was, however, fairly pleased. He travelled the Transvaal politicking informally, shoring up the English vote, trying to secure the farming vote, and talking to the railwaymen (‘simmering under a big grievance’) who might easily support a Labour man.

Toward the end of September Wyndham spent a Saturday to Monday with the Farrars at Bedford Farm, then a hive of Progressive activity. Hugh enjoyed it immensely. He made Lady Farrar’s acquaintance and engaged Farrar in political talk. This warmed him to the idea that ‘things are really going very well for the Progressives.’ Farrar’s recent speech at Potchefstroom, stressing the importance of agriculture and calling for the removal of the old cleavage between the town and veld, together with
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85 See diary, 22 Oct 1905, BLO: Ms Dawson 11.
strong advocacy of the country interests, all helped, he thought, to break down the perception that the TPA represented the interests of the towns and magnates only. 86 He hoped to secure Farrar to speak in Standerton and so open his campaign there. 87

Wyndham attended a banquet in Standerton on October 21, 1905, in honour of Nelson's centenary. This, a large event organised by the local St George's Society, was politically risky. Several Afrikaners attended and Wyndham admitted that on such occasions it was 'sometimes difficult ... to avoid a display of Jingoism which the Dutch might resent.' 88

Wyndham, like many other Progressive candidates, now proposed to stand as an independent and so attract Boer votes without alienating the Progressives: 'our one & only aim should really be to keep Het Volk & the Nationalists & Cresswell party out.' 89 He decided to have his Requisition signed by people outside the Progressive Association, which he hoped would 'help me with the Boer, who rather regards the Progressive Association with suspicion.' He appointed a man called Van der Spuy, who 'did very good work at the last elections in the Cape [and had] great influence over the Dutch', to act as his agent and planned to organize a regular campaign early in 1906. 90 John Buchan thought these tactics Machiavellian, but then 'Hugh might call himself a Mormon, if [it will ensure his] getting elected.' 91 Walden, however, was succumbing to those tactics and in November 1905 had ostensibly changed his mind and, although seemingly kept in place by the local Progressive Association, was a constant threat to a unified English vote. 92

Wanting to shore up the English voters, and perhaps at the same time not wanting to appear too Machiavellian or, even worse, later being 'hauled down as a mugwump', 93 Wyndham identified himself openly with the Progressives and fought the Standerton seat on a platform 'calculated to bring about the ultimate federation of South Africa under the
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93 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
British flag.\textsuperscript{94} He was also confident that there would be a large reaction in favour of the Progressives.\textsuperscript{95} For the moment the voter was volatile. Initially embracing the Progressives, he had become tired as the elections were so long delayed, and now was attracted by the National Association, which had become fashionable toward the end of 1906. Het Volk remained silent and refused to be drawn, but aspirant politicians in Johannesburg could not take the same line and this according to Hugh was ‘the temporary undoing of the Progressives.’ They had been forced to take the lead and make speeches, and, he thought, was also to be the undoing of the Nationalists, whose speeches and letters fill the papers in November 1906. They were a little premature. ‘If the elections were to take place tomorrow’, he wrote to Lady Leconfield, ‘their position might be a strong one, but I very much doubt if they will survive the four months which still have to be lived down.’ Wyndham was sure that he had already detected a drift back to the Progressives.\textsuperscript{96} Milner’s was happy to see the Progressives ‘uncurling their tails’ and expressed the hope that he may yet ‘live to see them waving in the air.’ ‘It pays in the long run’, he wrote to Marguerite Chaplin, ‘to speak straight to British workmen & nail your colours to the mast’, although he did ‘realise the difficulty of preaching “British ideals” when the British at home are behaving like asses.’\textsuperscript{97}

However, the delay of the election, caused first by the scrapping of the Lyttelton constitution and then the decision to send a commission to the Transvaal to report on the political position before the writing of a second constitution, produced inaction and loss of interest among the Transvaal British. Wyndham had started his campaign in January 1906. Wanting an idea of the support he could expect in the town, he commenced with a house to house canvas.\textsuperscript{98} He soon found that storekeepers, who would support him at the ballot, could not do so openly, whereas Het Volk storekeepers, as he noted, could ‘come openly into the field.’ This was all ‘rather typical of South African politics [and] part of the ordinary condition of a South African election.’\textsuperscript{99} Both Botha, the leader of Het Volk,

\textsuperscript{94} Transvaal Progressive Association Principles, SANAP: A140 Dr F. V. Engelenburg collection, vol. 7, f. 43.
\textsuperscript{95} ‘Politics are still very unsettled, but I think the future lies more & more with the Progressives.’ Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{96} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{97} Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 11 Nov 1906, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
\textsuperscript{98} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Dec 1905 and 6 Jan 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{99} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Jan 1906, WSRO: PHA.
and Wyndham spoke in the constituency that January and thereafter the electioneering died down.\textsuperscript{100}

Wyndham now took up the cudgels on behalf of the British settlers (whom he thought generally apathetic), lobbied the Ridgeway Commission and eventually got a clause inserted into the constitution 'protecting the settlers against the possibility of a Het Volk government boycotting them.'\textsuperscript{101} Wyndham also scurried to draw the British settlers into a settlers union and a farmers association, which was formed at a meeting held in Pretoria in July 1906.\textsuperscript{102} He hoped to be able to depute one man in the coming parliament, perhaps himself, 'to represent our interests – thus there will always be a definite expression of opinion on the part of Ld M's settlers here.'\textsuperscript{103} Rushing from settler meetings in Klerksdorp and Nylstroom to volunteer manoeuvres at Bronkhorstspruit, he was very busy during the last months of 1906 and for the first time he missed the mail: an abnormal caesura in his dutiful correspondence with his mother.

Between his settler work and volunteering, he attended functions, the Eton Dinner was held at the Carlton on June 4 (he sat next to Geoffrey Robinson, who thought it 'rather a feeble affair'), and, with the assistance of a Hollander, learned Dutch. His teacher, 'a nice old man intimately acquainted with Leyds', also tried, in the intervals between Dutch lessons, to persuade Hugh 'that neither Leyds nor Kruger were responsible for the late war, but the country Boers themselves.'\textsuperscript{105}

The new constitution, finally released in August 1906, drew mixed comment. Het Volk remained absolutely silent, but the Transvaal British were torn.\textsuperscript{106} Most of the Progressives, Drummond Chaplin included, were steeped in gloom. Still believing that

\textsuperscript{100} Wyndham sent his speeches to his mother, although these, as he informed her, were 'very limited in number, as the little meetings about the district will not be reported.' Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Jan 1906, WSRO: PHA.


\textsuperscript{102} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Jul 1906, PHA, WSRO.

\textsuperscript{103} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1906, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{104} Diary, 4 Jun 1906, BLO: Ms Dawson 11.

\textsuperscript{105} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Aug 1906, WSRO: PHA. Only a year earlier, Wyndham had criticised the Selbornes for learning Dutch: 'Lady Selborne & Lady Mabel Palmer are both busy learning Dutch, with the view, I believe, of conciliating the female element – which I am afraid they will find very difficult.' See Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1905, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{106} See, for example, William Carter to Algernon Lawley, 17 Dec 1906, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Letters - 'we shall have to try to work out our salvation as best we can.'
under the Lyttelton constitution they would have had a much better chance of conciliating the moderate Boers, they regretted any immediate grant of responsible government. Now the election would be 'carried out under the full play of party & probably the national cry, & ecclesiastical influence used to the utmost.' He expected the Boer phalanx, under the command of the ward and district officers and the predikants, to close ranks: 'I went to see a very good Boer not long ago, & he told me that the fact that I had been in house would be talked of all round, & he would probably be told the next day that if he had anything to do with me he would be behaving in an unpatriotic way.'

Yet, as Wyndham admitted, the Constitution was 'exactly what everybody expected.' He also saw it 'undoubtedly more favourable to the Boers & less favourable to the British than was the Lyttelton one.' It allowed, at the insistence of Het Volk, manhood suffrage, which 'let in' some ten thousand bywoners, otherwise disqualified, who, 'being poor & of no sort of influence or independence, will be led like sheep.' This also meant a further delay, as the voters rolls had to be reopened. In the Standerton constituency, the Unionists registered a further thirty names, but, as Hugh expected, the Dutch additions were undoubtedly much larger.

In early October 1906 the boundary commission announced that the town and district of Standerton would send two representatives to Pretoria. The district was divided into two constituencies. Wyndham resided in the constituency formed by the wards of Waterval, which included the town, and Klip River and lay along the railway. This was 'the only one an Englishman will have a chance of getting in for, & I think we ought to have a very fair chance.' The other comprised the three northern wards of the district, which were all rural. Although the delimitation suited Wyndham (he felt he stood a chance), rumours were circulating that he was to be opposed in the town. Walden, still smarting, was 'now a bitter enemy' and Wyndham complained that he was 'seen to do all he can to harm me.' He, in consequence, could not by any means count on a solid English

---

107 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Aug 1906, WSRO: PHA.
108 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Aug 1906, WSRO: PHA.
110 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, [date unclear] 1906, WSRO: PHA.
111 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA.
112 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Oct 1906 and 15 Oct 1906, WSRO: PHA.
vote and this meant that he was more dependant on his Dutch constituents, who, as he noted to Lady Leconfield, was 'rather a broken reed to rely on.'

Wyndham was correct. The constituency formed by Waterval and Klip River was the one where an English candidate stood the best chance. Standerton, town and immediate district, had not suffered the wartime devastations experienced in the eastern Free State and western Transvaal. Here the community had recovered quickly, with assistance from the repatriation department and other governmental organs, and in 1903 municipality status was granted. The townsmen appeared happy and on 4 January 1903, the national scouts, who had been settled there toward the end of the war, gave Chamberlain, the visiting colonial secretary, a rapturous welcome. Milner visited Standerton on 18 July 1904 and again on 11 Oct 1905, when he opened the waterworks and a government school. There was an air of prosperity. Wyndham records how the weir, built by the town council across the Vaal River, presented the populace with 'a new toy' in the form of a lake and 'everybody, as a consequence, is for the time being, mad on boating. People are building boats for themselves, or hiring them out for 1/- a seat an hour, & one enterprising man has written to the Durban Yacht Club for a copy of their rules.' The town and its people seem to have been doing well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (approx)</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Births</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious disease</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Demographics of town of Standerton, 1904
(Source: Meeting of Town Council, 28 Oct 1904, NASAP: MST 1/1/1 Standerton Town Council.)

113 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Oct 1906, WSRO: PHA.
114 For the work of the repatriation department see NASAP: GOV 587, file P.S. 281 Position of Boer leaders, Lawley to Chamberlain, 7 Sep 1903.
115 Grundlingh, Hencisoppers, p 351.
116 Meeting of Town Council, 8 Jul 1904, SANAP: MST 1/1/1 Standerton Town Council.
117 Meeting of Town Council, 1 Sep 1905, SANAP: MST 1/1/2 Standerton Town Council.
118 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Oct 1906, WSRO: PHA.
Standerton had a population of some six thousand people in 1904 (Table 4.1.), a good many of whom were, as Wyndham noted, Asiatics and Jews. There were also sufficient Anglicans in the town and district for the Bishop of Pretoria, William Carter, to start clerical work and Standerton, a garrison town with a good number of settlers, had by 1905 both a military padre and a rector in the town. This concentration of English speakers had been sufficient to gain control of the council when the town was corporated in late 1903. Of the twelve councillors elected, nine were English and three Dutch and the English candidate, H. Coles, was elected mayor by eight votes to four. The townsmen, a majority of whom were therefore expected to support Wyndham, joined the voters of the immediate district to make up the some 1730 men who appeared on the final voters roll.

However, for the past months rumours had been circulating, as to who was to stand in Standerton and whether there would be more than one British candidate. In September 1906 the computation was four candidates: two ‘Dutchmen’, Wyndham and Walden, who it seemed would re-enter the field. Walden, Wyndham thought, could not really stand, unless was he was being ‘secretly supported by Het Volk, to try and split the British vote.’

With the voters roll to close at the end of November and the delay in the election, first scheduled for January, and the constitution not yet published, Wyndham elected to lie ‘rather low.’ This was a ‘hopeless period of delay & inaction’ but he did not want to suffer burn out before the election and so refused to get ‘onto his legs’ until the Constitution was published and ‘everything settled.’ He held his shearing exhibition at Kromdraai on 21 November with some of the merinos imported from Australia. He received several hundred visitors and made his ‘first attempt at a short oration in Dutch’: ‘a grand opportunity to do a little quiet politics.’ Yet, in Standerton, there was ‘a
certain amount of grumbling' because he had 'not yet got onto [his] legs.' This was something of a risk, but one he thought he could afford to take.127

2. The General Election 1907

Yet, during the build up to the election, Wyndham lamented that the Progressive Association was 'in rather a poor way.' This did not surprise him. It was a mistake running the party purely on the finances of the big houses and he feared that the nearer the elections came the less influence actual party politics would have: 'people will go a great deal more for individuals, especially as there is nothing either for a candidate or a party to indulge in except vague generalities.' There were still no real questions before the country and 'nobody seems in a hurry to have them.'128 Frans Engelenburg, editor of De Volksstem and Botha's chief publicist, too believed there was 'een grote gelykluidendheid' (a large consonance) between the party manifestos.129

Hugh in South Africa also could not readily tap the family network as was done in Britain. Lady Leconfield canvassed for Lord Rosebery throughout his political career, as did their cousin Lord Carrington.130 Hugh's cousin, Harry Dalmeny (Lord Rosebery's son), received tremendous family backing and won Edinburgh in 1906 for the Liberal party.131 Lady Leconfield did not go out to South Africa to support Hugh in 1907, assistance he no doubt needed, although it is difficult to estimate, beyond personal bolstering, what effect she might have had. Wyndham's troubles with the volunteers also increased as the election approached. In Vereeniging 'resignations have been flying about like locusts';132 while in Standerton, the headquarters of his regiment, 'very few turned up' for a bivouac.133 These were difficult times for Wyndham and the presence of his mother would have been welcomed.

127 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1906, WSRO: PHA.
128 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Sep 1906, PHA, WSRO.
130 John Tryuder to Lady Leconfield, 30 Nov 1905 (ff.180-81), NLS: Rosebery Papers Ms 10170; Lady Leconfield to Lord Rosebery, 7 Dec 1905 (ff.97-98), NLS: Rosebery Papers Ms 10119.
131 Lady Leconfield to Lord Rosebery, 24 Jan 1906 (f.169), NLS: Rosebery Papers Ms 10119.
132 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Sep 1906, PHA, WSRO.
133 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Oct 1906, PHA, WSRO.
The second week of December brought a mixed bag of news. Wyndham's settler clause was inserted into the Constitution but the imperial board would last only five years and he worried that it 'may quite easily be washed out by an unsympathetic Governor & a Boer Ministry.' And no provision was made for further land settlement.134 He spent Christmas with the Drummond Chaplins and found that he had to instil an optimistic view into his hostess, who was 'very gloomy' and feared that Britain would 'have to fight the war over again in 10 years time or else retire from the country.'135 Wyndham was more optimistic. The position of the Progressives he thought was improving immensely and he predicted a few surprises including the electoral defeat of the National Association, ignominy for its leader, Sir Richard Solomon, and the political ruin of Selborne, which were no small solaces. Wyndham hoped that the Progressives would receive a majority large enough 'to cover the retreat of the Home Government.' Yet, he recognised, too, that if they were to protect the 'British' sector and imperial interests in South Africa, even if unassisted by an unreceptive government in London, the Progressives would have to reach some agreement with the Het Volk government. In fact, Wyndham was quite frank: 'we shall be bound to come to terms with Het Volk.'136

The second week of December 1906 also saw Louis Botha confirmed as his opponent in Standerton (he at first thought this hardly probable, 'although it would weaken our chances of splitting the Dutch vote'137). However he thought he would fare better against Botha than De Villiers, another local magnate, and, as he told his mother, 'it would be laughable if I were to defeat him.'138 Wyndham was soon in the thick of electioneering.139 Although he came out first, Botha held the first meeting (it will be a

---

134 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
135 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA; and diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 24 Mar 1906, UCT BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection. Milner, who shared Wyndham's perceptions, said of Marguerite Chaplin that she was 'quite sufficiently inclined to take a pessimistic view of things.' Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 24 Aug 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
136 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA. FitzPatrick was equally doubtful on 'the prospects of comings to terms with Het Volk.' See Percy FitzPatrick to the Editor of The Star, 26 Mar 1906, in A.H. Duminy and W.R. Guest (eds), FitzPatrick: South African Politician; Selected Papers, 1888-1906, pp 425-27.
137 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1905, WSRO: PHA.
138 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
139 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906 and 31 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
great thing to let him have first say. This took place before more than 800 people assembled in the Masonic Hall on 16 January. Several local farmers and businessmen were on the platform with Botha, including both Brits and Alberts, and Wyndham, 'in the back of the hall, accompanied by some of his supporters', was present too. Botha appealed for healing and a clean contest, but at the same time invoked his connections to the district as well as the struggle memories of the war.

Wyndham held his first meeting on January 19 and spoke to an 'absolutely full house', thereafter he was heckled for 45 minutes. He went into Standerton on January 21 to start canvassing there in person. He had 'a great many voluntary helpers.' He was 'pleased by the way people [came], & [had] great hopes of breaking through the apathy which as you know is apt to be the characteristic of the British vote.' This was followed by a speech at Val, the western end of the constituency, where, as Hugh probably rightly, judged 'nearly all the Boers there were guerrillas.' Wyndham nonetheless thought the meeting at Val 'really quite successful.' There were 'about 150 absolutely impassive Boers, & about 20 Englishmen' in the audience. The Boers, although 'very antagonistic', gave Wyndham 'a very good hearing' and afterwards did not pose many questions. Botha held his second meeting in Standerton on January 26. Wyndham was convinced that Botha, making the 'most rash promises to the electors', would be shown up.

The seat was particularly hard-fought: Wyndham was heckled and in late January 1907 was convinced he would be beaten but not without putting up 'a very good fight.' Coen Brits, 'who is a mere bully, & who is also the local Het Yolk magnate', took pleasure in disrupting Wyndham's meetings in the eastern end of the constituency. The battles - inter-party and personal - increased as the election approached. Wyndham met Smuts on the train between Johannesburg and Standerton on January 26, 'who was full of how Het

---

140 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
141 Pamphlet 'General Botha's First Election Meeting at Standerton on January 16th, 1907' (Pretoria, 1907), pp 7-8, UNISA: United Party Archives, Transvaal.
142 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA.
143 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA.
144 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA.
145 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA. See also H. Spender, General Botha (London, 1919), 178, where Spender states that Botha 'was fought very keenly by a young Englishman, the Hon. Hugh Wyndham, who had a large farm at Standerton...'.
146 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Feb 1907, PHA, WSRO.
147 See, for example, diary, 18 Feb 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.
Volk's one object was to run the elections in such a way that there should be absolutely no ill feeling between the two parties at the end.' This amused Hugh 'as one of the chief levers Het Volk [used against him in Standerton was to] try & prove that [Kromdraai] was given [to him], while on Ld Milner's staff.' As a result, several of Wyndham's supporters 'raked up certain well-known questionable things in Botha's past career', which, Wyndham understood, were flung at Botha on the night of January 26. The charges levied against Botha varied from actions during the South Africa War that were reckoned 'alles behalwe prijzenswaardig' to the acceptance of a bribe from the Zuid-Afrikaansche Fabrieken van Ontplofbare Stoffen Beperkt in August 1899. As Hugh noted to his mother, 'all politics ... turn on personalities, & it will soon be impossible for any self respecting man to take part in them.'

On 3 February Hugh, despatching another batch of election speeches to his mother, reported on progress that he reckoned satisfactory. He had received the promise of 'practically the whole Temperance vote in Standerton' and he was now also sure of 'the Railway vote, except about 3.' That week he had also had 'a pretty good meeting at an old Boer's place' and held the hope of considerable Boer support to the west and south of Standerton. He expected most of the vrouwen to be against him, so he thought he could 'only rely on the secrecy of the ballot.' Het Volk, he presumed on the other hand, held the eastern ward solidly and Wyndham planned to go the following week and hold a meeting there, near Paardekop. His strategy was simple. He followed Botha around 'pointing out that he is making promises he cannot possibly fulfil.'

However, before Wyndham entered what he thought the heart of Het Volk support in Standerton, Botha's publicists launched their coup de main. Wyndham's name was still closely associated with Milner and as a result he - like other progressives - was politically compromised. His lifestyle, furthermore, was did not draw the 'backvelder', who had little

---

148 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA.
Breytenbach-omkopery, NASAP: A787 Preller Collection, vol 93; and Minister of Justice to Bok, 3 Mar 1927, NASAP: A140 Engenburg Collection, vol. 60. These allegations were later to surface on a regular basis. See for example 'Generaal Botha's Reputatie wederrechtelik aangetast', De Volksstem, 2 Nov 1915; 'Was Generaal Botha in 1900 'n verrader?', De Spectator, 8 Apr 1916; and M.P.C. Valter, Generaal Louis Botha contra Generaal C. de Wet (Amsterdam, 1915).

149 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA.

150 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.

151 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.
appreciation for airs and graces, and whom Wyndham did not bother to nurture.\footnote{152} Instead of inspiring the appropriate sense of awe he and Kromdraai became convenient punching bags. While all sides whipped up ‘racial’ emotion and character assassination was frequent, Botha’s publicists, Engelenburg and Gustav Preller, both seasoned electioneers, found his opponent at Standerton an easy target.\footnote{153} They canvassed the opinion that his acquisition of Kromdraai ‘was a disgraceful government job.\footnote{154}

On 6 February a special Volkstem billboard confronted Standertonians: ‘How the Hon. WYNDHAM BECAME LANDOWNER. BY CIRCUMVENTION OF THE LAW!’ Free copies of the day’s paper - containing a leading article on ‘The Wyndham Scandal’ - were dumped all over the district.\footnote{155} Although Wyndham considered this a good sign - the Botha camp were ‘becoming seriously alarmed’ - it was libellous and if ‘repeated often enough some people are bound to end by believing there is something in it.’ He took legal advice and his attorneys were for action. After all, ‘the only way to affect these people in any way is to make them pay damages & costs, & I am not going to be satisfied with a mere…

\footnote{152}{During the Anglo-Boer War, poet, Jan F. Celliers, addressed an elderly, uneducated ‘uncle in arms’: ‘Worthy old ox! With a sage nod of the head and the smile of one who has never awoken I am often warned by you against reading so many “bits of paper”, because it results in weightier matters – like grilling meat and cooking porridge – not receiving sufficient attention’. As quoted and translated by F. Pretorius, Life on Commando during the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902 (Cape Town, 1999), p 122.}

\footnote{153}{The South African War failed to disrupt the continuity of Boer politics and in many instances the men who saw to the election of Paul Kruger in 1892 undertook the same task for Botha fifteen years later. N. G. Garson, ‘Het Volk: The Botha-Smuts Party in the Transvaal, 1904-11’, Historical Journal, 9 (1966), p 103. Engelenburg led Kruger’s campaign in the 1892 presidential election. Preller’s father was his electoral agent for Wakkerstroom. Engelenburg to Ribbinck, 30 Aug 1892, register herkiezing President Kruger, NASAP: H. Orban collection, W18.}

\footnote{154}{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Jan 1907, WSRO: PHA. The opinion that Milner and his staff enriched themselves was well-established. Edmund Bright to his mother, 3 Sep 1904 (“Lord Milner and his gang of thieves from England are certainly making hay while the sun shines”), in M. Fraser (ed), Johannesburg Pioneer Journals, p 172. See also the Debates of the Transvaal Legislative Council, 2 Oct 1905; as well as the Report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the Alienation of Crown lands to Government Officials, 1905, With Minutes of Proceedings, Minutes of Evidence and Appendices ( Pretoria, 1905); Settlers’ Ordinance 45 of 1902; Land Settlement Ordinance; Crown Land Disposal Ordinance, 1903.}

\footnote{155}{Illiquest case for Damages, Hugh Archibald Wyndham versus the Wallach’s Printing and Publishing Company Limited, 1907, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907; Nimocks, Milner’s Young Men, pp 67-8.}
apology and withdrawal if there is a good chance of retaliating on them.\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Feb. 1907, WSRO: PHA.}

He was learning that his class could, at times, be a hindrance.\footnote{The matter arose again in the 1915 election, when Wyndham’s labour opponent ‘said that Turffontein people were such snobs they would follow a doll if it had Hon. to its name.’ Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Sep 1915, WSRO: PHA. See also, D. Cannadine, \textit{Ornamentalism}, pp 137 passim.}

February 9 was nomination day and the following days were hectic.\footnote{Diary, 9 to 16 Feb 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.} On Friday 15 February there was ‘a really fine Progressive demonstration at the Wanderers – about 15,000 there – an extraordinary revelation of quite unexpected strength.’ This naturally received a big write-up the following day for \textit{The Star}.\footnote{Diary, 14 to 16 Feb 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.} Milner, in Britain, proclaimed ‘what a magnificent fight the poor old Progs have put up after all!’\footnote{Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 26 Jan 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.}

In Standerton the Progressive Association had a more difficult time. Heavy rains brought a flash deluge, and the Vaal, breaking its banks, flooded Standerton and brought distress to many.\footnote{Minutes, 18 Feb 1907, Meetings of Municipal Council, Standerton, SANAP: MST 1/1/2.} Wyndham, instead of using the opportunity to mix with the townsmen and shore up support, was cosseted at the time at Kromdraai, with Lady Cobham and her daughter, Frances Lyttelton. Lady Cobham, in her letters to England, stressed the gargantuan battle for the Standerton seat, thinking ‘Mr W ... so popular that only L. Botha wd have had any chance against him, so they ran the strongest man they could, & it is thought Mr W has no chance.’\footnote{Lady Cobham to Maud Lyttelton, 20 Feb 1907, HHA 2/23/8.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{l|cc}
\hline
Party & Number of seats & Percent \\
\hline
Het Volk & 34 & \\
Nationalists & 7 & \\
Labour & 3 & \\
Progressives & 21 & \\
Independents & 4 & \\
\hline
Total & 69 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The outcome of the 1907 Transvaal Legislative Assembly elections}
\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Feb. 1907, WSRO: PHA.}
\footnote{Diary, 9 to 16 Feb 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.}
\footnote{Diary, 14 to 16 Feb 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13.}
\footnote{Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 26 Jan 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.}
\footnote{Minutes, 18 Feb 1907, Meetings of Municipal Council, Standerton, SANAP: MST 1/1/2.}
\footnote{Lady Cobham to Maud Lyttelton, 20 Feb 1907, HHA 2/23/8.}
\end{table}
The election took place on February 20 and, with 34 seats, *Het Volk*, with the support of the Nationalists and Labourites and two independents, obtained a working majority of 21 in the new Legislative Assembly. The Progressives had complained that the delimitation of constituencies had favoured the platteland, but, nonetheless, Milner, although hoping for more, had thought 30 Progressive MLA’s would be ‘quite a respectable & promising result.’\(^{163}\) More realistic, the Anglican prelate, Bishop Carter, doubted whether the Progressive Association would ‘get more than 20 seats out of the 69.’\(^{164}\) In the end he was proved correct and the Progressives, with 21 seats, became the official opposition. The Nationalists, thoroughly defeated, as Wyndham had predicted, received just seven seats, Labour three and there were four independents (table 4.2).\(^{165}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Number of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louis Botha</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Hugh Wyndham</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Votes cast in the Standerton constituency, 1907 Transvaal Legislative Assembly elections
(Source: Cd.3528 - 1907 Further Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, p 165.)

Lady Cobham was also proved correct. Wyndham had stood no chance against Louis Botha. The average percentage turnout for the poll in the colony was 68 percent; and Standerton at 80.1 percent had the highest turnout for any constituency. But Wyndham had been correct too: Louis Botha’s candidature had solidified the Dutch vote in Standerton, Hugh drawing almost none.\(^{166}\) With 74 percent of votes cast, Botha won Standerton convincingly (table 4.3).\(^{167}\) On 25 February 1907 Hugh wrote to his mother:

---

163 Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 26 Jan 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
166 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1905, WSRO: PHA.
167 Selborne to Elgin, 25 Mar 1907, BPP: Cd.3528-1907, Further correspondence regarding the affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
As you know the election here ended disastrously for me. I suppose it was really only to be expected, as of course the Dutch vote, in spite of all promises, went very nearly solidly against me, & they polled to a man, whereas, naturally, there was a considerable apathy amongst some of the British.168

The election was undoubtedly disastrous for Wyndham, and this had a complexity of causes. In the first place, as the son of a British baron and entitled to the prefix honourable, as a former private secretary to Lord Milner, as an unpopular volunteer colonel, and as a leader of the British settlers, his status was undoubtedly a hindrance. In his person the detested strands of British conquest, Milnerism and British racial superiority came together in the district. He had not aided his cause by mixing his Volunteering work with Settler business and showing his colours with the Settlers Union, all the while fighting a campaign based on winning the support of the ‘moderate Dutch.’ Ironically, he had thought that party politics would count less and that ‘people will go a great deal more for individuals.’169 Yet, as an individual, he had little to offer by way of attracting any Dutch votes. From the lofty heights of his table, Wyndham misread the Transvaal political environment entirely. Blinded by class he was to do this again and again.170

Undoubtedly many Transvaal British, like their Dutch counterparts, voted on ‘race’ lines. The Bishop of Pretoria, it seems, voted for the Progressives largely because he did not like the Nationalists (‘practically throwing over Lord Milner’) and he did ‘not trust the Boers.’171 The Progressive Association represented the imperial connection: the editor of the Transvaal Leader, writing shortly before the election, reckoned that ‘the Progressive and Imperial interests are one’172 and that the Progressive Association was ‘first and essentially ... the British Party.’173 It was the home for all English-speakers on a political landscape where the parties would be essentially either ‘Boer’ or ‘British’ and, in Standerton in February 1907, there were simply insufficient men who identified themselves as firstly

168 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.
169 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA.
170 Compare, for example, two letters by Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Jul 1905 and 25 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.
172 The Transvaal Leader, 14 Feb 1907, as quoted by J.M.H. van Aardt, Die Botha-bewind in die Transvaal, 1907-1910 (D Litt, PU vir CHO, 1958), p 168.
173 The Transvaal Leader, 14 Feb 1907, as quoted by J.M.H. van Aardt, ‘Die Botha-bewind in die Transvaal, 1907-1910’ (D Litt, PU vir CHO, 1958), p 168.
‘British’ and part of a Greater Britain. Wyndham had thought that the Progressives had made a mistake by running the party ‘purely on the finances of the big houses.’ This was a gross oversimplification.

Yet, while Wyndham, their contender in Standerton, was not a perfect candidate, the Progressive Association itself must carry much blame for its defeat. Farrar, although a capable opposition leader in the house, was unable to weld together his party. FitzPatrick and Phillips remained at odds with him and the Progressive wives continued their wars against each other. As Lord Selborne told Patrick Duncan at the end of the election year, ‘the British have nobody to thank but themselves that they are not governing the country.’

Most of all, Het Volk showed a surprising ability to shore up the Dutch vote, drawing in the national scouts and healing old war wounds within their ranks. Standerton district housed two national scout land settlements, men whose support Wyndham hoped to garner. Although courted by him and other Progressives, these men, as Milner predicted, despite the prejudice and discrimination from the Dutch Reformed predikants and bitterenders, either joined Het Volk or were pressed to do so. Louis Botha would not have received his wide majority without them.

Botha was sworn in as prime minister of the Transvaal Colony on March 4, 1907. This, as the Bishop of Pretoria noted, was:

‘A certainly most extraordinary condition of things. A Boer government again, within five years after the declaration of peace. Botha Prime Minister under the British flag instead of being President of the S.A. Republic. At any rate no complaint can be made of a want of trust. How it will turn out the future will decide. But it would be an insult to the Boers to suppose that they have given up their ideals of a S.

---

174 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA.
175 Lord Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 30 Nov 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D6.3.6.
176 Grundlingh, Hendsoppers, pp 254-55, 349.
177 Milner to Leggett, 2 Jul 1904, GOV 668/17 (‘In my opinion the bywoner class whether on or off the Settlements, and whether “National Scouts” or “handsoppers” or “bitterendes” will ultimately fall into line with the general Boer Nationalist movement. I absolutely put aside all political consideration in this case.’), as quoted by Grundlingh, Hendsoppers, pp 353-54
Africa ruled on Dutch lines. But I see that a comet is to come into contact with the earth at the end of this month—perhaps that will settle the matter.\textsuperscript{178}

3. Wyndham v Wallach's Printing and Publishing Company

Wyndham, for the moment, had other things on his mind. Although the election in Standerton ended amicably, he noted that 'a considerable amount of bad feeling [remained] owing to the abusive tactics employed.'\textsuperscript{179} He had expected 'underhand methods' from Het Volk,\textsuperscript{180} but at first likened his defamation to all elections (they were 'a matter of personalities').\textsuperscript{181} A few days after the poll, however, he decided to go ahead with his libel action. To make them 'suffer in their pockets', he thought, was the only way to prevent them repeating such tactics in the future.\textsuperscript{182}

Wyndham commenced the action immediately. A summons was served upon Engelenburg, as editor of the Volkstem and a director of Wallach's Printing and Publishing Company.\textsuperscript{183} Wyndham filed for £10,000 in damages plus costs. Wallach's appointed their attorneys on February 28, a document witnessed by Gustav Preller and Harm Oost.\textsuperscript{184} Botha had urged his supporters 'to undertake their duties in a manly, honourable and determined fashion.' 'Let nothing be done', he told his gathering on January 16, 'that could not be considered manly and fair to our opponents.'\textsuperscript{185} However, Engelenburg seems to have been too ambitious and stepped over the parameters marked out by their principal.

---

\textsuperscript{178} William Carter to Algernon Lawley, 3 Mar 1907, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Letters.

\textsuperscript{179} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{180} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Oct 1905, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{181} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{182} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Feb 1907, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{183} De Volksstem appeared in August 1873 and ran to 1900 as a mouthpiece of the Boers. From 1904 when De Volksstem reappeared it was owned by Wallach's Printing and Publishing Company. Three directors were Isaac and Charles Wallach and Dr Frederick Engelenburg. See H. Lindsay Smith, \textit{Behind the Press in South Africa}, pp 113-14.

\textsuperscript{184} Power of Attorney, 28 Feb 1907, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f. 73/1907. Gustav Preller, a member of the old republican oligarchy, was during the war a correspondent for the De Volksstem, becoming an assistant editor of that newspaper in 1903 and remaining so until 1924, when he assumed the editorship. Harm Oost, a Dutch immigrant schoolteacher, who had been captured at Modder River. St Helena to the Netherlands, returning to the Transvaal in 1906, when with Preller he initiated the Second Afrikaans Language Movement. From 1907 to 1911 he was on the editorial staff of De Volksstem.

\textsuperscript{185} Pamphlet 'General Botha's First Election Meeting at Standerton on January 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1907' (Pretoria, 1907), p 10, UNISA: United Party Archives, Transvaal.
These tactics, Geoffrey Robinson diarised, represented ‘Krugerism revived.’ And Lord Selborne had occasion to complain that ‘The Volksstem ... does not report facts: it allows no facts inconvenient to it to penetrate to the Boers: it does invent and report things which are “not facts.” It is not an opposition paper. It is an implacable, unscrupulous, avowed enemy, using ink because it cannot at present use bullets.'

A court date was set, Wallach’s deciding to contest the action and use the defence of fair comment. Wyndham, ‘a bit surprised’ at their not wanting an out of court settlement, appointed Jim Leonard, who he reckoned ‘the best advocate in South Africa’, to represent him. Wyndham was confident, although clearly his was not a watertight case. He was still working on the High Commissioner’s staff when he decided to make his home in South Africa and made the application to the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the allotment of Kromdraai. It was to the High Commissioner’s Office that Lister addressed his letter to Wyndham in July 1903, furnishing him with the particulars of Kromdraai. In Wyndham’s defence, he had left Milner’s staff during July 1903 and, having had ‘nothing to do with [the] land laws, and claiming to have no knowledge of it or its procedure’, had Kromdraai allotted to him on August 17, 1903, after he had left Milner’s service. The case was heard before Chief Justice Rose-Innes on May 21, who waded through the details of Wyndham’s appointment and his acquisition of Kromdraai.

Although Rose-Innes decided in Wyndham’s favour (‘I won it, naturally’), the plaintiff only received costs and £50 damages. Wyndham attributed this judgement to his personal wealth (‘Sir James, who gave judgement seemed to consider that because I was well off I should not get large damages – a doctrine with which, I may say, I do not agree’). However Engelenburg had to make a public apology and so Wyndham’s name was cleared. Nothing of the court case is mentioned in Engelenburg’s biography of Botha.
despite the fact that the author had a 'long and close personal acquaintance' with his subject.\footnote{196}{The archival residue of the \textit{Volkstem} is also silent on the matter.\footnote{197}}

4. Conclusion

Far from seeing the establishment of greater Britishness in southern Africa, the post-Boer-War years were marked by the political reawakening and 're-assembly' of the Afrikaner, the grant of responsible government to the conquered republics and the parliamentary ascendancy of Afrikaner parties in these territories as well as in the Cape Colony.\footnote{198}{The electoral defeat in the Transvaal was followed in quick succession by electoral defeats in the Orange River and Cape colonies, which, with the apparent weakness and failure of the British government, had an enormous effect on the kindergarten as a group as well as on their perceptions on the position of the South African British. They were 'faced', according to Wyndham, 'with what is practically the abandonment of the whole of the original reconstruction policy, & very little has been put in its place, except to place the Boers in undisputed power.'\footnote{199}}

Wyndham, who visited Bloemfontein shortly after the election in the Orange River Colony in November 1907, found the:

'people rather depressed ... about the political outlook. Of course [after] the 5 years good honest British rule, it takes a little time to get used to the idea that one is really once more under a Dutch dominance – a dominance from which there is apparently no escape.'\footnote{200}

\footnote{196}{F. V. Engelenburg, \textit{General Louis Botha} (Pretoria 1929), p 144. See also Smuts' introduction. Brieweboek van die Volkstem 1893-1911, NASAP: Orban collection, 18/1. In the \textit{Volkstem} letter book there is unfortunately a break of more than ten years (6 Sep 1899 to 16 Aug 1910). This was not the first time, nor the last for that matter, that the Volkstem was involved in legal action. It was sued in 1896 for saying that a rival Dutch newspaper was in the employ of Cecil Rhodes and as such undermined the rights of the South African Republic in favour of Britain (\textit{Marias v Volkstem Company} (1896) 3 O.R. 66). And a similar set of circumstances arose in 1921 (\textit{Wallach's Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd, and Others v Die Noordelike Drukpers Mij., Beperkt, and Oost} (1921) T.P.D. 441).}

\footnote{197}{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.}


\footnote{199}{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 Dec 1907, WSRO: PHA.}

\footnote{200}{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.}
Marguerite Chaplin, a seasoned complainer, grumbled that, after the 'constant batterings, repeated demands on their loyalty to a country [i.e. Britain] that does nothing for her, but perpetually shooting them in the back', their constitution was weak and, what was worse, the war seemed a dreadful waste.²⁰¹ Lionel Curtis, more optimistic and agreeing with Milner that all was not lost in the long run, 'admitted that we had had a complete knockout (thanks, of course, to these devils at home) & that S.A. was Dutch as Dutch for years to come.'²⁰²

The South African British realised that the electoral defeats and, perhaps more importantly, the apparent weakness of the imperial government, had brought a total political metamorphosis in South Africa between 1907 and 1908 and, as Milner advised them, this held certain implications. For one, they were now relieved of their obligations to Britain and could focus on making a life for themselves in South Africa, which, to Milner's mind, was now more or less a foreign country, perhaps even a hostile one. The question of predominance had been settled in favour of the Boers. However, the British party, by sticking together and allowing the old issues of racial dominance to recede, could play a constructive role. This would mean neither a submissive attitude towards the Boer government nor 'beating the air, and flogging dead horses'; but rather 'a vigilant, alert critical opposition, denouncing every injustice, exposing every job' and 'leaving the door open to bargains [and] always looking to the possibility of ultimately becoming master of the situation.'²⁰³ Embracing this strategy, separating themselves from Britain emotionally and forging their futures in South Africa, independent of an unreliable Britain, these one-time British diehards helped forge a new, white, South African national consciousness.

However, on the short term, many of them were bitter. Marguerite Chaplin refused to consider a return to Britain, despite the intentions of her husband. She argued:

'We have been betrayed, beaten, kicked, & despised by our own countrymen & to go & live among them would be to drink the cup of gall, beyond endurance. The position indeed here seems well nigh hopeless – our own people cringe to the

---
²⁰¹ Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 3 Nov 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.
²⁰² Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 10 Oct 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
²⁰³ Milner quoted by W. Nimocks, Milner's young men, p 73.
Govt & each letter from headquarters at home brings nothing but repeated requests to forget our nationality, as they have, & to allow ourselves to be steamrolled or drugged by the Govt in the vain hope of inducing them to cease their relentless course. Relentless it indeed is, & all the more so because the force at the bottom of it all, is instinctive hatred of us.\textsuperscript{204}

John Maydon, the politician from Natal, whom Lady Selborne met on the RMS Saxon in 1909, spoke ‘as if he felt the present situation in the Transvaal as worse than that after the surrender of 81.’ Maydon, who believed federation would mean handing Natal over to a Dutch majority, abused not only the Liberal party but the whole English nation. And this, Lady Selborne expressed with concern, ‘may be typical of all the English out there.’\textsuperscript{205}

Not quite. Emily Hobhouse, also aboard the Saxon, did not consider herself an Englishwoman, but a Cornish woman and, as she told a fellow passenger, the Saxon invasion still rankled. This, Lady Selborne noted to Patrick Duncan, carried ‘national quarrels rather far’ back and teasingly trusted ‘that bitter memories of Bannockburn’ would never interfere with her friendship with him.\textsuperscript{206}

Wyndham was at first equally bitter. The settler clauses were very disappointing. As he noted to his mother:

‘The Imperial Board is only to last 5 years & may not be renewed at the end of that period however necessary it may be to do so. Further the Board may quite easily be washed out by an unsympathetic Governor & a Boer Ministry, & no provision is made for the continuance of the policy of Land Settlement.’\textsuperscript{207}

He could not understand how Selborne could ‘swallow these things.’ The British position in the Transvaal, never strong, was weaker after February 1907. They could, therefore, not ‘afford to play about in this way.’\textsuperscript{208} Wyndham blamed Selborne, who, he thought, had played not according to principle but political opportunism, for the collapse of the British position. And he wanted ‘to see somebody take up the case against Selborne in

\textsuperscript{204} Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 13 Dec 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.
\textsuperscript{205} Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 2 Jul [1909], UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D4.3.5.
\textsuperscript{206} Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 2 Jul [1909], UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D4.3.5.
\textsuperscript{207} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{208} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
England, for at present it looks very much as if he was merely changing to office.\textsuperscript{209} Having lost in Standerton, Wyndham, after his legal victory, returned to his horses and his soldiering, determined to devise new strategies to 'cover the retreat of the Home government.'

\textsuperscript{209} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
CHAPTER FIVE
Covering the retreat of the Home government, 1907-1910

On April 4, 1909 Hugh Wyndham went over to Pretoria to join the rest of the Kindergarten for a lunch at Government House. There they were photographed, something that he thought a ‘rather gruesome entertainment.’ Lord Selborne, who was to leave shortly to witness the passage of the draft Act of Union through Westminster, took no fewer than five photographs and a professional photographer took a further three, and between each shot the group was posed by Selborne’s sister, Lady Laura Ridding, which, as Hugh complained to his mother, ‘meant a solid hour of photography.’ In these photographs, taken out on the broad verandah, Milner’s young men are grouped around Lionel Curtis, their unofficial leader and guiding light. Standing behind Curtis, erect and moustached, John Brand holds the first issue of The State, their mouthpiece for closer union. Hugh, having recently completed a short series for The State on South African defence, leans forward somewhat contentedly in a wicker chair on the left of the group, with John Dove in front of him. Philip Kerr sits in the foreground on a leopard skin, in African lore the symbol of imperium.2

The group gathered that day at Government House had much cause for self-satisfaction. Their influence on the constitution for the South Africa union was considerable. In fact, Selborne derived profound pleasure in the knowledge that ‘Milner’s Kindergarten will have more profoundly influenced the history of South Africa than any combination of Africanders has ever done.’ Yet, the photographer captured too a little of the emptiness of the imagery. The viewer can sense something of the anxieties, disappointments and tensions of a group still under siege. Dougal Malcolm, Selborne’s private secretary and sitting in the wicker chair on the right, was in 1909 the only member of the Kindergarten still in government employ. The remainder had been pushed out of the

---

1 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 5 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
2 These were published as ‘Some aspects of South African defence’, The State; A South African National Magazine, 2(6) Jun 1909 and 2(7) Jul 1909.
3 Lord Selborne to Lionel Curtis, 8 Feb 1909 (f.233-34), BLO: Ms Curtis 1.
civil service following the Het Volk landslide, which had been foreseen by all except the most blindly optimistic and the melancholia present before the election permeated everything thereafter. The Progressives, although not having the parliamentary majority for which Wyndham and others had so unrealistically hoped, now had both to ‘cover the retreat of the Home Government’ as well as ‘come to terms with Het Volk’ but from a weaker position. Milner, realizing that the success of which he had once dreamed was now impossible, suggested that his disciples reappraise the situation realistically. In spite of this, Geoffrey Robinson - who recognised that the game was still good in itself, only that it was an essentially different game from the old one - understood that South African politics were neither hopeless nor unimportant from an imperial point of view. Yet, important to Milner, Robinson’s voice, broadcast through The Star, of which he was still editor, was ‘not carping’, but nonetheless ‘quite devoid of “optimising” & boot licking rot.’ He was joined by others of the kindergarten, who, now more optimistic, devised a scheme through which they hoped to bring Milner’s dream of a unified South Africa under a British flag to fruition.

The activities of the Kinder and their associates had diversified after February 1907. Some served in the legislature: Drummond Chaplin, Abe Bailey, Aubrey Woolls Sampson, Percy Fitzpatrick, and Farrar. Curtis and Feetham were appointed by Selborne to the upper house, from where they joined the Progressives in the legislative assembly to form the ‘loyal opposition.’ Duncan and Hichens returned to England, the latter later returning to the Transvaal to practice law. Curtis, not having ‘the means of playing a very conspicuous part’ in South Africa, decided nonetheless to stay and devote himself to the study of ‘problems’ neglected by others. He now spear-headed the closer union movement and, in January 1909, he and Kerr produced the first number of The State.

---

4 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
5 Milner to Geoffrey Robinson, 14 Sep 1907 (ff.51-61), BLO: Ms Dawson 61. These thoughts are repeated in Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 31 March 1908, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
6 Milner to Robinson, 17 Apr 1908 (ff.63-68), BLO: Ms Dawson 61.
8 Governor of Transvaal to Secretary of State, 25 Mar 1907, BPP: Cd.3528 - 1907 Further Correspondence relating to affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, pp 162-66.
They were supported in the closer union movement by progressive Boers, who expected on unification to have a majority in a unified South Africa. Nonetheless, the kindergarten held that British immigration, drawn by economic prosperity and political stability, would soon change this. John Dove moved to Pretoria, where as chairman of the Transvaal Land Settlement Board he was sometimes at odds with the schemes promoted by Wyndham, who also stayed on in South Africa, to increase the flow of British settlers into rural South Africa and protect them from the Boer governments.10

1. Settlers and Volunteers

‘Giving up politics’ after his electoral defeat, Wyndham returned at first to his horses and to his ‘volunteering’, the latter as a first step in covering the imperial retreat.11 He achieved some distinction as a progressive farmer and breeder of thoroughbred stock; and, although outside the corridors of power, he took a leading part in public and sporting affairs, both in Standerton and in Johannesburg. Between these interests, farming and the maintenance of a military presence on the platteland, Wyndham also sought a role to play in the Closer Union machine. He had used Kromdraai, the Transvaal Volunteers and the Transvaal Settlers’ Union to build influence and gain political power, an object accessible through several routes. However, having lost in Standerton, Hugh could not become ‘the Settlers’ voice’ in the legislature and Selborne did not see fit to nominate him to the upper house. Hugh therefore pinned his hopes on a seat, possibly the chair, of the Land Settlement Board. He had, after all, spearheaded the call to have at least two settlers on the board and the remainder of the membership familiar with land settlement and sensitive to the settlers’ point of view. However, another disappointment lay ahead. John Dove was appointed as chairman and Wyndham was not even offered a seat. He wrote to his mother: ‘the whole thing is such a farce, its powers are so limited, & its resources so small, that I don’t think it will be able to do anything useful.’ He and the other settlers were at first against Dove’s appointment. For one they objected to the appointment of a lawyer to manage land settlement, although, as Wyndham noted, the protection of

10 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 21 Dec 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.2; and Nimocks, Milner’s young men, pp 69-70, 75.
11 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.
settlers’ rights being the main business of the board, a lawyer was perhaps best. Nonetheless the decision clearly rankled.\textsuperscript{12}

In March 1907 Wyndham and his Standerton troop provided an escort for Selborne, who arrived to open the Agricultural Show. Hugh, still involved with the Standerton Farmers’ Association, had a vested interest in the show, which was planned as a two-day affair. After the show, Wyndham hosted at Kromdraai a camp for two squadrons of the volunteers and cadets, together with ‘nearly all the officers from the other Squadrons.’ The house was ‘turned into a Club House’ and lectures and gymkhanas were held. This Wyndham enjoyed immensely, although he was concerned ‘that the dining room [would] not be sufficiently large to accommodate everybody, as over 20 officers [were] expected.’\textsuperscript{13} However, with the land at Kromdraai being so flat and treeless\textsuperscript{14}, Hugh had difficulty preparing schemes for manoeuvres.\textsuperscript{15} Nonetheless, although very hard work, the camp was a great success and Wyndham did not get to bed before midnight each night, and had to be up before dawn. The field exercises went off as planned. ‘There is nothing’, Hugh noted afterwards, ‘more depressing than when you prepare an elaborate battle, & it all goes wrong & ends in a farce.’ He had twenty-one officers there and as a result his dining room, which just contained twenty-two at a pinch, was filled to capacity.\textsuperscript{16}

Having now been sidelined with the Land Settlement Board, Wyndham travelled the length and breadth of the Transvaal, drumming up support for the settler movement. In April he went to Warmbaths for a week to raise support for ‘some joint action with regard to the farcical board which the home government has been so good as to institute for our benefit.’\textsuperscript{17} He hoped to get a fairly unanimous opinion from the settlers to use in England through the Imperial South Africa Association. In Britain his uncle, Lord

\textsuperscript{12} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{13} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{14} The highveld has ‘no trees and few bushes – one to the square mile, perhaps. Just miles of grass broken by kopjes.’ See John Dove to Mrs Hunt, 10 Nov 1907, in R.H. Brand (ed), \textit{The Letters of John Dove} (London 1938), p 12.
\textsuperscript{15} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{16} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{17} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
Rosebery, had raised his banner, but there his and the other cries made little difference.\textsuperscript{18} For Wyndham the chief hope for South Africa lay in the other colonies, which he hoped were ‘surely not prepared to throw over the whole result of the war, whatever the Home Govt may be prepared to do.’\textsuperscript{19} In London \textit{The Spectator} talked airily of having another war if necessary, which, as Wyndham observed, was ‘indeed … a cheerful ending to the policy of conciliation.’\textsuperscript{20}

That April, Wyndham also travelled to Vereeniging for an inspection of the squadron there, to Heidelberg also on volunteer business, and to Johannesburg for a Bisley.\textsuperscript{21} On each occasion the roads, being very poor, presented challenges and Wyndham eventually elected to take the train, normally being in transit to volunteer inspections on Sundays.\textsuperscript{22} At the beginning of May, he took the Lake Chrissie troop, composed of very scattered farmers (all ‘regular country gentlemen’ according to Dove\textsuperscript{23}), out for a weeks training. This took the form of a patrol, which Wyndham met at Machadodorp and then marched back with them some of the way towards Lake Chrissie. He had never been in this part of the Transvaal and he used the opportunity to call on the Everards, ‘Englishmen who have farmed in those parts for many years, & who I have long promised to go and visit.’\textsuperscript{24}

At the end of April, Wyndham was in Bloemfontein, again ‘on Settlers business.’\textsuperscript{25} He hoped to form a cooperative Society for the benefit of settlers and went the next week on a similar errand to Klerksdorp and then on to the Lowveld, where he met with settlers at White River. He forecast great success for this Settlers’ Cooperative Union, if the necessary capital could be raised.\textsuperscript{26} However, his attention was diverted that April by the circulation of the first rumours of a major restructuring by the Het Volk

\textsuperscript{18} Lord Rosebery to Winston Churchill, 2 Feb 1907, Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge University: CHAR 2/72/25; Lord Rosebery to Winston Churchill, 14 Aug 1907, CHAR 2/30/78; and Oswald Mouler to Winston Churchill, 15 Aug 1908, CHAR 2/35/14 F.
\textsuperscript{19} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA
\textsuperscript{20} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA
\textsuperscript{21} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr, 15 Apr, and 22 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{22} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA. Wyndham complained of the roads. See, for example, Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA (‘… we had a very wet motor ride back – the roads all flooded & very muddy’).
\textsuperscript{24} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{25} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 28 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
government of the armed forces of the Transvaal. Much to the horror of some British and colonial politicians, stories of the re-establishment ‘a Boer Army’ abounded in the press. The Pax Britannia, they thought, represented peace in South Africa and militarism was something of the past. Percy Molteno, a liberal of Cape-birth living in London, could not see the Cape attacking the Transvaal; and Natal, in his view, only maintained a militia to ‘keep down the natives’. Nonetheless Botha moved forward with the resurrection of the commandos (albeit in the form of rifle associations) and insisted on cutting the budget of the Transvaal Volunteers to £100,000 a year. Colonel P.S. Beves, the Commandant, set £120,000 as the non-reducible minimum and, if he did not get this, threatened to resign.

Lord Selborne intervened and managed to stop the changes in the Volunteer organisation which, he thought, ‘would have destroyed the force.’ Wyndham was ‘very much relieved.’ His regiment was left substantially untouched, apart from a reduction in establishment from 800 to 600. This, however, pleased Wyndham, who even proposed to reduce the numbers a little further still, ‘in order to have nothing but good men in.’ On 1 July 1907 the Eastern Rifles amalgamated with the Western Rifles to form the Southern Mounted Rifles, and Wyndham was retained as commander of the new regiment.

In the meantime, matters in the Transvaal were deteriorating. The depression was worsening (‘as how else can it be until the labour problem is decided’), unemployment was rising and on May 1 the management at Knight’s Deep Mine, eager to lessen the impact of the loss of Chinese labour and increase the productivity of their white miners, ordered their white shift bosses to supervise three instead of two drills. This increased the workload as well as the risks associated with mine dust and a considerable strike broke out on the Rand. This Wyndham dismissed as ‘a very artificial affair’, the precipitating event ‘being that one man is required to supervise 3 boring machines instead of 2.’ On some mines over the past months, men had been supervising three, many voluntarily. Now the agitation

---

26 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
27 Percy Molteno to Louis Botha, 23 Apr 1907, in V. Solomon (ed), Selections from the Correspondence of Percy Alport Molteno, p 289.
28 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Apr 1907, WSRO: PHA.
29 Lord Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 3 May 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D6.3.3.1.
30 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
31 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
seized hold of this and brought on a strike, principally in Germiston, which Wyndham thought would fizzle out. However, over the next days the industrial action assumed large proportions. Yet Wyndham’s opinion remained unchanged. He was convinced that the strike would end in failure for the men: ‘I think the strike will afford an excellent opportunity to the mining houses, to reconstruct the conditions of labour, & thus effect a greater economy in the cost of production.’ Johannesburg was picqueted with troops and by late May three lives had been lost. However Wyndham’s primary concern at this point was that the Volunteers would not be called out, as this would delay his sailing for England. Hugh was eager to leave. He had not been back in England since settling on Kromdraai and just at the moment when it seemed as if he might be free to leave, the strike threatened to keep him in Johannesburg.

He needed ‘a change badly’ and, with the Johannesburg Agricultural Show and his libel action over, he desired to raise the case of the settlers in London. During May he placed his affairs in order. A passage was reserved for later in the month and he planned to deploy at Amersfoort, shortly before sailing, with two of his squadrons. Yet, due to an administrative glitch the camp was postponed and this prevented him from sailing in May. And then, to compound his irritation, Selborne used the window so created to summon him to Government House, where Hugh spent the last weekend in May waiting on a governor, about whom Hugh thought there was ‘something particularly uninspiring.’ Selborne, with no little apprehension regarding Wyndham’s visit to England, was anxious to see him before his departure, to talk to him about the settlers and the importance of reconciliation.

Hugh left South Africa at a time when ‘everyone in Johannesburg [was] either bankrupt or on the verge of bankruptcy.’ Government expenditure was higher than ever before, with increased provision for education and suffering from the decision to send away the Chinese without the Government knowing how to replace their labour. Some five
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33 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
34 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
35 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
36 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
37 ‘I should like to see somebody take up the case against Selborne in England.’ See Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 31 Dec 1906, WSRO: PHA.
38 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
39 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 May 1907, WSRO: PHA.
40 Dougul Malcolm to Patrick Duncan, 22 July 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.25.1.
million pounds was loaned for advances to farmers and the linking of farms by rail to the towns. This, as Dougal Malcolm noted, did not 'produce a cheerful spirit', although it did induce Curtis to embark, mentally at least, on the fantastic idea of 'the fission of a white labouring South African population, to be produced by the pressure of long years of bankruptcy and starvation', which, although noble, was 'hardly likely to be popular in the community'.41 Under these conditions of distress, the Progressives branded the gift of the Cullinan diamond to the Crown as 'inopportune'.42

Wyndham sailed for Southampton at the beginning of June.43 He, of course, visited several country houses, including Petworth and Goodwood, and went to Cowes. He also attended a meeting of the Compatriots Club at Leo Maxse's house ('really a most interesting discussion on South Africa -- all points of view being represented'). Here he 'could not resist making a speech' and told his mother that he had 'seldom enjoyed an evening more.'44 On July 15 he stood by John Buchan as best man.45 He re-cemented old relationships - went to Oxford to meet with Spooner, the warden at New College, and 'a lot of old friends there' -- as well as attempting to influence some members of the Liberal government and, in particular, Winston Churchill, who, as under secretary for colonies, had played an active part during the passage of the Transvaal constitution.46 This meeting seemingly never took place. Churchill and Milner were bruising each other in speech and in the press and Churchill, branded a turncoat for abandoning the Tories in 1904 and then seemingly the Empire, was not going to expose himself to the ranting of a reactionary from the imperial periphery, who on the face of it wanted to extend Milnerism past its sell-by date.47
2. Marriage to Maud Lyttelton

Wyndham had another important matter in England. He needed a wife and companion, to assist him in covering the imperial retreat in the Transvaal and who would mother his children and instil in them solid British values. Yet, finding 'the right kind of woman in Africa', as Lady Selborne commiserated with Patrick Duncan, was no easy thing. Neighbouring farmers brought their daughters to Kromdraai, where they 'sat round without speaking for hours – drinking tea & whiskey', all in the hope that Wyndham 'might take a fancy to one'. But South African women, although good, wholesome and homely, simply did not have the societal connections and Hugh, like other aristocrats, was largely insular when it came to the marriage market. Among the two hundred great governing families of Britain, 'everyone knew or was related to everyone else ... People who met each other every day, at each other’s homes, at race meetings and hunts, at Cowes, for the Regatta, at the Royal Academy, at court and in Parliament, were more often than not meeting their second cousins or brother-in-law’s uncle or stepfather’s sister or aunt’s nephew on the other side.' Britain's dominant social elite knew each other, and the innermost circles knew each other intimately and often quite apart from Westminster.

The lady of Kromdraai, as one might expect, would necessarily be drawn from within this circle. Yet, out in South Africa, Hugh had little opportunity to meet suitable possibilities. The daughters of Sir Arthur Lawley were too young and in any case Jack Lyttelton, who met them in 1905, found them 'delightful ... very sporting and tomboyish,' characteristics that hardly appealed to Hugh. And, to make matters worse Hugh, like Patrick Duncan, did not excel in meeting ‘such English girls that come out’ and both despised small talk. In the end, it was another family intervention that saw him to the altar.

---

48 See also John Dove to his sister, 24 Nov 1907, in R.H. Brand (ed), The Letters of John Dove, p 18; and Patrick Duncan to Lady Selborne, 30 Dec 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, J1.1.9.
49Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 18 June [1909?], UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D4.3.3.
50Wyndham related this to a luncheon party in the House of Assembly. See Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 May 1916, WSRO: PHA.
Wyndham's mother, aided and abetted by Lady Cobham, wove a future in which his lot was united with Maud Lyttelton, the eldest of the Cobham children. Maud was born on 22 July 1880 at Hagley Hall, Worcestershire, where the Lytteltons had lived since at least 1235. Like the Wyndhams, the Lytteltons ranked among the great governing families of England and their antecedents and contemporary relatives were acquainted, sometimes intimately, with Hugh's ancestors and members of his extended family. Their shared ancestors included several prime ministers, including Chatham and Pitt, while Hugh's uncle, Rosebery, was a Liberal ally of Maud's uncle, W.E. Gladstone and Hannah Rosebery and Lavinia Talbot (one of Maud's many aunts) socialised during the parliamentary sessions.

Yet, although related somewhat distantly to each other and acquainted for many years, Hugh and Maud were clearly not close: he remained 'Mr Wyndham' and she 'Miss Lyttelton' until well into 1907. Although Maud 'came out' in the same year as Hugh's youngest sister, during which time they shared the London Season and visited each other in

---

53 Her father, Charles Lyttelton (1842-1922), succeeded his father as 6th Lord Lyttelton in 1876 and the last Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, as 8th Viscount Cobham in 1889. Maud's mother, a Cavendish, was a daughter of the 2nd Lord Chesham and a cousin of the Duke of Devonshire. S. Fletcher, Victorian Girls: Lord Lyttelton's Daughters (London 2004), pp 2, 212-13, 254-57. The papers at Hagley and Petworth are littered with such references and Maud, herself, did much to publish material from the archival holdings at Hagley and elsewhere, which stress the importance of family both laterally and longitudinally. Lord Rosebery, in Chatham: His early life and connections (London 1910), addressed the eighteenth century connections between the Pitts, Grenvilles, Lytteltons, Stanhopes and Wyndhams; while S.G. Checkland, The Gladstones: A Family Biography, 1764-1851 (Cambridge 1971); Betty Askwith, The Lytteltons: A Family Chronicle of the Nineteenth Century (London 1975); Sheila Fletcher, Victorian Girls: Lord Lyttelton's Daughters (London 2004) and L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters (New York 1930) are windows into the same theme for the later period. And then these are supported by a wealth of family biography and autobiography. See also Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 May 1920, WSRO: PHA.

54 Such links continued into the following generation. George Wyndham, for example, was a close friend of several of Maud's family, including Gladstone's daughter, Mary Drew (diary, 7 Apr 1881 and 10 Jun 1913, and Mary Drew to Dorothy Drew, 27 Sep 1910, in L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters, pp 223, 459); while Maud, on occasion, accompanied the Percy Wyndhams to the theatre. The first such occasion was in 1896, when Maud, only sixteen, went to 'Captain Brassbound's Conversion' with 'old Mr Percy Wyndham and his daughter Mrs Adeane.' The incident is recalled in Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Feb 1909, WSRO: PHA.

55 Their nearest relationship was fourth cousins once removed. Both were descended from Sir William Wyndham (1688-1740): Hugh in the direct male line; Maud (from Sir William Wyndham's daughter, Elizabeth) through the Grenville, Neville, and Glynn families.
the country, Hugh was at the time already in South Africa. There, however, he had regular contact with several of Maud’s relatives, including her Boer-War-general uncles, Lord Chesham and Neville Lyttelton, as well as her cousin, Neville Talbot, who after the war had accepted the position of ADC to his uncle and namesake. Hugh also met Jack Lyttelton, Maud’s brother, whom he may have known as a younger boy at Eton, and their acquaintance was renewed when Jack returned to South Africa in 1905 as Selborne’s ADC. Maud and Hugh, although they did not correspond, received news of each other. Jack wrote from South Africa saying that he had ‘met Hugh Wyndham a good deal’, whom he said was ‘a merry fellow, breeds and runs horses, and wears large sombrero hats which go curiously.’ The merriness, probably exaggerated, and the horses must have appealed to Maud. Both Jack and the Selbornes’ daughter, Lady Mabel Palmer, invited her to visit South Africa and, although Maud in the end did not go, her mother remained busy.

Lady Cobham paraded her daughters from country house to estate in search of a match. In early January 1907 she and Frances, the second Lyttelton daughter, were at Petworth: Lady Leconfield had five unmarried sons (Charles, Reginald, Hugh, Edward and Humphrey) any one of whom would have made a perfect match for one of the Lyttelton girls. She and Frances were in the Transvaal at the time of the election and stayed as guests at Kromdraai. In her letters to Maud, Lady Cobham stressed the gargantuan battle for the Standerton seat, suggesting that Wyndham was ‘so popular’ that only Botha ‘had any chance against him.’ She clearly wanted one of her daughters to accept Hugh; she liked

---

58 Maud ‘came out’ in the same year as Hugh’s youngest sister (Margaret) as well as two of his cousins (Margaret Primrose and Sybil Primrose). See ‘The girls who came out in my year’ in Scrapbook kept by Maud Mary Lyttelton, from 21 April 1899, HHA; and Maud Lyttelton to Lord Cobham, 5 Oct 1902, HHA 2/31/37.
60 Jack Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 2 Feb 1902, HHA 2/6/10.
64 Lady Cobham to Maud Lyttelton, 9 Jan 1907, HHA 2/23/1.
65 Maud Lyttelton to Lucy Lyttelton (later Masterman), 28 Apr 1907, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/71/3/2.
him and tried to make the best of him. Although an interest, fomented by their mothers, aunts and cousins, developed between Hugh and Maud, the eldest of the Lyttelton girls, they were not 'in love.'

They were engaged that October and Maud took him around the country to meet the family institutions: to Kennington to meet the Bishop, Edward Talbot, and Aunt Lavinia, whom Hugh thought 'the most charming person he'd ever met', and then on to Richard and Uncle Edward at Eton, and to Falconhurst to make the acquaintance of the John Talbots. Although this trekking from country house to country house, staying a few days at each place, was tiring, it was an opportunity to make friends and renew acquaintances.

Wyndham returned to South Africa towards the end of October, leaving Maud in London to settle her marriage linen and arrange matters for a wedding early the following year. On the voyage there was 'an indescribably poor band.' Yet, despite this, Hugh 'at last got to the end of [his] sea journey', which had been 'been pleasant enough.' He enjoyed 'farming shop' with two friends on board, and with this, and Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, which Maud gave him to read on board, and 'a certain amount of Patience (I mean card patience)' the time passed quickly enough. He arrived in South Africa, where the news of his engagement drew the interest of Lady Selborne and returned immediately to some volunteering and settler work.

In November, in answer to the labour shortages and loss of the Chinese labour, Wyndham participated in 'a great Native Colonization scheme', 'a sort of Labour farm' he called it, whereby Africans would be settled 'on plots on condition that they pay their rent in the form of so much work in the year on the mines or other public works.'

---

67 It would seem as if aristocratic mothers often chose spouses for their daughters. See, for example, the discussion in Frances Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 25 July 1907, HHA 2/23/19. Hugh, in turn, thought Lady Cobham 'quite delightful.' See Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Mar 1907, WSRO: PHA.

68 Maud, writing some years later to Lady Leconfield, admitted that her marriage to Hugh had begun 'with no little aversion.' Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 May 1914, WSRO: PHA.

69 Maud Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 16 Oct 1907, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/17/13/3.


72 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Oct 1907, WSRO: PHA.

73 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.

74 Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 19 Oct 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan papers, D4.1.2.

75 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
Wyndham was asked to become a Director and he found this experiment in labour tenancy 'a most interesting & novel experiment', although he 'hardly hope[d] that [they would] avoid the accusation of slavery.' However, if a success, this scheme would, he thought, succumbing to the rhetoric of the day, represent 'the first fruitful effort at dealing with the native problem, at any rate in this Colony.'

He also went to Bloemfontein, which he always found 'rather oppressive', to start a settlers' cooperative society. 'Poring over Articles of Association & other papers all day' Hugh did not feel in the best form. He then went on to a political meeting in Standerton and to Johannesburg on 12 December for a military tournament — 'a volunteer affair, which is proving a great success [his regiment getting] several 3rd prizes.' Hugh returned to England early the next year, sailing from Cape Town at the end of January in the company of Jack Lyttelton.

Figure 5.1: The financial means of Lords Cobham and Leconfield compared. (Source: David Cannadine, *The Decline of the British Aristocracy*, pp 710, 724.)

Hugh and Maud were married on Tuesday 25 February 1908, when, despite the awful weather, an assemblage of the rank and fashion in London and country society...
gathered at the fashionable church of St Peter on Eaton Square. In many ways they were cut from the same cloth. Maud, for one, was also an arch Conservative and a staunch supporter of a Greater Britain. Yet, in other ways they were quite different. There was a difference in their senses of humour. The Lytteltons loved ragging ("Their laughter was a tornado or convulsion to which they succumbed"), whereas the Wyndhams were staid and, perhaps as a recent writer has explained, 'odd to say the least'; 'some members being marked by bizarre persecution mania or behavioural habits which kept them from being prominent in society.' Hugh and Maud did not laugh at the same things. And there were notable differences too in terms of family wealth and political influence (see figure 5.1). The Leconfields were substantial financially and fashionable socially, Petworth being one of the most selective country houses in England. The Lytteltons, although financially less substantial, were as fashionable and had considerable political and social influence. Niece of both Alfred Lyttelton and W.E. Gladstone, and an established writer, Maud was a well-known quantity. She had established success in writing, which, as her brother noted, was 'one of the few virtuous ways in which a woman [could] make herself famous.' And, indeed, in February 1908, *The Times* of London heralded the:

'Marriage of the Hon. Maud Lyttelton; Brilliant Ceremony in London.'

Hugh, on the other hand, his ego perhaps hurt by this headline, was relatively unknown in London. Out on the imperial periphery since 1901, he had last drawn attention when he lost Standerton to Louis Botha. For the Wyndhams, intent 'on restoring [their] political

---

80 Mary Drew to Lavinia Talbot, 1 Jan 1902, in L. Masterman (ed), *Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters*, p 455.
83 Hugh was of course very aware of this discrepancy in their families' finances. See, for example, Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Sep 1917, WSRO: PHA; as well as S. Fletcher, *Victorian Girls: Lord Lyttelton's Daughters* (London 2004), pp 2-3.
84 Jack Lyttelton to Lucy Lyttelton (later Masterman), 11 Aug 1905, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/17/15/1.
85 'Marriage of the Hon. Maud Lyttelton; Brilliant Ceremony in London', *The Times*, London, c. Feb 1908, Scrapbook kept by Mary Viscountess Cobham, HHA. The presents, according to the social correspondent of *The Times*, numbered upwards of three hundred and were viewed by the friends of the family on the Monday before the wedding at the London house of Maud's parents, 11, Gloucester Place, Portman Square, which they hired for the occasion. Hugh presented Maud with a diamond tiara. Maud gave him a dressing case.
influence, Maud was most acceptable. On the other hand, for the Lytteltons, Hugh was also quite a catch at a time when marriage was an unemotional matter, a contract where money weighed as least as heavy as love.

After a short stay in London the Hugh Wyndhams went to the continent for their honeymoon. Hugh enjoyed going abroad. They were in Florence in March and went on to the Ritz in Paris the next month. In Europe they explored Roman ruins, Medici temples and memorials to Napoleon and French martial prowess, perhaps at least as much as each other. Although the marriage started with ‘with no little aversion’, the honeymoon represented their primary opportunity to grow together and bond.

They departed for South Africa in June (Maud, enjoying the voyage, played ‘a brilliant part on the ship’) and so missed Jack’s marriage to Violet Leonard on June 30, when for the second time in 1908, a Lyttelton assemblage gathered at St Peter’s on Eaton Square. Maud, seeing the wedding photographs eight months later, remarked how ‘rather ghastly’ she thought Violet looked. This remark, not unmixed with some jealousy as Violet was by that time already expecting, reflected Maud’s prejudice against colonials. And to make matters worse, Violet, although the daughter of Charles Leonard, the Rand attorney and member of the Reform Committee, had a Dutch-speaking mother, who was soon to be granny to the new crop of Lytteltons at Hagley.

Maud was at first happy to fulfil the expectations of wife. She was content to please Hugh, run an efficient household and play at the roles of graceful hostess, chiefly at their

87 Commenting in December 1914 on war marriages Maud noted how the war gave ‘a fatalistic as well as emotional impetus – people don’t count their pence with such care & feel love is enough.’ Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Dec 1914, WSRO: PHA.
88 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Mar 1908, HHA 2/31/50.
89 Frances Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 24 Mar 1908, HHA 2/31/50.
91 Rachel Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 9 July 1908, HHA 2/31/51.
93 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Feb 1909, WSRO: PHA.
94 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Apr 1912, WSRO: PHA.
Maud had time for leisure, which she spent in gossip with family and friends, reading and the keeping up of an impressive correspondence. Shortly after her wedding she already hatched 'the glorious plan' of inviting her sister Frances to South Africa and invitations to Edward and Lavinia Talbot and their daughter Winny followed. Maud was, however, soon bored with her humdrum existence and her family detected that something was wrong. She admitted to Lady Leconfield that she got 'so bored thinking of new ways to cook a chicken.' Even Patrick Duncan, not a perceptive observer of women, if Lady Selborne may be believed, felt that what Maud wanted most was 'some person or motor which would make her do things and pull her out of the centre of indifference in which she seems to live.' Hugh was incapable of playing such a role.

Maud, like all Lytteltons, had an interest in the Victoria League and took up with the Guild of Loyal Women, the League's sister organisation in South Africa. The Guild, claiming to be non-political, cared for war graves and, commencing with the Cape Dutch, sought to achieve reconciliation in South Africa, although, for them, reconciliation implied loyalty 'to Crown and Empire.' Maud nonetheless seemingly played a key role in introducing South Africans visiting Britain, many of them Dutch speakers, to society at home. Although as she told Lady Leconfield, whom she asked to meet with Mrs Krause, wife of Dr Krause, who had been condemned to be hanged for inciting people to rebel during the war, she suggested that 'any civility within reason will be a good thing.'

Maud, Hugh reported to his mother, 'worked wonders in Johannesburg Society [and broke] through various cast iron cliques.' But with a title and connections (her aunt, Meriel Talbot was the Victoria League's highly competent secretary from 1901 until

96 Frances Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 24 Mar 1908, HHA 2/31/50.
97 Lavinia Talbot to Maud Wyndham, 31 Dec 1908, HHA 2/6/30.
98 Rachel Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 3 Oct 1910, HHA 2/5/2.
99 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
100 Patrick Duncan to Lady Selborne, 27 June 1910, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, J1.2.17.
103 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Mar 1909, WSRO: PHA.
104 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
1916\textsuperscript{105} this was not too difficult. However, of great concern to imperialists in England and South Africa, was the materialism of Johannesburg and the division among British women there.\textsuperscript{106} The Selborne’s daughter, Mabel Palmer, told Maud in August 1905, that ‘no one [in Johannesburg] takes the faintest interest in anything outside what effects £s.d. in the mines & shares etc. Everything & everyone turns on these 3 letters. I confess I don’t think Johannesburg people are calculated to impress one imperially!’\textsuperscript{107} These were sentiments shared by Jack Lyttelton, who opined in a letter to Maud that the town was ‘largely peopled by cats of the most cattish order and all divided up into factions.’\textsuperscript{108} Women’s organisations therefore proliferated through fission. The Federation of British Women was established in 1906, apparently under the auspices of the Progressive Association, and contained ‘a great many conflicting elements, not only of parties but of the different personalities of the various officials.’\textsuperscript{109} Within months, Marguerite Chaplin was part of the move to establish ‘the kind of League’ she thought was needed: not formed on party lines but on principle, and possibly having a common membership. Yet, the principles proposed (imperial ascendency and the maintenance of the British Flag in South Africa, for one) placed the British Women’s League squarely in the political arena and with little to differ it from the Federation of British Women.\textsuperscript{110} Within a year, the British Women’s League was in trouble. Marguerite Chaplin was at odds with Nina Boyle, whom even Milner thought ‘a very difficult person.’\textsuperscript{111} Mrs Chaplin, no easy woman herself (Hugh thought her in 1909 ‘even less charitable to her neighbours than formerly’\textsuperscript{112}), considered resigning and leaving Florence Phillips to ‘put Miss B in her proper position.’\textsuperscript{113} Milner intervened in an attempt to save the League (‘I think the mere

\textsuperscript{105} Eliza Riedi, ‘Women, Gender, and the Promotion of Empire: The Victoria League, 1901-1914’, \textit{The Historical Journal} 45(3) 2002, p 576.

\textsuperscript{106} See, for example, Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 24 Dec 1907 and 5 Jan 1908, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.

\textsuperscript{107} Lady Mabel Palmer to Maud Lyttelton, 18 Aug 1905, HHA 2/21/30.

\textsuperscript{108} Jack Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 2 Oct 1905, HHA 2/21/37.

\textsuperscript{109} Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, undated, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.

\textsuperscript{110} May Cooke to Marguerite Chaplin, 25 Feb 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B2.

\textsuperscript{111} Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 5 Jan 1908, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.

\textsuperscript{112} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Oct 1909, WSRO: PHA.

\textsuperscript{113} Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 26 Nov 1907, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.
fact of keeping the women, where sympathies are, in a broad sense, British, together, must be of much use\textsuperscript{114}) but, even this, was only of momentary effect.

Occasionally Maud travelled within southern Africa, accompanying Hugh on business or escorting visitors. For example, she and Mabel Palmer, having guided Maggie Wyndham and Frances Lyttelton to Cape Town to catch the return boat to Southampton, went round the coast to Durban, where Hugh, who hoped Maud would 'be all the better for a change to the coast', met them.\textsuperscript{115} From Durban the party of three went to Pietermartizburg ('the slackest place') as the guests of the governor, Sir Matthew Nathan. There they attended the opening of the Natal parliament and a banquet that evening. The Natalians, Maud grumbled, 'talked of Johannesburg as if it was Paris & if I'd stayed on a Maritzburg I shd have begun to think it was too.'\textsuperscript{116} In April 1909 she accompanied Hugh north to Blauwberg, where he hoped she would 'enjoy ... a good deal when she is once started.'\textsuperscript{117} Yet, travelling in South Africa did not have the excitement of the country house circuit or the London season and Maud (who never developed a love for South Africa, 'as the rest of her family' did\textsuperscript{118}) looked forward increasingly to her visits to the United Kingdom, the first of which lasted from May to December 1909.

3. **The Southern Mounted Rifles and debate on South African defence**

Such travelling about the country allowed Wyndham to further his settler and military interests. Following his return from Britain, Wyndham, without losing interest in his stud, worked on the creation of a platform from which to gain access to the corridors of real political power. This was two-fold: the rolling out of various colonization schemes, resulting in an increased British presence on the platteland, and secondly Wyndham's position in the Transvaal Volunteers and the platform this provided to gain access to and take part in the pre-Union defence debates.

\textsuperscript{114} Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, 5 Jan 1908, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3.
\textsuperscript{115} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 March 1909, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{116} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 April 1909, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{117} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{118} Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 19 Oct 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan papers, D4.1.2.
Command of the Southern Mounted Rifles was in some ways more difficult than that of the Eastern Rifles. The Southern Mounted Rifles formed one of two district-based corps of the Transvaal Volunteers, with a regimental area encompassing much of the southern Transvaal. The regiment had a strength of 662 men in 1909, of whom a satisfactory 89.91% were deemed 'efficient.' However the long distances and financial cost made regimental concentrations difficult. Nonetheless, in 1910, as many as 534 of the total strength of 591, turned-out for the concentration at Florida and the Annual Report records that 'many had to come as much as 300 miles by rail and had previously to trek from 40 to 50, and occasionally as much as 90 miles, to the nearest Railway Station.' Wyndham seems to have succeeded in reducing the numbers and keeping the best. The 1911 Annual Report on the Transvaal Volunteers and Cadets praises the troopers of the Southern Mounted Rifles as 'a hard, wiry lot of men inured to hardship; mounted on the useful Cob of the Country which, though without great pace, can cover very great distances without undue fatigue.' The men, the report went on, were 'commanded by a lot of keen Officers, who are kept well up to the mark by their Commanding Officer.'

Few of the Transvaal Volunteer officers passed through the British staff colleges, despite the need for uniformity in training articulated at the inter-colonial military conference convened in Johannesburg on 21 January 1907. Attaching colonial officers to Imperial regiments and the posting of Imperial officers to colonial units, mostly for instructional duties, it was thought, could bridge this hiatus. In 1906, for example, Wyndham trained in 'savage warfare' with the British Pretoria garrison and such exercises were supplemented occasionally by specialised courses in Britain. Wyndham, himself, was attached to the Military Operations Directorate at the War Office for three

122 See, for example, Ward to Under Secretary for Colonies, 10 July 1905, NASAP: GOV 77; Alfred Lyttelton to Lord Selborne, 30 Sep 1905 (f.609), NASAP: GOV 80; and Lord Selborne to Lord Elgin, 15 Oct 1906 (f.1011) and Selborne to Elgin, 22 Oct 1906 (f.1028), NASAP: GOV 202.
123 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Aug 1906, WSRO: PHA.
Invasion from neighbouring territories belonging to European states, particularly Germany and Portugal, and brought on by a war between the United Kingdom and a European power that maintained a 'native' army in Africa, was Wyndham’s second scenario. Lord Selborne, although establishing cordial relations with his counterparts Von Lindequist and Coutinho, in Windhuk and Lourenço Marques, was wary. He viewed in particular the concentration of more than fifteen thousand German troops in South West Africa with anxiety. There they were assisted by ‘a few thousand’ armed Boers, who Selborne felt, might, in the event of an Anglo-German war, pass in small commandos into the most rebel districts of the Cape Colony, cut the railway line to the north, and put the Boers throughout South Africa to a sore temptation to take the opportunity of rising.’ Wyndham, however, thought this scenario could also be lightly regarded. The frontier regions were undeveloped and, in the case of German South West Africa, deserts provided ‘an impenetrable barrier.’ Yet, as he pointed out, development often occurs almost unnoticed and ‘to limit the study of defence to facts as they happen to exist to-day is to rob it of half its significance.’ This was shown by none other than Jan Kemp and his rebel commando late in 1914. Despite the bitterness of time and their past history, Wyndham later praised Kemp and the feat. He wrote his mother:

‘Kemp’s march across the Kalahari with a following of 1600 rebels will always remain as one of the most marvellous performances. The other day I was reading the Military reports on this area [which he himself had informed], which limited the number of men it was possible to move at a time to 50’

According to Wyndham, his third contingency (a general rising of ‘natives’) formed South Africa’s ‘real weakness’ and in conjunction with the first two would bring ‘a crisis which we may devoutly pray may never come about.’ With ‘native’, Wyndham meant both Africans and Afrikaners, but, in 1909 and the air of reconciliation between the white groups, he could not write of Afrikaner strife and he likewise avoided reference to industrial unrest, although this was very evident and much on his mind.

---

133 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 9 Dec 1914, WSRO: Maxse Papers 455.
Wyndham’s focus therefore fell (for political reasons only) on black Africans and here, he held, South Africa had the ‘supreme disadvantage of not being able to place absolute confidence in her position within her own borders.’ However, invoking a considerable body of opinion, he thought Africans would never be a threat because of their inability to form one organised force:

‘...one of the first principles of strategy is to divide your enemy and defeat him in detail: therefore, when by the force of circumstances he is already divided and never likely to be otherwise, to defeat him in detail is a simple and expeditious matter.’

Yet, as Wyndham noted, there was a counter-side to this argument. The very absence of an African coalition also forced a division of government forces and introduced a considerable amount of military inconvenience. Invoking history and in particular the co-operation between Cetswayo and Sekhukhune, he forecast the creation of diversions and, instead of having one definite entity with which to deal, the government would find itself ‘surrounded by a swarm of rebellions, which besides necessitating a continual change of objective will certainly lead to hostilities being unduly prolonged.’ He found equally poignant examples from the New Zealand wars, where the Maoris, using external lines, were not concentrated but scattered through many districts. And, closer to home, in the 1906 Bambata rebellion, no sooner had the rebels been disposed of in the Nkandla Forest than Duncan Mackenzie found himself fully occupied in the Mapumulu district to the south. ‘It [was] unnecessary, however, to multiply examples’, Wyndham argued. ‘The point is that by being divided as he is the native has a regular strategic system to hand. It is no argument to say he is not capable of employing it, because he has utilised it in the past.’

In fact, the Bambata rebellion had shown that simply the threat of uprisings elsewhere was sufficient and had moreover highlighted the fact that the colonial forces

---

were 'quite inadequate to deal even remotely with any extreme contingency.'\(^{139}\) The Transvaal government actually took the precaution in May 1906 of massing rifles and ammunition in Pietersburg, Lydenburg and Pretoria.\(^{140}\) Wyndham's answer lay in 'balancing' South African military power and he, with Colonel P.S. Beves, the Inspector of the Transvaal Volunteers, and his other senior officers prepared two emergency plans: one for internal security (general African 'unrest') and the other to meet an external threat and particularly with regard to German South West Africa.\(^{141}\) In the first, entitled *Simultaneous Trouble with the natives in all the self-governing colonies*, its authors thought it impossible to predict an area of greatest potential trouble but highlighted the Witwatersrand, the Western Transvaal and the region north and east of Pietersburg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 days</th>
<th>7 days</th>
<th>14 days</th>
<th>21 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krugersdorp (No 1 Mobile Column)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietersburg (No 2 Mobile Column)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.2: Deployment of the Southern Mounted Rifles in the event of an emergency**
(Source: E. Jonker, 'Ontstaan en ontwikkeling van die Transvaalse Verdedigingsmag: Transvaal Volunteers', *Militaria* 3(3) 1972, pp 48-51.)

As a result hereof, two mounted columns made up from the Transvaal Volunteers were planned: No 1 Mobile Column to concentrate in Krugersdorp for deployment within the Witwatersrand or into the Western Transvaal; and No 1 Mobile Column in Pietersburg, the other 'hot spot.' This impacted upon Wyndham and his regiment in terms of both estimated time and numbers of troopers. One squadron of the Southern Mounted Rifles was attached to each of these columns, although the bulk of the SMR was reserved to protect the Swaziland border in conjunction with imperial troops.\(^{142}\) Within four days of a mobilisation, Wyndham was to have 100 troopers in either place and this escalated to

---

140 Assistant Under Colonial Secretary to Colonel Lukin, 16 May 1906, NASAC: CO 8319, file 5124
141 Supply of 600 M.H. Rifles and quarter of a million cartridges for Transvaal Govt.
200 within seven days and 400 within fourteen days. Alternatively, in the event of a war with Germany, the troops would mass in Kimberley, where Wyndham was to have 500 troopers of the Southern Mounted Rifles within three weeks. (Table 5.2).

For Wyndham the problem of defence was 'one of remarkable complexity and magnitude' and in 1909 he laid down three requirements to be met if South African defence was to be sound in terms of internal security. 'Native' rebellions, he observed, 'start suddenly and unexpectedly by the murder of outlying farmers', whom, he thought, would benefit from the protection offered by loop-holed buildings erected on every farm in exposed districts. His first call was therefore for fixed defences, a system whereby farmers in outlying localities would be ready for emergencies and able to defend themselves and their families until they could be relieved and the offensive action taken.143

Such action, he argued, secondly, had to be short, sharp and decisive to confirm in the minds of Africans – both combatants and sympathisers – that the Europeans were the masters. This was typical colonial rhetoric. Flying columns had to be organised, equipped and trained in peacetime and ready at a moment's notice to take the field and deal vigorously with a rising. Invoking General Aston, on the British staff in South Africa, Wyndham reckoned that such a force had to have the power and mobility of a queen on a chessboard: able to be moved where and when needed and 'not tied by the leg to local defence.'144 He likened the colonial forces out during the Natal rebellion to pawns, as he wrote to his mother on 25 May 1906:

'For the present force to pursue Bambata & Siginanda through that country, is like following a will o' the wisp. The native of course retreats & our horses are becoming rapidly exhausted. This is bad, as the chief danger is that the affair should be dragged out too long.'145

Using previous colonial campaigns as a guide, Wyndham recommended a mobile force of at least twenty thousand of all arms: 'Here then is some data for our guidance',

---

he wrote in 1909. 'We find in 1879 17,000 troops required to defeat the Zulus as a whole, while in 1906 5,000 are necessary to quell a rebellion of only a portion of them. In 1852 2,000 troops failed to gain a decided victory over 6,000 basutos (sic); in 1880 10,000 are mobilised against the same tribe, with the same result. Instances of defeat of large bodies of natives by a few white men are no useful guide. These actions were defensive. The white men could not have “pacified” their enemies.' 146 While Wyndham thought a permanent force of twenty thousand most desirable, he recognised that this was not viable financially and South Africa would, for some time, have to rely on volunteers.

Yet, to Wyndham, the disadvantages of a voluntary system were obvious. An unpopular though efficient officer (and here he was perhaps writing from own experience) could have an effect on recruiting; and the volunteer himself may be placed at a disadvantage in the workplace. Patriotism, he also noted, was likely to flourish in waves, fanned during national disasters. And, with volunteer forces:

‘the absence of preparation is admitted only after it is too late, and is followed by a wild rush to join hastily raised regiments, which have to undergo the hardest training of all – the training of a raw recruit surrounded by the realities of war.’ 147

More than just the ability to ride and shoot was required. This point, he argued, was amply borne out by the failure of the Boer forces in the last war against the British Empire. He therefore stressed training, acknowledging all the requirements of military organisation, which, he argued, as the science of war advanced, were becoming more and more complicated. The Boer commandos were regarded by some as ‘a fortuitous concourse of individuals instead of a highly organised collection of units.’ 148

Nonetheless, the volunteer was excellent material. As he noted, the volunteer, ‘by the mere act of volunteering, has proved that he has a proper conception of duty, which may be absent from the individual who is compulsorily enrolled.’ And, then, too, ‘compulsion is apt to lead to the performance of only the minimum required for efficiency, whereas in a voluntary system a greater degree of competition combined with

145 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 May 1906, WSRO: PHA.
esprit de corps can be cultivated. Wyndham had had little trouble enrolling volunteers in the Southern Mounted Rifles. His Piet Retief squadron of 150 men, nearly all Boers, was keen and efficient. On the borders of the Transvaal Colony adjoining Swaziland and Zululand, these men, Wyndham argued, were ‘very much alive to what would happen, & the exposed position they would be in in the event of a native rising, & so they are all anxious to join the Volunteers.’ He recognised, however, that volunteers might not always be available in sufficient numbers and for this reason he advocated a combination of voluntary and compulsory service.

In sum, Wyndham envisioned a striking force of twenty thousand volunteers and conscripts. They were to be organised into first and second reserves in order to avoid the risk of any district being depleted of defence owing to the absence of its active defence forces, which would form a portion of Wyndham’s proposed flying column. Such local forces, organised in such a way that they could be called on to defend a district, would allow of the removal of active mobile forces to deal with ‘trouble’ elsewhere. If the regular forces were removed and the country left unprotected, and they suffered a reverse, this would immediately be translated into proof that colonial superiority was a thing of the past, and ‘the work of massacre would begin.’

He argued that had the Transvaal organised second-line reserves her active and mobile forces might have been released during the Bamabata rebellion ‘for the purposes for which they in reality should exist.’ In the event, when Wyndham’s regiment, the Eastern Rifles, was mobilised, only some thirty-three men could be sent to Natal for service with the Zululand Field Force, and the rest had to remain behind to secure the Transvaal border and maintain local security. Wyndham’s third call, therefore, was for universal military training and a system of cadets, of active volunteers or militia, of first and second reserves. He proposed a system where every boy, having received training in a Cadet Corps, either enrol in the first reserve or volunteer for the active forces. Advantages would have to be offered to encourage the ‘best men’ to join the active list, but both the active volunteer and first reserve would be required to do the same amount

150 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Dec 1909, WSRO: PHA.
of training. He proposed further that his second reserve be filled with older men, who would also be called upon should the country be invaded by a European power.  

The Transvaal Volunteers in conjunction with the imperial garrisons dotted across the platteland, fulfilled several functions. Their mobile columns and high visibility kept the Africans down, Het Volk in check and the miners of the Witwatersrand at the workface; and all the while the Royal Navy kept any external threats at bay.

4. Land settlement and the Settlers Cooperative Union

The farming sector was in some trouble after 1907. The flood of new farmers brought on land price inflation and exacerbated the shortage of labour, and, from 1907, the farming community had to contend with a depression that lasted though to 1911 and made an already complex struggle on the land more difficult. Despite the presence of a variety of farming associations and cooperatives, farmers remained ‘divided [until at least the 1920s], between and within districts, on political lines.’ Dutch and English-speaking farmers pursued their interests through different political parties and associations and within the Dutch sector, loyalties were also divided. The cooperatives, statutory bodies established to make farmers more self reliant, attracted the poorer farmer; while wealthy landowners, like Wyndham and Louis Botha, with their own marketing facilities and able to raise credit on better terms, were divided into associations with sectarian interests. For Wyndham and his set these interests embraced British immigration, land settlement, and progressive farming, and, to his mind, these three things were inseparable.
Yet, Wyndham and his land-settlement associates, Philip Kerr, John Dove, Geoffrey Robinson, and Robert Brand, were pessimistic about private land settlement.\(^{155}\) State-funded settlement was at an end (the Het Volk government was unwilling to subsidise British immigration and settlement on the platteland) and private funding, which remained small, could not replace the loss of state lands and official money.\(^{156}\) Wyndham therefore set about establishing what he called a ‘settlers cooperative union’ with a view to privatising settlement. He went down to Bloemfontein on 1 December 1907, where, together with Sir Hamilton Gould Adams, he spent days ‘poring over Articles of Association & other papers.’\(^{157}\) Wyndham hoped that this union, apparently an umbrella organisation for all of the British colonies in southern Africa, would show ‘what can be done by true cooperation & by progressive methods of farming’ and so ‘attract further settlers to the country, & perhaps some day lift the Boer out of his reactionary rut.’\(^{158}\)

The Settlers Cooperative Union would fulfil two essential functions: address the labour shortages and ensure the continued migration of British farmers to the South African veld. To solve the first predicament – the agricultural labour shortages – Wyndham and Dove launched a scheme to import white agricultural labourers from Britain. The terms they offered included £5 a month in wages, supplemented by farm produce, a contact for three to five years, a house and the right to graze some stock and plant or have a share in the crops. Married couples – to increase the ‘leaven’ – were preferred. Although, some Dutch farmers were said to be interested, three main difficulties remained: money was needed for the assisted passages, the applicants had to be selected, and the farmers in South Africa identified. The project was to be launched through the Union, which, together with ‘every decent Farmers Association in the country’, would add to a register of farmers who required labour.\(^{159}\) Wyndham was

155 See, for example, diary, 15 Dec 1907, BLO: Ms Dawson 13. Wyndham was at this time involved in various other land schemes too. This included, with John Dove, the settlement of progressive British farmers in Rhodesia, working ‘from the settled parts to the districts about to be successively opened up right into the virgin country which is reserved for future development:’ John Dove to ‘Dear Dieter’, undated [c.1906], UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.1.
156 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 11 Jan 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.4.
157 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 Dec 1907, WSRO: PHA.
158 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
159 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 21 Dec 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.2.
tasked with the work of maintaining the register and the forwarding of the names to the London committee, where they would be matched with labourers identified in Britain through, it was hoped, the county councils.160

The second quantity, British yeoman, was to be recruited from the colleges of British universities and, after some training in South Africa, planted on the land. A small committee was established in Johannesburg and another in London. The latter, run by G.L. Craik, Gerard Craig-Sellar and Lord Lovat, identified the ‘right sort of men’ (men with capital of about £1500 and ‘willing to put their backs into it’). In South Africa, the Johannesburg committee arranged a year or two of training, the men serving as apprentices (with farmers who could ‘be relied upon to look after them and see that they learn something’161) before taking up their land. Wyndham, responsible for the database, forwarded the details of farmers and settlers to London, where they would be matched with the names of prospective ‘pupils.’162

The scheme promised to ‘be the beginning of a really good movement on the high veld.’163 Yet, despite having Patrick Duncan as chairman of a White Expansion Society,164 nothing came of the scheme.165 The heyday of imperial migration to South Africa had passed and with it the influence of men like Wyndham had waned in official circles. In May 1909, Wyndham, as chairman of the Transvaal Settlers Union, had written to Selborne complaining that the settlers of the Transvaal had not been represented at the unveiling of the memorial to Dr Adam Jameson.166 No special favour of notification of the event had been extended to him personally or the settlers corporately, reflecting the gap that had widened between Wyndham and the Governor’s Office, following the departure of Jack Lyttelton. He was not on good terms with Selborne (he could never ‘find anything in common with Lord Selborne’, whom he thought always seemed ‘like a log’167).

160 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 27 Dec 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.3.
161 Patrick Duncan to Frank Fletcher, 17 May 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, E41.3.
162 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 1 Sep 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.6.
163 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 27 Dec 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.3.
164 John Dove to Patrick Duncan, 27 Dec 1907, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.13.3.
166 Hugh Wyndham to Private Secretary to the Governor, 2 May 1909, and Private Secretary to the Minister of Public Works to Capt Ewen Cameron, 6 May 1909, NASAP: GOV 1184, PS5/4/09 Miscellaneous The Hon Hugh Wyndham.
167 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Nov 1907, WSRO: PHA.
and he had no personal connection with the governor’s new private secretary. Hugh, who had always been addressed familiarly as ‘Dear Hugh’ or ‘My dear Wyndham’, was now ‘Sir’.\footnote{168}

Yet, this did not dampen spirits entirely and several further schemes were mooted by the members of the kindergarten that remained in South Africa. John Dove suggested the transplantation of some of the white population of the southern states of the United States to grow cotton in the Lowveld.\footnote{169} Wyndham now receded into the background and Dove and Duncan, using the Chartered Company in Rhodesia as primary machine, continued their attempts at white immigration and settlement on the land.\footnote{170}

5. Closer unionism and the establishment of the Unionist Party of South Africa

The policy that followed the British election of January 1906 and the apparent coup de grâce delivered by Het Volk to Milnerism in February 1907 settled the question of predominance in favour of the Boers.\footnote{171} The kindergarten as a group had supported a grant of responsible government for the two former Boer republics. They felt, however, that if responsible government could not be postponed until a British majority had been secured, at the very least something had to be done to avert an eventual and unavoidable collision of the former republics with the Cape and Natal colonies and the drift of South Africa into another war. The only way to avoid such a catastrophe, they argued, ‘was to unite all four colonies under one Government [and so they] decided to start a movement for South African Union’,\footnote{172} to which Selborne gave impetus and, supported by Jameson, the prime minister of the Cape, they placed the matter before the four colonial parliaments and this led to the National Convention which met in 1908 and 1909.

\footnote{168}{Capt Ewen Cameron to Hugh Wyndham, 8 May 1909, NASAP: GOV 1184, PS5/4/09}
\footnote{169}{Patrick Duncan to Lady Selborne, 12 Sep 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, J1.1.1.}
\footnote{170}{‘White Expansion on the Land’, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A9.10; Lady Selborne to Patrick Duncan, 28 Nov 1909, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A9.12; and Lord Lovat to Patrick Duncan, 5 Aug 1910, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A31.5. Milner thought Rhodesia was ‘a field into which British immigration, on the land (the real point) is still possible.’ See Milner to Patrick Duncan, 28 Jun 1911, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.28.2.}
\footnote{171}{Milner to Geoffrey Robinson, 14 Sep 1907 (ff.51-61), BLO: Ms Dawson 61.}
\footnote{172}{L. Curtis, With Milner in South Africa, p 345.}
The spirit animating the convention, described by FitzPatrick as expressing 'a broader, more generous, more truly patriotic and non-party attitude than had ever marked any discussion or purpose in the past' and based on mutual respect, openness and sincerity, was at first promising. Botha and Smuts showed themselves capable of taking other than a purely racial view of politics and this encouraged the British Progressives to work cordially with them. However it remained to be seen whether the 'Boer Progressives' would agree to a reasonable Constitution and whether 'they will be able to lead their people into working it in a reasonable spirit thereafter.' Such a new departure, setting the war aside and holding the hope of a new relationship between British and Dutch South Africans, would also end attacks on the British officials that remained as well as on the settlers. However, the spirit did not last and Botha and Smuts, leaders of the Boer progressives, were increasingly rebuked and gradually ostracised by the Afrikaner nationalists (‘the backveld’ according to Wyndham) for abandoning volk and embracing empire.

Wyndham, not a parliamentarian and therefore unable to sit at the National Convention, informed the closer union movement and observed the impact of the closer unionism during his travels on military and settler business through the Transvaal, Natal and Orange River colonies. Although ‘the stream of closer union oratory still goes on’, he complained to his mother in March 1909, he reckoned that it had had little effect on ‘the country Boer, & his racial aspect.’ This hardened Wyndham more and more to ‘the paramount necessity of our not entirely retiring from opposition.’ No coalition ministry he continued:
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176 The Transvaal Progressives were represented at the National Convention by Farrar, FitzPatrick and Lindsay (to the great disappointment of Drummond Chaplin and Patrick Duncan), while the Cape Progressives were represented by Jameson, Smartt, Walton and Jagger. See Lord Selborne to Lord Midleton, 1 July 1908, in D.G. Boyce (ed.), The Crisis of British Power: The Imperial and Naval Papers of the Second Earl of Selborne, 1895-1910 (London 1990), pp 360-63; Milner to Marguerite Chaplin, no date [1908], UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B3; and L. Phillips, Some Reminiscences, p 142.
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would have any effect on the backveld element, which is in reality the strongest element in the country. But a strong opposition has a great effect on them. Our small progressive association in the country districts have an influence far in excess of their mere numbers simply by their somewhat uncompromising attitude & by the publicity they give to anything odd that the other party does. This is the attitude I think the Progressive party as a whole should take up. It is really more the attitude of a vigilance committee than anything else — and it is practically all we have to look forward to for some little time, until parties get reorganized on some new basis.\textsuperscript{179}

Outside the corridors of the Old Raadsaal, Wyndham remained a key member of the Progressive Association, supporting their leader, George Farrar, both on public platforms and with little moots held in Parktown or at Government House or out in the country at Kromdraai or Bedford Farm, the Farrar residence near Johannesburg, where the matters of empire were debated and policy informed and sometimes settled.\textsuperscript{180} The Wyndhams wined and dined with the political and social elite, often using the opportunity to have people meet visiting relatives. On December 26, 1908, for example, they, together with the Selbornes, Farrars and Geoffrey Robinson, attended ‘the usual “Royal” lunch’ laid on by ‘Old Marx’.\textsuperscript{181} On January 2, 1909, they went to see the 4\textsuperscript{th} Hussars beat the 9\textsuperscript{th} Lancers at polo, Maud and Maggie Wyndham later joining Geoffrey Robinson and Dougie Malcolm for tea. The next day the Wyndhams gave a dinner party (‘quite a pleasant evening’ according to Robinson), which was attended by Hugh’s sister Maggie, Maud’s sister Frances Lyttelton, Lady Mabel Coke, Charles and Lady Kathleen Villiers, Francis Grenfell, a Cavendish cousin, and Geoffrey Robinson.\textsuperscript{182} Over the next month the Wyndhams dined at the Phillips\textsuperscript{183} and at Government House,\textsuperscript{184} they

\textsuperscript{179} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 March 1909, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{180} This is the theme of one of John Buchan’s novels. See \textit{A Lodge in the Wilderness} (London 1906).
\textsuperscript{181} This was Sammy Marks (1843-1920), the main partner in Lewis and Marks and director of \textit{Eerste Fabrieken} and Hatherley Distillery near Pretoria. Diary, 26 Dec 1908, BLO: Ms Dawson 14.
\textsuperscript{182} Diary 2-3 Jan 1909, BLO: Ms Dawson 15.
\textsuperscript{183} Diary 25 Jan 1909, BLO: Ms Dawson 15.
\textsuperscript{184} Diary 21 Feb 1909, BLO: Ms Dawson 15.
entertained Robinson on 8 February, when he met Lady Leitrim and her mother, and the Wyndhams also entertained delegates to the military conference.

The Progressive Conference was held during the second week of March 1909. Wyndham, one of the five delegates from Standerton, thought the conference most successful and the prospects of the party ‘very good just now.’ Although the delegates ‘coming up from all parts of the country’ were most enthusiastic, Wyndham recognised that a good deal of organisation was required in overcoming the hurdles in building an opposition in the first union parliament.

The Progressives themselves were responsible for the imposition of many of these hurdles, the first of which was the question of the leadership of the new opposition party. George Farrar (‘a fine fighter ... playing the part of the Opposition chief on the whole very well’), his deputy Percy Fitzpatrick, and Drummond Chaplin always girded at each other, a situation worsened by the social barometers set by their wives. Little love was lost between Marguerite Chaplin and Ella Farrar, and even less between the latter and Florence Phillips, who returned permanently to South Africa in 1909. FitzPatrick, who drew heavy criticism from Wyndham, resigned the deputy leadership of the Transvaal Progressives. This may have been brought on by the poor relationship he had with Farrar: Basil Long, a fellow Unionist, has suggested that FitzPatrick was jealous of the leadership position Farrar held among the Transvaal Progressives. A charismatic, towering leader was needed to keep all in the new centralised party. The Wyndhams dined at the Johannesburg residence of the Chaplins on March 5, when the party included Jameson, Walter Long and the Eustace Fiennes. Jameson, according to Maud, was not in good form: ‘He hates this country more than ever & is rather sick of politics.’ He would, they thought, ‘gradually give it up & live wholly in England.’ Jameson’s lack of

---
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ambition was something of a problem to Unionists who looked to him to keep them together.

These differences, undoubtedly fuelled by their wives, coincided with the debate on the composition of the first South African government. Jameson, Smartt, FitzPatrick, Phillips and Walton supported a ‘best-man’ coalition ministry including like-minded people from all parties, with the exclusion of extremists on both sides, under the leadership of Jameson, and leading to the formation of a new centrist party, drawing moderate English and Dutch-speakers. This, however, did not attract the support of many Transvaal Progressives, including Chaplin, Farrar and Wyndham, and Milner, their mentor, was entirely against coalition of any kind. Milner’s chief concern was that the Progressives would ‘go all to pieces’, which he thought very possible, although a speech of Wyndham’s (“man power to his elbow”) gave him ‘some hope.’ Afrikaner domination was perfectly safe and Botha’s cleverest game was to play the magnanimous part and ‘so win over the weak-kneed Progressives.’ Botha’s only real danger was an open assertion of Afrikaner dominance, which would consolidate the opposition, but this, Milner felt, was recognised by both Botha and Smuts, who were ‘quite clever enough to see’ it.

Chaplin, Farrar and Wyndham professed no faith in the Afrikaner and were strongly opposed to a centrist party and the possibility of a Dutch-speaking party leader. Wyndham’s argument against the collation ministry, following in Milner’s wake, was arithmetic. Unless, he thought, the Progressives got five seats in the cabinet, that is half, he was sure it would be a great strategic error. In any case, as he pointed out, the other side would probably not agree to the cabinet being evenly divided, and to join as a minority would simply stultify all opposition and strengthen the hand of Het Volk. Their only role was one of a vigilance committee and Wyndham spent the next months broadcasting this view across South Africa and trying to shore up an opposition sufficiently strong to fulfil such a role.

192 Lord Milner to Geoffrey Robinson, 17 Apr 1909, BLO: Ms Dawson 61, ff. 73-76.
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In March Hugh spoke at Bethal before going down to Durban to meet Maud and Mabel Coke, who had travelled by boat up from Cape Town after seeing off Maggie Wyndham and Frances Lyttelton, who departed after their South African sojourn for Britain. Maud needed the break. Hugh recognised that she would ‘be better for a change to the coast — a very necessary thing really for anybody living up here.’ They went to Pietermaritzburg as the guests of the governor, Sir Matthew Nathan. Wyndham was rather impressed with ‘the position in Natal’, where he thought the agitation against closer union was ‘largely a newspaper one, playing on Natal’s notorious parochialism.’ Everybody he met seemed in favour of the Act of Union, which he was sure would pass in Pietermaritzburg as it had done in Pretoria and Bloemfontein. However, the politicians in Natal, although identifying themselves with the Progressives in the Cape and the Transvaal, were unwilling to commit themselves to a new opposition party. In April 1909 John Maydon and Charles Smith, two Natal legislators, went to Bedford Farm for a moot with a group of Progressives, where they attempted to obtain additional ‘safeguards entirely satisfactory to the Natal People’ but, remaining outside the new parties, eventually entered the Union parliament as independents.

The position was quite different in the Cape, where, that April, Wyndham thought the outlook for union had never been blacker. Hofmeyr and Schreiner, hoping to wreck the closer union process, led what Wyndham described as ‘a dangerous intrigue’, attacking the very fundamentals of the Act of Union, including the principle of equal political rights. Wyndham was convinced that the unification of the colonies would end ‘the backstairs influence of the Bond’, which did not suit Hofmeyr. Smuts, speaking in the Transvaal parliament, made a strong statement to the effect that if equal rights were tampered with there could be no union — this, Wyndham hoped, was a clear signal to the Bond in the Cape that no help would be forthcoming from Het Volk for their ‘wrecking
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tactics.\textsuperscript{199} The ‘intrigue’, which Wyndham rather hopefully thought might split the Bond, led to ‘several drastic amendments to the Act of Union’ in the Cape parliament, which he thought could not possibly be accepted at the National Convention ‘without quarrelling with the whole of the British section.’ While the Cape’s position might have been ‘all ... bluff’, it created an atmosphere of suspicion, which, as Wyndham agreed, ‘had been happily lacking up to the present.’ Wyndham expected the convention to dismiss the amendments, when the draft act would go before the Cape House again and so result in further delay. The key to the situation as Wyndham noted lay in the Transvaal and, if Botha and Smuts remained firm, the Cape would have to give way.\textsuperscript{200} Wyndham hoped that the majority at the National Convention would ‘resist all further compromise’: ‘it would be better to postpone the whole thing for 10 years rather than give away any more.’\textsuperscript{201}

Shortly before leaving for England in May 1909, Wyndham completed his two-part series for \textit{The State} on South African defence and he and Maud moved out of their Queens Road residence. They wanted to acquire a new home and viewed several houses with a view to purchase. The first was Hohenheim, the home of the Fitzpatricks, which, although having a ‘venerable and historical feel’ (the Reform Committee met there and later Chamberlain and Milner discussed affairs of state in the summerhouse) it was, Maud thought, ‘really a horrid place [and] wouldn’t do at all.’\textsuperscript{202} They also viewed Emoyeni, the residence of H.C. Hull, on which they made an offer and sailed for England.

The passengers sailing for Southampton were seen off by Jameson and other progressive dignitaries.\textsuperscript{203} Described by one of their number as ‘a tremendous boatload of friends & acquaintances’\textsuperscript{204} the Wyndhams had as fellow passengers Lady Methuen, wife of the British commander-in-chief in South Africa, Lady Farrar, financier Otto Beit, Johannesburg attorney James Stratford, and Lady Winchester, whose husband was
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involved in Wyndham's land settlement schemes. Geoffrey Robinson, a fellow kindergartener, two of Maud's cousins, Geoffrey Lyttelton and Mabel Coke, and two ladies from the Victoria League, completed the party. Aboard they 'talked a great deal of S.A. politics' and played bridge and games and sports, all of which filled the days of an 'amusing journey.'

The Wyndhams arrived in London, where for the duration of the season they shared a house with Maud's sisters, Frances and Rachel. A good deal of politicking was done between the social events. The draft Act of Union, having been passed by the four colonial parliaments, was placed on the table of the House of Commons that July and this necessarily meant a good deal of work for the visiting South Africans. Wyndham and Robinson dined at the Savoy, as guests of Milner, to confer with an eclectic mix of politicians and peers. A 'Kinderfest' was held at Norfolk House in the week before the second reading of the South Africa Bill in the House of Lords. And in-between Maud and her mother, who hoped that Geoffrey Robinson would propose to Frances, hosted parties and arranged events throughout July, all 'full of friends.'

After the London season, Hugh and Maud moved into the country. The first invitation, it would seem, came from Abe Bailey, the Rand magnate and Progressive member for Krugersdorp, who had recently bought 'a place' in Sussex. These invitations bored Maud, who confided to Lady Leconfield at the time: 'I rather wish one cd confine one's S. African acquaintances to S. Africa - the sight of them in London is a nauseating thought.' Far more agreeable were visits to Maud's family at Hagley and to Crewe Hall, the home of the Colonial Secretary and his wife, who was one of Hugh's Primrose cousins. They visited the Percy Wyndhams at Clouds in August, where Hugh found his cousin, Wilfred Blunt, and enjoyed talking to him about South Africa (Hugh was
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surprised at the moderation of his views). And from Sussex they moved to Ireland, accompanied by Frances Lyttelton, as guests of General Neville Lyttelton, who was then governor of the Royal Hospital in Dublin.

The inter-colonial military conference convened in Johannesburg in January 1907 had articulated the need to establish uniformity in training for officers and stressed the importance of specialised courses in Britain. For this reason, Wyndham was attached to the Military Operations Directorate at the War Office for three months in 1909 for instruction in intelligence duties. This period of three months overlapped with the London Season, the country house circuit and the visit to Ireland, highlighting perhaps the idea that British officers were gentlemen first and any knowledge of the military came a solid second. He did however attend the German manoeuvres in September — Maud going with him to ‘do some sightseeing.’ He was filled with admiration for the German army but was convinced that they would have ‘to alter some of their methods before the end of the next war.’ The moving of ‘great solid blocks of Infantry about under the fire of opposing guns [was he noted] very heroic but very expensive.’

Shortly before leaving for the continent, Hugh heard that the Hulls had accepted his offer of purchase for Emoyeni. This excited Maud. She relished the prospect of buying ‘some furniture & wallpapers etc’, before returning to Johannesburg. She stood as godmother at the christening of Jack’s baby on September 22 and then went about London choosing furniture, carpets and drapes.
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Her relationship with Hugh, which had started, as she later admitted, 'with no little aversion', was troubled. Although theirs was an arranged marriage, there can be no doubt that Maud was a woman of strong passions. Her life rotated around three or four prime concerns, the first of which was to produce a son and possible heir to the Leconfield title and estates. Her letters provide some detail of her gynaecological concerns, the sadness even vulnerability, at not being able to produce the muchwanted child and by September 1909, blame was starting to circulate. During the latter part of Maud's visit to England in 1909 there was a definite uneasiness in her relationship with Hugh's mother, who unrelentingly foisted her own gynaecologist – Sir H. Croome – upon a reluctant Maud.

Maud underwent a procedure that October 'that needed two or three days in bed.' This was performed by Dr Aarons ('a wonderful man & very nice tho a Jew by extraction') upon the recommendation of her cousin DD Balfour. The operation caused some anxiety and Lady Leconfield cabled Hugh, who had in the meantime arrived in South Africa. Nonetheless, Maud was discharged in November and, after visiting her family, sailed for Cape Town.

Maud looked forward to going back. Their new house, renamed Wyndhams, required work and to this she looked forward as she did to the impending visit to South Africa of Hugh's mother, with whom relations were now much improved. She and Lady Leconfield would consolidate their fence mending as they supervised the refurbishment and arranged the furniture. Maud, who had expressed her boredom at 'thinking of new ways to cook a chicken', returned armed with 'Lady Dudley's cookery book' ('a few recipes read made my mouth water'). However, she soon fell back into her old rut and hated her existence on the veld. Patrick Duncan, who visited the Wyndhams at Kromdraai six months
later, felt that what Maud needed someone or something to channel her energies and give meaning to her life.\footnote{231}

Hugh had arrived in Cape Town on 12 October. He thought, ‘the most pleasing feature’ of the voyage was ‘the number of families that appear to be on their way out. 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} & 3\textsuperscript{rd} classes are all packed with children, especially the 3\textsuperscript{rd} class.’\footnote{232} He stayed with friends, first the Chaplins and then with Feetham, while he waited to take occupancy of Hull’s house.\footnote{233} Politically, matters had settled some what while he had been in Europe. The idea of a coalition ministry had been shelved and consequently the foundations of an opposition were beginning to appear. Jameson returned to South Africa in November intent on leading the new opposition, while ‘certain personal difficulties’ existed within among the Progressives. Duncan did not expect him to lead for long and at best they had a few years to ‘get our house in order.’\footnote{234} Milner, too, recognised that Jameson was ‘the only possible leader’, although he doubted whether he cared much for the job.\footnote{235}

The Transvaal Progressives also settled on their candidates for the first union election and on ‘getting them into the field.’ Wyndham was adopted as candidate for the Turffontein constituency. This ‘coming out openly ... with candidates’ forced the hand of the wobblers, who would be forced to ‘take one side or the other.’ Furthermore, with Hofmeyr dead, there was no doubt that Botha would be the first prime minister and that he would ‘form a purely party government from the existing majorities in the 4 Colonies.’ This carried Wyndham’s approval as ‘on this basis we should be able to produce quite a decent opposition.’\footnote{236} Drummond Chaplin, Wyndham’s host that October and a fine party organiser, was pleased with these developments too, although Hugh, however, found ‘it impossible to discuss politics’ with Chaplin’s wife.\footnote{237} Chaplin did good work, including the establishment of party organisation and making contact with like-minded people in the Cape and in Natal. Duncan, however, thought this premature, believing that alliance formation would best happen once the new parliament was in session and the Natalians
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had experienced ‘a little wholesome adversity’ which was necessary for them to develop party feeling and loyalty to a leader.\textsuperscript{238}

Duncan, however, did not feel at home in the Progressive Party and Jameson (who Lady Selborne thought a pure idealist who, craving something to worship, ‘filled one empty niche in his temple with Cecil Rhodes, whose memory he reveres, with a respect that is almost idolatry\textsuperscript{239}) did not make the party more catholic in its views. For one, Duncan looked forward to ‘a real coalition of Boer and mine owner’, but recognised that this would leave ‘so few of us ... on the other side.'\textsuperscript{240} Wyndham did not have the same problem: he had already been adopted as a Progressive the previous October.\textsuperscript{241} He thought ‘the political prospects of the Opposition’ were improving. People, he thought, were keener than they had been and, as the idea of a coalition ministry had been abandoned by all parties, people were starting to realise again that party politics were inevitable.\textsuperscript{242}

Yet, again, the British sector was divided. Fitzpatrick and Bailey were on their way out and there were renewed rumours that they intended to form a third party. Fitzpatrick, who had never got on well with Farrar, toyed with the idea of taking ‘up a middle attitude’, which Hugh thought would cause him to ‘fall between 2 stools, as the Boers don’t want him in the least.’ And, the same fate he expected to befall Lionel Philips, who, although back in Johannesburg, had made no public utterance.\textsuperscript{243} Hugh thought this incredible and reckoned that they would have to join an opposition led by Jameson. Yet, they and ‘a few misguided people’, including Sir Willem Van Hulsteyn, ‘still choose persistently to believe that Het Volk is to be abolished & a Utopia established – but the number of these is becoming fewer.’\textsuperscript{244}

Lindsay and Van Hulsteyn defected to Het Volk, which barely caused a ripple among the Progressives. ‘The whole episode has created a very small impression’,
Wyndham told his mother, and the two turncoats had ‘never been anything but half hearted members of the party.’ He was sure that the Progressives would ‘get on all the better without them.’ With this, Milner was in agreement: ‘you get stronger & not weaker by shedding real “rotters”.’ Wyndham was however a little concerned that Lindsay and Van Hulsteyn were ‘trading on the idea of the formation of a third party’, which was to combine the moderate sections of the existing parties, a notion that Botha very cleverly kept alive. Wyndham, convinced that Botha hoped to split the opposition, was nevertheless assured that he would have little success and that only Lindsay, Van Hulsteyn and Lionel Phillips and ‘one or two others have been captured.’ Milner was more cautious. He thought FitzPatrick, who was ‘drifting about rather without a compass’, ‘too good a man to be swallowed up by Het Volk.’

By December matters had improved for the opposition. Jameson, Farrar and Chaplin, whom Milner considered ‘the best man in the field’ despite his lack of charisma and popular appeal, had commenced discussions for the establishment of a party to bring all Progressives in South Africa together and even Lionel Phillips now spoke of ‘we progressives.’ Lady Selborne, more optimistic than ever, thought that ‘if Mrs Drum Chap doesn’t insult Mrs Li Phil in the next ten days, I shouldn’t be at all surprised if he took the opportunity of the Doctors visit, to give in his adherence to the party. Lady Farrar is fortunately in England, so that is one danger less.’ Phillips, however, Lady Selborne thought, would be of little use to any party, ‘as he will never face the guns’, but ‘his money & influence ought to be valuable.’

---
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6. Conclusion

The Progressives, not having the parliamentary majority for which they had hoped, had from February 1907 to cover the retreat of the imperial government as well as come to terms with Het Volk. Milner realizing that his policy for British ascendency in South Africa was at an end, called upon his kindergarten to reappraise the situation realistically. They, however, devised a scheme whereby their mentor's dream of a unified South Africa under a British flag was brought to fruition.

Wyndham, giving up politics for the moment, returned at first to his horses and to his 'volunteering' and later played a somewhat fruitless role in the closer union machine. Not having the seat on the Land Settlement Board for which he had hoped, he spearheaded several movements – including a settlers' cooperative society and a settlers' union – to address the issue of farm labour shortages, the continued flow of British settlers to the veld and their equipping with the means to keep them there. In this he was assisted, quite ably, by Maud Lyttelton, whom he married in February 1908. This marriage, very much an aristocratic affair, forged ties within the British nobility and their relatives in the United Kingdom and South Africa came in time to form an 'Imperial connection'. Yet, however valuable such connections may still have been in Britain, Afrikaner ascendancy was making them a liability in South Africa, and Afrikaners felt little propinquity with either Wyndham or his wife.

Few of the group gathered on the verandah at Government House on April 4, 1909, remained in South Africa. Satisfied with South African unification, many of them drifted on to new ventures. The Selbornes, after five years in South Africa, returned to Britain in April 1910. Feetham, Duncan and Wyndham were elected that October to the first union parliament, where they joined Jameson, Farrar, FitzPatrick, Woolls Sampson, Bailey and Chaplin and others on the Unionist benches. There was enough to do in connection with

---
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matters affecting effective union, both in terms of South Africa as well as between the
different parts of the empire. Robinson remained, for the moment, editor of The Star and
Curtis, still devoting himself to the study of problems neglected by others, turned his
attention to the governance of the empire and the possibilities of an imperial
parliament.\footnote{254}

In South Africa, Wyndham, with a smaller group of the kindergarten and in
collaboration with counterparts organising their forces at home, embraced the work of
maintaining the British connection and what they described as ensuring a future for South
Africans of British origin. Yet, although it was then difficult to foresee the outcome, the
writing was certainly on the wall. A pageant to celebrate the unification of the four
colonies was planned to coincide with the opening by the Prince of Wales of the Union
Parliament in October 1910.\footnote{255} This would comprise several tableaux' depicting South
Africa history. However, as the Archbishop of Cape Town noted, the planning
committee, who were to decide on the events to be portrayed, were instructed not to bring
the story through to 'modern times.' The political unification of the colonies had been
possible, but their histories unsurprisingly remained contested.\footnote{256}
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Illustration 1: Petworth House.  
A residence of Wyndhams and their ancestors since 1150.  
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)

Illustration 2: The Leconfield family shortly before the First World War.  
Hugh stands to the left of the mantelpiece.  
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)
Illustration 3: Milner's young men.
Wyndham is seated in the wicker chair on the left.
(Source: UCT: BC294 Patrick Duncan Papers, F5.8.1. This also appears as the front piece to W. Nimocks, Milner's Young Men: the Kindergarten in Edwardian Imperial Affairs (London 1970).)
Illustration 4: The breaking of the so-called ‘Wyndham Scandal’ on 6 February 1907.
Illustration 5: An establishment family: the Lytteltons and the Gladstones in Hagley Park.
Fltr: Maud Lyttelton (aged 16); Lady Cobham, her mother; Mr and Mrs W.E. Gladstone; and Lord Cobham. Mrs Gladstone was Lord Cobham’s aunt.
(Source: Hagley Hall Archives, courtesy of Rt Hon Viscount Cobham)

(Source: Scrapbook of Mary Viscountess Cobham, Hagley Hall Archives)
Illustration 7: Wyndhams, Parktown, the north and south elevations. The west wing was added after Wyndham's ownership.  
(Source: 'Restoration and skills transfer: Emoyeni, Parktown Ridge, Johannesburg', Urban Green Life, Jan-Feb 2003, pp 28-29.)

Illustration 8: Wyndhams, the south front.  
(Source: Parktown and Westcliffe Heritage Trust.)
Illustration 9: The Wyndhams entertaining on the terrace at Wyndhams. Lady Mabel Coke, Mr Scott, Francis Grenfell and Hugh Wyndham. Hugh's sister, Margaret Wyndham is resting on the wicker chair. Maud's brother, Geoffrey Lyttelton looks out to the Magaliesberg through a telescope. (Source: Parktown and Westcliffe Heritage Trust.)

Illustration 11: The Woman's franchise debate.
Wyndham's Woman's Enfranchisement Bill was read a first time on 17 February 1914. When the Speaker enquired when he would move the second reading, Wyndham replied "Wednesday, the 1st of April", an announcement that was met with loud and continuous laughter. The matter sounded in the press.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)
Illustrations 12 and 13: Two images from 1914

Left: Hugh Wyndham sketched by Maud in March of that year.
(Source: WSRO: PHA, courtesy of Rt Hon Lord Egremont and Leconfield.)

Right: The press image of the Union's Chief Intelligence Officer, September 1914.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579.)
Illustration 14: Winnipeg winning the South African equivalent of the 2,000 guineas in December 1914.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579.)
Illustrations 15 and 16: Wyndham in the constituency on polling day in 1915.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)

Illustration 17: Wyndham in 1915.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)

Illustration 18: Maud Wyndham in 1915.
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579)
Illustration 19: The Wyndhams with Alice Duncan (seated right) in 1916. Born Alice Dold, she and Patrick Duncan were married in 1916. Wyndham regretted her being 'at least 2/3 German in blood', but, after a period of 'suspended judgement', he and Maud became quite attached to her. Maud, however, could not help wishing that she was 'Russian or Swiss or Fijian or anything but German.'
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579.)
THE HON. HUGH WYNDHAM (in his best aristocratic vein): "I would like to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to these oft-despised but exceedingly nutritious products of agriculture, vulgarly known as Monkey Nuts, which I understand are exceedingly popular with that considerable section of Society which is wont to frequent the pit, gallery and similarly less exclusive portions of our theatres and places of amusement."

[Mr. Wyndham moved that monkey-nuts be included in the definition of agricultural produce.]
Illustration 21: "What a happy country!" Hugh Wyndham, representing the imperialist faction in South African politics, is taken to task by the nationalist press. He suggested that farmers pay a realistic land tax to boost revenues for the South African war effort. (Source: *De Burger*, 18 March 1916, p 7.)
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579.)
Illustration 23: A caricature of the Johannesburg Town Council published in *The Star*—“At voting time it became obvious that the Hon. Hugh Wyndham had done a bit of strap-hanging in his day.”
(Source: WSRO: PHA 9579.)
CHAPTER SIX
Fighting for freedom, 1910-1914

The task facing the Unionists was, as Milner had predicted, both difficult yet, at the same time, 'not a wholly useless or unamusing one.' As a group they advocated stronger ties with Britain, and, individually, they negotiated different avenues to that goal. For Wyndham this was the assumption of an active role as an opposition MLA and, in particular, the maintenance of the constitution and the rule of law, and the canvassing of several civil liberty causes. This even led Thomas Boydell, a Labour member of the house, to proclaim in 1914 that 'Hugh’s ancestors had [probably] been fighting for freedom for 2000 years!' This perception was far from the truth and the Wyndhams, nursing a constituency courted by an ascendant Labour, were happy to allow it to persist. As Maud noted to Lady Leconfield, ‘If only he knew they’d fought steadily against it.’

Hugh Wyndham, like much of his family, did not like change. He was conservative, even staid (the official visit of the Gladstones to Johannesburg ‘was a most slovenly affair. It is of course unattractive to see motor cars escorted by mounted troops’), and belonged to a class that felt threatened by any variation from comfortable tradition and a known way of life. However, the situation in South Africa was somewhat different. Here their function, as a loyal opposition, was the role of a vigilance committee, always alert and ready to denounce every injustice and expose every ‘job’ and yet, concurrently, open to negotiation and the striking of deals, with either the parliamentary labour party and the working class man or with progressively-minded Afrikaners. Maud, now endeared to Boydell, promptly resolved to sit through his
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speeches. This was a time that demanded openness to potential friends and a period, as Milner noted to Marguerite Chaplin to ‘organise your own forces, keep your self-respect, & your powder dry, & ... wait.’

1. Unification and disintegration

The death of King Edward VII on 6 May 1910 seemed to mark the end of an era, coinciding as it did with portentous change within Britain and across an empire now at its zenith. In England the ruling class was said to be under siege. The ‘people’s budget’ of David Lloyd George had finally passed through parliament, but not before forcing a reform of the House of Lords and an electoral confirmation for the Liberals in January 1910. This was, as the perceptive Archbishop Carter noted, ‘an anxious time [for] all who care for England.’ He had been depressed reading Charles Masterman’s The Condition of England, which he thought ‘very pessimistic & no doubt ... over stated.’ Yet, the Japanese warships that visited Simonstown and the flooding of Cape Town with ‘Jap: sailors, very small and looking very young’ was of concern for anybody eager to see a powerful Greater Britain and an undisputed Royal Navy in command of the seas.

But matters in Britain did not improve between 1910 and 1914. The country was ‘racked with strikes & dissensions & threatenings of all kinds.’ The industrial drama was fanned by syndicalism, a revolutionary trade unionism, that, sceptical of the parliamentary process, rejected constitutionalism and called for an active insurrection by the workers. Faced with the realities of declining wages and sensing the revolt against privilege, led at first in parliament by Lloyd George, the miners, textile workers, transport workers and railwaymen all gave notice one after another. The troops were sent in
September 1910 to protect the coal mines of South Wales from striking miners. During the summer of the following year, trade was affected by a national transport strike that paralysed the ports. This was followed in August 1911 by a railways strike and a near general strike in Liverpool. At the centre of this industrial conflict stood Tom Mann, who had led the London dock strike of 1889 as well as the Broken Hill strike in Australia in 1909 and was now, arguably, 'the most famous syndicalist in the English-speaking world.'

1912 was a year of even greater conflict. A national miners’ strike broke out in March and this was followed by a dock strike in the early summer, which resulted in the closure of the port of London. By that March, more than a million men were on strike and ‘most of the manufactories [were] giving notice one after another.’ Lord Cobham, Maud’s father, predicted that ‘within a week or ten days the East End [would] be starving, & then something worse than squalls may be anticipated.’ With Ireland in revolt and some 1.25 million workers on the street, Lord Cobham spoke of a looming civil war, characterised ‘by raids of starving creatures upon country houses.’ The suffragettes, becoming more militant, took concurrently to the streets, smashing windows and slashing national treasures. In March 1912 the British Museum and several galleries had to be closed on their account.

The discord in Britain and the demand for change was viewed from South Africa with anxiety. Maud Wyndham, clearly anxious, wrote that the news from Britain sounded ‘like the early days of the French Revolution.’ For both she and Hugh, the reports of the strike and the waves than radiated out from it, was of great concern. Hugh likewise cast the events in Britain as ‘a revolution.’ The country’s trade had suffered and, as he noted, if the strike could be ended, considerable time would be needed for a recovery. The shortages of coal had affected the schedules of both steamships and trains (the numbers of both being largely reduced), although, surprisingly, the strike seemingly had no effect on the
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mail steamers to South Africa,\textsuperscript{17} which carried family news that did little to allay the fears of relatives living out in the empire. Lord Cobham reckoned that they were all ‘living on the edge of a volcano’ and, if the strike continued for another month, they would cease to exist as a nation. Perhaps a tad overly dramatic, he applied for leave to practice revolver shooting in the village quarry at Hagley, and laid in stores of wood and siege rations.\textsuperscript{18}

For the moment, the house parties continued and the mail letters to the Wyndhams were ‘full of dinner parties & gaietie.’\textsuperscript{19} Lord Brownlow assisted the poor by cutting down trees in his park for firewood. Maud hoped her father would do the same at Hagley, it was public spirited and also important for the poor to see the rich affected. An ‘emphatic line of demarcation between rich & poor’, she argued, gave ‘wherewithal to Socialists to triumph to.’\textsuperscript{20} Some were not taking any chances however. Hilda Grenfell, one of Maud’s Lyttelton cousins, had ‘all her luggage ready for an immediate bolt to the Continent!’\textsuperscript{21} Lord Cobham, in his usual jocular fashion, wrote to Maud saying that Hagley, close to Birmingham, was likely to be one of the first houses ‘raided’, and that perhaps the next she would hear of them was that the Cobhams had taken steerage tickets to South Africa!\textsuperscript{22}

The genteel classes, abandoning the London season, flocked abroad.\textsuperscript{23} Lady Leconfield escaped to Cannes, away from the strikes and suffragettes,\textsuperscript{24} while others went to South Africa, which, in contrast to Britain, seemed young and fresh. Visitors were in awe of the new union, particularly as it came at a time when Ireland was in revolt and the United Kingdom appeared to be tearing apart.\textsuperscript{25} And yet, with polo, cricket and regular dinner parties, all sharing in the company of an elite, which was partly English and reasonably genteel, South Africa was also in many ways comfortably familiar.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{17} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{18} Rachel Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 8 Mar 1912, HHA 2/34/22.
\textsuperscript{19} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{20} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{21} Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 1 Mar 1912, HHA 2/34/19.
\textsuperscript{22} Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 1 Mar 1912, HHA 2/34/19.
\textsuperscript{23} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{24} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{25} See, for example, the letters written by Rachel Lyttelton to her parents. They number fifteen – HHA 2/5/1 to 2/5/15.
\textsuperscript{26} The Duke of Westminster, George Wyndham’s stepson is a case in point. In December 1910 he hosted a sporting week on his Free State estate. Horses were raced and polo was played by day,
1910 also saw a change at Government House. The Selbornes, after five years in South Africa and a ‘final moot’ that April, departed.27 Although they would be sorely missed (Curtis ‘felt like the household cat when the family have gone to the sea-side’), the Wyndhams felt a little different. Hugh had never really liked Selborne and his successor was, moreover, Maud’s cousin. Gladstone was accompanied by his wife and a twenty-year-old niece, Dorothy Drew.29 They were followed to South Africa some months later by her mother, Mary Drew, who became a regular guest at Government House after Dorothy married Captain Francis Parish, one of Gladstone’s ADC’s.30 And so the Wyndham family connections at Government House grew.

The Union of South Africa came into being at midday on May 31, 1910. Lord Gladstone, her first governor general witnessed the swearing in of her first cabinet, with Louis Botha, as her first prime minister. Botha, Gladstone and his predecessor had thought, could muster the most support across the country and, having Jan Smuts to cover the parliamentary and administrative work, could concentrate on his main function, that of ‘keeping the takhaars in a good temper.’31 Union services were held by the archbishop of Cape Town that morning. But William Carter, the Anglican prelate, found ‘no enthusiasm’ for the Union: the prospect of ‘a pure Dutch government’, he thought, was ‘not exactly inspiring’ and then ‘Boer ideals [were] not the same as British ideals.’32 Gladstone, who chaired the Eton dinner some days later, confided to Wyndham that he was ‘going to avoid the mistake of spending his first year or two running after the Boers, & neglecting the English community.’ This comforted Hugh. Selborne he thought ‘never quite got over his critical mistake of spending his first year pursing the Dutch.’33 And he was happy to see

and scratch occupied the evenings, while entertainment was provided by a band of the Carbineers from Bloemfontein. See Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 16 Dec 1910, HHA 5/8/52.
27 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 19 Apr 1910, HHA 2/34/3.
29 Dorothy Drew was recuperating from a bout of pneumonia, which she developed during the London season. L. Masterman (ed), *Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters* (New York, 1930), p 459.
33 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
that Gladstone, while anxious to hear all sides, would not err in ‘curry[ing] favour with Dutch by slobbering over them.’

The Wyndhams were both busy in 1910. Maud, with her father, was editing the collection of ‘Granny’s letters’; while Hugh, having acquired a coal mine, had to make periodic visits to Middelburg in addition to his regimental work and the gathering pace of Unionist politics. The strikes in Britain provided a business opportunity for Transvaal coal, which was rumoured to be fetching 45/- a ton. Wyndham seemingly never made much as Maud reported towards the end of the year that, despite its prospects, Hugh’s coal mine was still not profitable. Two years later, the coal from the Vaalbank mine fetched 6/- a ton, two shillings more than what was normally made when sold at the pit’s mouth, an increase due again to the shortages created by the strike in Britain. By January 1914 the mine, delivering better coal, was now prospering. However, the syndicalist ideas, rampant in Western Europe and Australia, now spread to South Africa through the migration of labour, visitations of leading lights (Tom Mann visited in 1910 and then again in 1914) and dissemination through the paper the Voice of Labour, which was published by Archie Crawford and Mary Fitzgerald (‘Pick handle Mary’). Their attempts to consolidate a radical left alternative to the South African Labour Party together with the new militancy of the Transvaal labour movement, made the Labour Party seem innocuous by comparison and encouraged some personal rapprochement between people like the Wyndhams and Tommy Boydell. And so, despite South Africa’s problems, ‘compared to England this place is all love & peace.’

---

34 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
36 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 23 Nov 1910, HHA 5/8/44.
37 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 11 Apr 1912, HHA 2/34/29.
38 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 28 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/30.
40 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 19 Feb 1912, HHA 2/34/13.
2. Turffontein

Wyndham, after his unsuccessful bid to establish an English presence on the veld around Standerton, had shifted his political interest toward the Progressive stronghold of Johannesburg, where, in October 1909, he was adopted as candidate for the Turffontein Division.\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Oct 1909, WSRO: PHA.} He started on the political circuit immediately, although for the moment this was mostly work of a social kind (‘attending horrible social functions’\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Oct 1909, WSRO: PHA.}). He had had to attend these alone during the 1907 campaign. Now he had Maud to assist him and his mother promised to come out and lend a hand, too. He expected Lady Leconfield, a seasoned campaigner in Britain,\footnote{John Tryuder to Lady Leconfield, 30 Nov 1905 (ff.180-81), NLS: Rosebery Papers Ms 10170; Lady Leconfield to Lord Rosebery, 7 Dec 1905 (ff.97-98), NLS: Rosebery Papers Ms 10119.} to ‘be able to do a lot.’\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Nov 1909, WSRO: PHA.} However, as Wyndham was to realise, the use of titles had considerably less impact on the imperial periphery, a condition reinforced by accusations of snobbery and imported social distinction. Maud in any case disliked South African electioneering and was unwilling to dispense favours for the sake of the ballot box. She deigned to visit the constituency occasionally, attending bazaars (‘where were the usual hideosities’\footnote{Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Dec 1909, WSRO: PHA.}), social functions and the odd gaiety.\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.}

Wyndham expected to face two opponents in Turffontein, a Het Volker and a certain Pierson who, he thought, would stand as an independent. In this event, Wyndham thought the Het Volker (possibly ex-general C.F. Beyers) would get in, and in June 1910 Wyndham still did not know who was to oppose him.\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.} However, uncertainty with regard to his opponents, boundaries of the electoral division, and the date of the election itself, placed a break on Wyndham’s campaign.\footnote{Patrick Duncan to Lady Selborne, 27 Jun 1910, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, 11.2.17.} He and the other candidates used the break to found branches of the party; and, with this end in view, he and Duncan motored to Standerton in June 1910.\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.} Opinion seemed to be turning in favour of the Unionists, as many of the old
Transvaal Nationalists joined them. This pleased Wyndham, implying as it did, that the ‘British’ vote would now not be split as it had been in 1907.  

In the meantime, Wyndham also went to the racecourse (he won two races one Saturday and another race a week later) and he and Maud cruised the party circuit. Maud spent a weekend with the Farrars at Bedford Farm, while the Wyndhams hosted dinner parties on a fortnightly basis, for groups that included politicians (Jameson, Feetham, and the Chaplins), soldiers (Major Bagot of the imperial staff), visitors to South Africa (Miss Johnstone Scott and Dennis Finch Hatton), the newspaper editor, Geoffrey Robinson, and members of the Methuen family. On these occasions and the moots (one was held at Wyndhams on July 3) politics were discussed, sometimes quite emotionally, particularly if Marguerite Chaplin was present, and several courses, prepared by the Wyndhams’ cook, consumed. Geoffrey Robinson records that he dined with the Wyndhams on July 14, ‘for another melodrama – followed by the inevitable supper.’

By August the newspapers were full of election speeches and political comment. And at the end of the month Captain Scott arrived in Cape Town and delivered a public lecture on his Antarctic expedition. Such activities, proclaiming the greatness of Britain, came at a time when the election gathered pace and this, together with other demands on Wyndham’s time meant that he had less time for some of his past interests. Land settlement was the first to suffer, although here, he was possibly more realistic than some of his partners. Lord Lovat, who now spearheaded the London committee, attempted to activate Wyndham again, but to no avail. His disinterest increased it seems with time.

Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Jun and 13 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
This was a sign that marital distance was growing. Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
See, for example, diary, 30 Jun 1910, 3 Jul 1910, 14 Jul 1910, 13 Aug 1910, BLO: Ms Dawson 16.
Diary, 3 Jul 1910, BLO: Ms Dawson 16.
Diary, 14 Jul 1910, BLO: Ms Dawson 16.
He was, for example, also a member of the Anglican Synod. See Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Nov 1909, WSRO: PHA.
Lord Lovat to Patrick Duncan, 5 Aug 1910, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A31.5.
In February 1912, for example, Wyndham met ‘two young ladies who [had] mysteriously arrived from England’ to take up farming in South Africa. He was unable or unwilling to assist, leaving them to the Secretary of Agriculture, who was equally ‘at a loss as to what to do with them.’ Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Feb 1912, WSRO: PHA.
The general election took place on Thursday, 15 September 1910 and, with very little obvious difference between the party programmes, the electorate divided largely on racial lines, so reinforcing the 'racial' makeup of the parties. Botha's party (a 'Dutch coalition' of the Bond, Het Volk and Orangia Unie, and soon known as the South African Party), fielded an English-speaking candidate in Turffontein: R.H. Henderson, 'a carpet bagger from Kimberley', whom Maud nonetheless thought 'quite pleasant & easy.'\textsuperscript{60} This was a two-way race as the Labour Party did not enter the lists.

The election Maud thought, while exciting, did not approach an 'English Election.' In fact there 'was nothing like the excitement of the last Eton & Harrow Match.'\textsuperscript{61} Wyndham went down to the polling station in Turffontein by eight in the morning and 'polled a quantity quite early.' Maud remained in Parktown and went down at about 11.30, 'after the mails came in.' This she thought was time enough 'as there was nothing to do but hang about & grin, & talk.'\textsuperscript{62} Her aunt, Lavinia Talbot, was correct in her observation that the wives of candidates in South Africa played a lesser role in elections in South Africa than they did in Britain, although she was sure that Maud was 'all the same ... able to do many a useful little job and were able to pull a few wires.'\textsuperscript{63} This she on occasion did, riding with the editor of The Star or lunching with him at the Carlton.\textsuperscript{64}

Maud reported afterwards that the hospital was emptied of possible voters and how the doctors, all 'stout Progressives', would not give day passes to known supporters. These patients and other voters were conveyed to the polling booths by the eleven motor cars at the disposal of Turffontein Unionists. The Wyndham's quondam coachman, now a private taxi driver, did wonders as did their chauffeur who conveyed voters in the Wyndham's motor car. All of the Wyndhams' male servants were keen to vote, 'the cook's young man' even going to Pretoria to cast his ballot for Sir Percy. After the poll closed the Wyndhams dined at the Carlton before returning to Turffontein to hear the poll declared. They were still counting when they arrived, as some of the boxes came in from

\textsuperscript{60} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{61} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{62} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{63} Lavinia Talbot to Maud Wyndham, 22 Sep 1910, HHA 5/8/27.
\textsuperscript{64} Diary, 10 Aug 1910, BLO: Ms Dawson 16.
far. Wyndham, who was expected outside Turffontein to lose, won the seat drawing 53.7 percent of the vote (table 6.1). Henderson, who 'got the Dutch vote solid', despite his Kimberley background and his inability to speak a word of Dutch, failed to attract meaningful English support. 65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>No. of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Hugh Wyndham</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.H. Henderson</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unionist majority</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


That evening, after the customary speeches in the constituency, the Wyndhams returned to the Carlton Hotel, which was now crowded. There, the winning candidates were cheered and soon after fetched to speak to supporters at the Rand Club. Milner had hoped that six former Transvaal Progressives would get in – Farrar, Chaplin, FitzPatrick, Feetham; Duncan and Wyndham – and he sent a wire congratulating each of them. 66

Maud immediately sent cables to Great Stanhope Street and to Hagley and other family addresses; and these were followed by longer mail scripts. Despite her reservations as to the excitement of the election, she nonetheless considered the poll an absolute victory for the Unionists. Botha's party had 'only got in on the unopposed backveld vote & are going to have a beastly time'.67 She praised FitzPatrick’s victory over Botha in Pretoria East, but was fairly reserved on her husband’s success in Turffontein. 'Hugh’s election went off all right' she had told Lady Leconfield. 68 Their families were ecstatic. 69 Yet, outside there seemed little appreciation of Wyndham’s victory, 70 even though he had not been expected to win the seat. 71

65 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
66 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
67 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
68 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Sep 1910, WSRO: PHA.
69 Lady Cobham was thrilled with the news that Hugh had won by 144 votes: ‘it shows what a hard won victory Hugh’s is.’ (Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 16 Sep 1910, HHA 5/8/26). Lavinia Talbot was 'proud' to be 'Aunt to a new M.P.' (Lavinia Talbot to Maud Wyndham, 22 Sep 1910, HHA 5/8/27). Spencer Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 7 Oct 1910, HHA 5/8/31. Jack Lyttelton,
The results were otherwise predictable. Botha and his coalition, winning 67 seats, obtained a working majority; while the Unionists, with 39, formed the official opposition. The latter were also confident that had the delimitation of constituencies not favoured the platteland their return would have been greater. However, in the Transvaal the Unionists fared well. As forecast, they swept the Rand and overall gained 45.8 percent of the vote (table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Seats contested</th>
<th>Seats won</th>
<th>No. of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7401</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent - Labour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>13485</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19995</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Eleven of the 20 Transvaal seats won by the SAP were uncontested.


The next month was spent celebrating electoral successes and planning strategy, political and parliamentary. The Wyndhams attended the races and, together with a good deal of political talk, played evening cards: the Drummond Chaplins, Dr L. S. Jameson, and other Unionists providing one or more foursomes after dinner get-togethers. One evening in October 1910 the Wyndhams and Jameson introduced the Chaplins to the game of grab. 'We smashed a table', Hugh records, and 'destroyed several packs of cards & drew blood on several occasions. Drummond at times I think was a little shocked. It is a game we shall have to introduce into the House at Capetown.'

recently returned for Droitwich in the House of Commons, thought Hugh's 'a fine performance.' (Jack Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 12 Oct 1910, HHA 5/8/34).

See, for example, diary, 15 Sep 1910, BLO: Ms Dawson 16; and L. Phillips, *Some Reminiscences*, p 145.


Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Oct 1910, WSRO: PHA.
However, if, as Archbishop Carter noted, the Unionist minority comprised several very able men, they also faced some difficulties. The first of these was the question of leadership. Jameson, because of the personal difficulties that scuttled the Progressives, had returned to South Africa to lead the new opposition. Jameson was still charismatic, yet, Maud thought, he hated South Africa and 'only sticks on from love for Rhodes & I daresay the feeling he's the only man who can lead the English party out here.' The others, as Maud noted to her father, were 'so mortally jealous & distrustful of each other [that] it w'd all fall to bits if he left.' Although still charismatic, Jameson's ill health (Hugh thought him 'tired & unwell') was unfortunate for the Unionists as it robbed them of his zest. But, at least, they had a little time to get their house in order.

Once the festivities, the Union Pageant and the ceremonial first opening of the South African parliament on 4 November had passed, and 'the captains and the kings [had] departed', the Unionists settled down to business and, exploiting divisions within the ministry, acted both as the official opposition and a vehicle to stave off, for as long as possible, growing 'Boer' influence.

3. Parliament: Limiting 'Boer' influence

The Unionists had fought the election on platform embracing the maintenance of the imperial connection and the sanctity of the constitution. This included an independent, impartial and politically-free civil service, immigration of whites, taxation of unimproved

---

76 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 28 May 1910, HHA 2/34/5.
77 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Jun 1910, WSRO: PHA.
80 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Oct 1910, WSRO: PHA. Their disquiet was expressed by Drummond Chaplin: 'And so, after all that has taken place, the country goes back to the Boers. They have got their thumb on us now and they will never be fools enough to take it off ... Nothing violent will be done, but slowly and gradually Dutch traditions, ideals and methods will more and more assert themselves, and one fine day the British public will wake up to find that South Africa is actually Boer.' Quoted by B.K. Long, Drummond Chaplin: His life and times in Africa (London 1941), p 58.
property and the making available of land to settlers. The Unionists, ‘very happy & cheerful’, tackled the government on each of these issues. The ministers, having divergent opinions, were heckled as the opposition, clearly enjoying the game, sought to find the weaknesses in the phalanx.

Wyndham, elected junior whip for the Unionists, was very keen, professing that it would give him ‘plenty of opportunity (sic) to learn the working of the House.’ He spent hours pouring over manuals dealing with parliamentary procedure and delivered his maiden speech on November 8 with an oratory on the Transvaal Police, when he tackled J.B.M. Hertzog, the Minister of Justice, on the axing of two English-speaking police colonels (colonels Burns-Bogg and Madoc) and the appointment of less-qualified Afrikaners in their stead. Hertzog, he claimed, had blatantly used the reorganisation of the police force as a means of getting rid of English-speaking policemen and creating a politically-dependent civil service. The newspapers were full. Wyndham had started a debate that was taken up by other members. For the Unionists, Hertzog personified the spirit of racialism and Hertzogism had to be fought and, as a result, the ex-general from the Free State bore the brunt of much Unionist rhetoric and particularly so when his education bill was tabled. For the Unionists, who, during the election, had stressed the relationship of South Africa with Britain, the imperial connection was related directly to two further issues: education and language.

---

81 See, for example, ‘An Electoral Address. Choice before the Voters’, The Star, 15 Sep 1910.
82 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 23 Nov 1910, HHA 5/8/44.
83 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 Nov 1910, WSRO: PHA.
85 Debatten van de Volksraad, 8 Nov 1910, col 33.
86 Debates of the House of Assembly, 8 November 1910, cols 33-34.
87 See for example J.C. Macneillie in Debatten van de Volksraad, 8 Nov 1910, col 35-36; P. Duncan in Debatten van de Volksraad, 15 Nov 1910, col 99; and E. Nathan in Debatten van de Volksraad, 15 Nov 1910, col 104.
88 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 23 Nov 1910, HHA 5/8/44. See also the sparring between Crewe and FitzPatrick, and Hertzog, Debatten van de Volksraad, 8 Nov 1910, cols 269-300, 304-38. The reorganisation of the civil service, according to Lord Selborne, represented the widespread evils of Hertzog’s influence and the role of the predikants. See Lord Selborne to Howard Pim, 22 Feb 1912, Wits: A881 Pim Papers, BL.1.
89 The language controversy was fought by the Dutch to maintain Afrikaans on equal-footing alongside English; while for the Unionists this was the maintenance of English in the premier position to ensure ‘British supremacy’ at least on the language front. Afrikaans was dismissed as ‘an inferior patois.’ See for example the ‘Editorial’, The Star, 20 Oct 1910.
As far as the language controversy was concerned, Hugh was not surprised it was not understood in Britain. For him there were two points at issue – one was a question of principle and the other a question of detail. Regarding the first, the Unionists claimed that equality between the two languages meant that everybody should have been at liberty to use which ever language was preferred. For the Nationalists, he explained to Lady Leconfield, ‘that equality means that everybody shall be compelled to use both’, while the Unionists were ‘not prepared to agree to compulsory bilingualism as such a principle will put every imported Englishman at a disadvantage.’ The Unionists therefore stood for equality of opportunity, whereas the Nationalists were for equality in practice. Moreover, Wyndham argued, it was ‘of no value to him to learn Dutch [whereas it was] of immense value for every Dutchman to learn English – in fact he cannot get along without doing so.’ The net result, to Wyndham’s mind, was that Hertzog’s scheme would ‘bolster up artificially the Dutch language to the disadvantage of the English speaking community only.’

The question of detail, Wyndham continued, related to the so-called education controversy, which had been referred to a select committee in 1911. This committee agreed that the medium of instruction up to Standard 4 ought to be the home language, although the other language could be taught as a subject if the child’s parent requested this. However, in the amending ordinances introduced during the 1912 session, this compromise was altered to read that the other language would be taught unless the parent objects. This was, as Wyndham correctly noted, a small matter, although he regretted that the ‘solemn compromise’ achieved between the parties in 1911 had been abandoned by the government. This smacked of dishonour and partyism. However, Wyndham concluded, ‘even when the education controversy is settled we shall still be left quarrelling on the question of principle as to whether compulsory bilingualism shall be underlying principle or complete freedom.’

Compulsory bilingualism, apart from being contrary to educational efficiency in the schoolroom, was for Wyndham synonymous with Afrikaner domination and in conflict with the principles of equality and freedom enshrined in the constitution and the sacred
understanding reached at the National Convention. Moreover, the new political appointments replaced experienced officials on grounds of monolingualism and, as a result, the civil service question was related closely to the question of descent and language. However, notwithstanding, Milner thought that the 1911 session had exceeded his expectations, although he qualified this, explaining that it was ‘perhaps ... not saying much, for [his] expectations were not great.’

Hugh and Maud travelled to Britain at the end of the parliamentary session and then, having made contact with family and friends, crossed to the continent for a grand tour. The trip, by boat, visited Copenhagen, Christiana, Gothenburg and Stockholm, before reaching its terminus at St Petersburg, where the wealth of Romanov palaces amazed Hugh. No wonder, he thought, ‘the country is always on the brink of revolution.’ They returned to London at the end of August 1911, where after they spent time at Norton Conyers and with Lady Leconfield at St Christopher’s, before moving to Gosford, the home of Hugh’s relatives, the Elcho’s, where a large coroneted party had gathered. At dinner one evening, Lord Wemyss, observing Lady Cunard, in the latest fashion and able to ‘hardly wobble’, remarked that he would ‘have a photograph done of her in that dress & present it to the House of Lords as a type of person that w'd have a vote.’ The Wyndhams, returning to South Africa in October, did not remain in England for the marriage of Hugh’s brother, Charles, to Violet Rawson.

Aboard the Kenilworth Castle, Wyndham was pleased to note that the boat was fairly full and that there could be no doubt that the passenger trade between England and South Africa was on the increase, with the second and third classes much fuller than usual. This was a good sign and boded well for British immigration. He spent the trip in conversation with the Winchesters and W.P. Schreiner, who ‘waxed enthusiastic about

---

94 Milner to Patrick Duncan, 28 Jun 1911, UCT: 8C294 Duncan.ill.apers, D1.28.2.
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[Lady Leconfield’s] influence on the Empire’, and reading a book on Curzon’s administration in India, which was ‘absurdly interesting’, as well as *Prester John*, the only novel of John Buchan that he had ‘ever attempted, & I can hardly lay it down.’

The Wyndhams spent the Christmas season in the Transvaal. Hugh spent some time with the Volunteers, he had a camp at Ermelo in January, and he and Maud went down to Kromdraai. The farm was prospering and, with some things paying, now cost them a good deal less. The sheep and oats (the best crop Hugh ever had) were profitable and, but for the foot and mouth in England, they would have imported cows. A dairy had been established, which was soon to sell milk, and they had also mechanised the harvesting of the oats, with two machines, one to reap and the other to bale.

January was also spent at the races (he ‘managed to run second with Bellona, & third with Bonnibel’) and on political work in the constituency. Wyndham held a series of meetings in his constituency, ‘so many’ he told his mother ‘that it [was] quite like Election time.’ The second, on Monday January 15, Maud expected to be rather rowdy as Hugh had announced that he would like to see the regulation of the gaming industry, including the doing away of bookmakers, and two prominent Johannesburg bookies threatened to wreck the meeting. Maud, whenever in Turffontein, was confronted by constituency socialites for news of the Wyndham and Lyttelton families. They ‘read every word’ on them in the fashion magazines and studied the published wedding photographs of both Maud’s sister Frances and Hugh’s brother Charles. Wyndham also spoke in the Georgetown constituency, vacated by George Farrar, who had retired from politics.

However, if the Wyndhams were popular in Turffontein, the Unionists faced both a growing leadership crisis, exacerbated by personal divisions, as well as a credibility
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problem. The party lost its secretary, A.E. Balfour, as well as Farrar and Jameson, within a period of six months, in addition to suffering a series of electoral defeats in 1912.106 Georgetown, a supposedly safe seat, was lost in January: Mary Fitzgerald and her ‘Pick-handle Brigade’ broke up Unionist meetings. This was followed by Greyville in June as well as the Commissioner Street seat in the Provincial Council that September. These came as a shock and highlighted the seriousness of the Labour challenge.107 Supporting the Labour candidate in Greyville, Cresswell had told the electorate there that the Unionists, continuing to harp on the ‘racial question’, were hoping ‘to draw the electors away from the real issues at stake’, which he defined as ‘the high cost of living’ and particularly the ‘heavy rents and the high prices for food’, which benefited only the property owners and producers.108

At the end of January 1912, the Wyndhams moved down to Cape Town for the opening of the session.109 They took up residence in a bungalow beside the Seahurst Hotel at St James’s. Small and comfortable, this allowed them to save on accommodation.110 In fact they were almost living on Hugh’s salary as an MLA. ‘A Labour member’, Maud told Lady Leconfield, ‘can’t do more!’111 Wyndham, nursing a constituency in the southern suburbs of Johannesburg, was all too aware of the potential of the Labour challenge and the dangers associated with a third party, formed along lines other than ‘racial.’112 While a ‘great blow’, the loss of Georgetown, he hoped, would ‘have a revivifying effect on the party.’ The triumph of Labour had been caused ‘very much by the absence of opposition displayed by us last session’113 and Wyndham
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therefore wanted the party, focusing less on reconciliation, 'to take up a more militant attitude.'

He arrived in Cape Town ready to take up the cudgels. On February 5 he replied to the minister, Abraham Fischer, on the Land Settlement bill. Maud reckoned 'he trounced the poor old buffer' in a speech much enjoyed by some of the other ministers, including Smuts and Hull. The next day he questioned the prime minister on the re-appointment of the Transvaal field cornets, all of whom had been re-appointed for a further three years immediately after the closure of the last session. And, days later, he voted with the Labour Party on what was considered a very socialistic motion on unearned increment. As a result he was chaffed by colleagues and the cross benches. Merriman, who remarked later that Hugh reminded him of himself forty years ago, suggested that Wyndham 'ought to wear a red tie at once.'

However, the question of a national defence force for South Africa loomed largest during 1912. This had, for some time, engaged the close attention of the defence minister, but Smuts, wanting to avoid any 'appearance of compulsion or militarism on the European model', moved cautiously and sometimes to the consternation of the opposition. Woolf Sampson, anxious about the rumours of troubles brewing in Basutoland, raised the issue in parliament in 1911. He called for a study of the whole question of defence as the country needed a reliable, well-equipped, and deployable defence force. Smuts, agreeing that the topic was of national importance, but wanting to buy time, gave an insight into government's thinking on the matter. The reaction was positive until Wyndham entered the debate on March 8. Wyndham complained that the minister's speech was entirely unsatisfactory as it had only given a very vague idea of
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policy and had not addressed coastal defence or the matter of the naval contribution. This quickened the debate and almost twenty members spoke (many of them volunteer officers or former Boer officers).

The defence debate, carried by politicians and newspapermen, dragged into the following year. Steyn and Merriman were agreed that 'the first duty is to put the internal defence of S. Africa on a sound footing.' But the latter was concerned that South Africa 'not be led into militarism and to any unwise pledges of sharing in the quarrels in [the] inciting [of] which we have not been consulted.' He rather saw a small force, with good organisation and excellent supply and always ready, but with 'not too much discipline.' He was concerned that Botha, due to his politeness, would be induced to exceed prudence and South Africa would have 'a sort of sham military system' and be tempted 'to try it on the first occasion.' Duncan criticized the bill for other reasons. While it was sufficient for internal defence, it was entirely inadequate to defend against the attack of a European enemy. And, in any case, the time would come when South Africa would have to be able to defend herself and even perhaps offer support to Britain.

Behind the scenes, Smuts drafted a bill that was sent for comment to key politicians, on both sides of the house, as well as Lord Methuen, the commander of the imperial garrison, his naval counterparts at Simonstown, and Sir William Graham-Greene and other officials at the Admiralty. The Defence Bill, kept secret outside of this circle, was printed for the first time in November and again circulated within the group as well as to several additional opinion leaders. The latter were ex-president M.T. Steyn, ex-general C.F. Beyers, Sir Thomas Watt and Sir Charles Crewe, the former Cape defence minister. Smuts expected trouble from the Unionists, not from his own ranks.
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although the alignment of the Defence Bill with imperial policy was also not missed. Steyn, for example, although generally pleased with the proposals, was a little concerned that the cadet system would bring a spirit of militarism and that the lines between the imperial forces and the Union forces were blurred.

Smuts introduced the South Africa defence bill on 7 February and an avalanche of criticism followed, with high levels of discontent in the country districts of particularly the Transvaal, much of which, according to Beyers, might have been avoided. Beyers had wanted a volk’s congress but Botha and Smuts, not wanting to upset ‘the English’, decided against this. The bill enjoyed the support of all the Unionists, but not that of Smuts’ own party, who would have to rely on Unionist support if the bill was to be passed. Wyndham noted that there was ‘a great deal of suspicion of its provisions amongst the old fashioned Boer population’ and mostly regarding the principle of compulsory training. ‘The backveld Boer’, Maud informed her father, ‘likes to sit on his stoep in safety & see the English soldiers standing guard & buying their produce.’

Much to Wyndham’s surprise and delight, the government opposed the popular cry of the Afrikaner people. One after the other, former generals and commandants of the Boer forces, all in the governing party, stepped up to the podium in parliament, some supporting Smuts and the bill, others vociferously against. A heat wave hit Cape Town that February, which, Hugh complained, made ‘the interminable debates in the House even less bearable than they were.’ The business of the house had been slowing down, one bill had been passed (the Land Settlement Bill) and only two further bills had passed
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their second readings, both of which were referred to select committees. And the
defence debate promised to be a long one. As a result, Wyndham jokingly remarked, that
'in a short time [they would] start passing Estimates & legislation with breakneck speed,
having already consumed a month in doing nothing.' He nonetheless managed to
escape from the house for a time to judge horses at the Cape Town Agricultural Show –
'a very easy job, as there was hardly a horse worth looking at.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afrikaner (Boer)</th>
<th>Unionist</th>
<th>Labour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen J.C. Smuts (chair)</td>
<td>Sir Bisset Berry</td>
<td>Col F.H.P. Cresswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen C.F. Beyers</td>
<td>Col C.P. Crewe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cmdt F.R. Cronje</td>
<td>Mr C. Henwood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr H.C. van Heerden</td>
<td>Lt Col Hon Hugh Wyndham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3:** Composition of the parliamentary committee on defence, 1912.

The debate continued that Wednesday and Thursday, until Smuts finally suggested that most of the points raised in the debate could best be referred to a select committee, which would hear witnesses and request documentation, and the house adjourned at 10.10 that night. The committee was appointed a week later, comprising nine members: four Afrikaners and five English-speakers, and creating a political division of four Unionists, four members of the 'Dutch' party, and one Labourite (table 6.3). They numbered three former Boer officers (two generals and a commandant) in the persons of Smuts, Beyers and Cronjé. There were three English-speaking colonels Crewe, Wyndham and Cresswell, who, incidentally, also represented each of the former colonial forces: the Cape Colonial Forces, the Transvaal Volunteers and the Natal Militia. And there were also three civilians: Sir Bisset Berry, Mr C. Henwood, and Mr H.C. van Heerden, the chairman of the Afrikanerbond. While the language split was 4-5 in favour of the English section, General J.C. Smuts, the Minister of Defence and a former Boer general, dominated all as

---

138 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Feb 1912 and 21 Feb 1912, WSRO: PHA.
139 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Feb 1912, WSRO: PHA.
140 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Feb 1912, WSRO: PHA.
141 *Debatten van de Volksraad*, 29 Feb 1912, cols 630-631; and Union of South Africa, Parliament,
chairman. Wyndham found his appointment to this committee immensely pleasing. He would be able to give further vent to his ideas on South African defence and engage, for the balance of an otherwise boring session, in interesting discussion.

The fusion of four disparate forces and at least three military traditions, and the recognition and protection of the two languages, was no easy task. They studied the proposals for a Union Defence Force and took evidence from a variety of military specialists, again representative of British and Boer military systems and in almost perfect equity. The committee considered petitions, consulted the Military Code and Rules of Procedure as provisionally adopted from the Army Act. But defence was a contentious matter and, from the start, Beyers and Cronjé, sometimes in concert, attempted to give a heavy republican imprint. The Unionists, on the other hand, satisfied with the bill generally, stressed the importance of defence as an imperial matter. The 1911 imperial conference had felt that member countries would, as far as possible, have to assume responsibility for their own defence in the event of war. This view was supported by the Unionists, who had first called for the formation of a national defence force. Wyndham, with his series of articles in The State (1909), had placed his ideas before the first united parliament and called upon ‘the people of South Africa’ to see that South African defence was ‘dealt with broadly and with a proper conception of the requirements of the case.’ South Africa, he argued, had a chance in 1910, ‘of founding her defence upon a solid and permanent basis.’ The country required a defence force sufficient not only for internal defence, but also able to engage with a European army.

Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.

This included a permanent artillery corps on the basis of the former republican state artillery, the lengthening of the period of service for rifle associations, and, despite their protest, the wording ‘commandos’ and ‘commandant’ were removed from clauses 20; Beyers and Cronjé attempted to give the new rifle associations the same colour as the old Boer commandos.

Richard Feetham to his mother, 19 Apr 1912, RHO: Feetham Papers, Box 3, file 1, f. 134.
Unlike her sister dominions, the question of a South African navy triggered a vociferous political debate. While all political parties recognised the need for a naval presence in South African waters, they could not agree on the character of that presence. Roland Bourne, the Secretary for Defence, opined that the available finances would determine this: a South African navy would for many years to come be beyond the resources of the Union and he therefore supported the idea of contribution. Bourne was a fringe kindergartener and his position, unsurprisingly, lay with the Unionists, who had for some time called for an increase in South Africa's cash contribution to the Royal Navy as 'incontestable proof' of the loyalty of the entire country.

However, the country was incontestably divided. The debate on the naval contribution commenced in parliament on 26 March 1912, when P.A. Silburn (Unionist, Durban Point) moved that South Africa consider a cash contribution to the Royal Navy calculated on the basis of the value of the sea-borne trade, which would have had the effect of increasing the contribution from £85,000 to £350,000 per year. Hugh Wyndham, who seconded the motion, stated 'It took some courage to support the motion ... If one got up in this House and talked about the Empire some people either called him a Jingo or others called him a megalomaniac.' South Africa, Wyndham believed, should not depend upon Britain for her defence, but as a self-respecting nation she should pay for her own defence. He believed that Canada and Australia had taken the wrong line in creating their own small independent navies, which as he reminded the House, John X. Merriman, a former Cape premier, had called 'tin-pot navies.' Wyndham wished to place the defence of South Africa 'on a proper basis' by either assuming responsibility for the defence of the ports or by making a sizeable (increased) contribution to the Royal Navy.
Merriman had always supported the idea of a naval contribution. It not only insured South Africa’s seaborne trade, but, he argued, the time had come for South Africa to face the obligations of her new status. However, aware of the difficulties of contribution, which some interpreted as tribute, he suggested that it rather be regarded as an insurance premium. Steyn, on the other hand, did not at all like the idea of a contribution to the fleet, which he regarded as ‘the emblem of ultra Jingo Imperialism.’ He preferred Merriman’s idea of an insurance premium (‘it is at all events a more business-like proposal than a blind contribution’). The purchase and equipping of ships to sail under British command was equally unattractive, even if these were assigned to South African waters, had a South African character and were manned by South African seamen. If money was to be spent, it had to be on a South African navy and this, for the moment, South Africa could not afford. Yet, as Christiaan Beyers, a former Boer general appointed in 1912 to head the new active citizen force, suggested, South Africa could best assist by assuming responsibility for the defence of South African ports and the maintenance of docks, refitting establishments, magazines, and depots. In this way she could contribute but still be in complete and ‘unmenced’ control of her own. The Silburn-Wyndham motion was, of course, defeated in a House dominated by the South African Party and the establishment of a South African navy was postponed by ten years.

The select committee on the defence bill submitted their report on 18 April and with effect from 1 July 1912 the Union Defence Forces came into being. A combination of six forces, this was essentially an unhappy marriage between the British and Boer military systems and a Defence Council, which could summon specialists to join in deliberation or give advice, was created to deal with conflict. The council, a safety mechanism, largely for the protection of language interests, was to function for five years from the commencement of the Defence Act, a period that was renewable. There were four

---

157 Churchill to Bourne, 23 Jul 1914, MAP: DC, Box 564, file DC 57624 Naval Matters.
159 Debaten van de Volksraad, 18 Apr 1912, col 1498.
160 These six forces were the SA Permanent Force (SAPF), the Active Citizen Force (ACF), the Coast Garrison Force (CGF), the Rifle Associations (or resurrected Commandos), the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve (RNVR), and the Cadet Corps.
defence councillors, two English and two Afrikaans, and representing the four provinces. Wyndham, who succeeded Crewe in 1918, served on the council until 1921.

However, the UDF remained an essentially unhappy marriage between the British and Boer military value systems. Many Afrikaners could not endure 'the melting pot' of the new Union Defence Forces, and appealed to old patrons for personal support or followed them into rebellion in 1914. Complex dynamics, embracing personal prejudice as much as the demands of modern warfare and the requirement of imperial standardisation, shaped South African defence policy and the formation of the Union Defence Forces. Several explanations, chiefly from the Afrikaner nationalist perspective, have been provided for the alleged heavy British imprint on the Union Defence Forces. These range from the length of Britain's presence in southern Africa and her pre-eminent position after 1902, to the blaming of Smuts and Botha for their abandonment of the volk and embracing of empire. Yet, while each of these explanations has merit, they remain, even collectively, inadequate. Historians generally have not assessed the role of the individuals behind the establishment of the UDF, the nature of that force, and the specific purposes for which it was designed. The UDF was a consensus, a product of a combination of systems, but nonetheless a thoughtful combination, one of 'proper conception.'

Military factions were created in the struggle for power and Beyers took steps to fill posts with his supporters. Wyndham retained command of the Southern Mounted Rifles.
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right up to the formation of the Union Defence Forces and the absorption of his regiment into the new South African Citizen Force. As a kindergartener and vocal Unionist, Wyndham undoubtedly carried that imperial label which did not endear him to republic-minded Afrikaners. The new commandant general of the Citizen Force, Brigadier General C.F. Beyers, a close friend of former-general Jan Kemp, who had given Wyndham so much trouble in the Eastern Rifles, was now determined to exclude Wyndham so much officers from his force. Such action, to quote Charles Leonard, worked towards ‘permanent alienation instead of reconciliation’ and affected the unity of the Union Defence Forces materially.

Beyers interfered directly in Wyndham’s regiment: directing officers of the Southern Mounted Rifles to proceed to the Military School in Bloemfontein to qualify for employment in the new Permanent Force. After meeting with Sir Roland Bourne, the Secretary for Defence, who offered an explanation on behalf of General Smuts, Wyndham stood down. He had little choice in the matter and being a good commander would in any case not stand in the way of advancement for his men. Wyndham was sacrificed to satisfy Beyers and his protégés. He neither resigned nor was he transferred to the Reserve of Officers. Although no longer in command of the SMR, he continued to be held on their strength and even after this regiment was absorbed into the new Citizen Force.

Jameson was taking strain in 1912. After making a solid contribution to the debate on civil servants and the language question at the end of February, he was ‘fairly knocked up’ and, without ‘a ghost of a leader anywhere’, the Unionists faced a leadership crisis. However, contrary to opinions in Britain, Wyndham and fellow Unionists welcomed Jameson’s departure (it did ‘the party no good being led by a man who has not the health
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to be an active politician\textsuperscript{169}) and now the party could take up the fight with greater vigour.\textsuperscript{170} Smartt, the new leader, though, did not enjoy the regard of many in the party. Wyndham considered him no more 'than a temporary expedient'\textsuperscript{171}; while Feetham thought Duncan the best candidate and the only one able to 're-establish the party's influence up here on the Rand.'\textsuperscript{172}

Wyndham was eager to return to the Rand, both to visit his residences as well as meet military obligations. And, in any case, with select committees in the morning and sitting in the house in the afternoon and some evenings, he needed a break from the rigours of the session.\textsuperscript{173} Hugh and Maud went up to Johannesburg on 30 March, when the house was in the middle of the budget debate and its business 'as congested as ever.' They had only carried up to that point three 'very unimportant measures' and 'the government's programme includes about 20, & they are very anxious to finish the session by the end of May!'\textsuperscript{174} Hugh spent the first week at Florida for the Easter camp. This, he regretted, was the last camp they would have, as his regiment would 'cease to exist under the new defence scheme. We cannot complain about this, as it could not be fitted into any defence scheme that could be adopted, but I regret very much that it should be so.'\textsuperscript{175} He nonetheless thought the camp very successful, 'though the comfort of it was interfered with by a great deal of rain.' He and Maud then took a flying visit to the Kromdraai, which they found prospering, and then, after only a day or two at their Parktown residence, Hugh returned to Cape Town, leaving Maud to supervise the alterations and the addition of three new rooms to their Parktown residence.\textsuperscript{176} The hall had been
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refurbished and the smoking room too, the staircase was rebuilt and some of the bedrooms refashioned. Each day, Maud conducted a steady stream of tradesmen over the house until she began 'to feel like the housekeeper at Hatfield or Chatsworth.' One day, ordering felt for the floor of a guest bedroom, she was told by the carpetman in an awed voice that 'It must be a very large room.' 'Such', she told Lady Leconfield, 'is the ease with which greatness is achieved here.'

Returning to the house after a fortnight, Wyndham found 'that very little progress' had been made during his absence. They had only managed to bring the budget debate to a close; while there were 'fully a dozen bills which have not advanced even one stage, though they are all Government measures.' He was greeted with the news of the sinking of the Titanic. And the house, breaking its inertia, passed a resolution in sympathy. As Maud noted 'somehow a floating palace with every luxury & luxurious person on board is much more strikingly awful than a poor battered fishing or cargo boat that carries its life in its hands.'

Maud rejoined Wyndham at the end of April, when they moved into the Mount 'Nelson.' But, by now, Hugh was tired. The session had become 'very tedious', and he hoped they would not have to stay for much longer than a month. He felt he had very little news – 'there is nothing more barren of event than the long protracted debates of a fruitless session.' Wyndham, nonetheless, in concert with other Unionists, tackled the government on a range of issues, several of which related to the curtailment of the old republican land networks and the undue influence of patronage on the veld. This not only included the equitable taxation of rural landings in the former republics – farmers in the former Cape and Natal colonies paid more tax – but also the consolidation of legislation relating to land survey and the status of field cornets. On each of these issues, the
Unionists were opposed, often vehemently, by a large block of MLAs that represented farming interests in the Transvaal Province and the Orange Free State.\footnote{184}

The debate on the position of the field cornets was particularly controversial.\footnote{185} Wyndham, resuming it in May 1913, reminded Louis Botha, who was also Minister of Agriculture, of his promise in 1911 to provide consolidating legislation to standardise the status of these officials throughout the Union.\footnote{186} In the former republics, field cornets, who were chiefly used for the inspection of sheep, undertook political activities and exercise of patronage in their wards.\footnote{187} Botha, however, powerless to effect change in the face of ‘takhaar’ opposition, could do little more than regret the accuracy of Wyndham’s remarks.\footnote{188} Attempting to forge a new South Africanism, Botha failed to convince the majority of his party that the new state of things in South Africa was not a restoration of the old republics but an incorporation of their peoples with those of the colonies and migrant Britons, in a greater unity.\footnote{189} Botha, needing to keep his party and the platteland placated, did nothing.\footnote{190}

Wyndham, during the session, also took up the cudgels on behalf of women’s suffrage. In him, South African suffragettes found rather an unlikely champion. He was not only ‘against manhood suffrage ... unless it was for the good of the country’\footnote{191}, but his wife, like most of the women in their families, disliked suffragettes (‘the vile women’) intensely.\footnote{192} Maud, in a letter to Hugh’s mother, opined that the suffragette who had slashed

\footnote{184}{For Wyndham’s speech on land taxation see the Debates of the House of Assembly, 20 Feb 1913, cols 405-406. His speech on the Land Survey bill is reported in the Debates of the House of Assembly, 23 April 1913, cols 1815-1817. Wyndham appealed for the adoption of the Transvaal practice whereby the evidence as to the boundaries of a piece of land was the diagram. This, he argued, was superior to the Cape practice, where the evidence was the beacons on the ground, ‘because beacons sometimes had a curious way of travelling about the country.’}

\footnote{185}{Duncan first raised the question of field cornets, their supposed duties and their interference in local politics, back in November 1910. Debatten van de Volksraad, 10 Nov 1910, col 42.}

\footnote{186}{See, for example, Debatten van de Volksraad, 11 Apr 1911, col 2163; Debatten van de Volksraad, 6 Feb 1912, col 121; and Government Notice No 730, 1 May 1911.}

\footnote{187}{Wyndham mentioned the case of Mr De la Rey Swartz, who sent out political notices, signed by himself as field-cornet, as well as the cases of other field cornets, who mixed their official duties with political canvassing. See the Debates of the House of Assembly, 9 May 1913, cols 2312-14.}

\footnote{188}{Debates of the House of Assembly, 9 May 1913, col 2313.}

\footnote{189}{See, for example, the views of Duncan on Botha’s premiership in Patrick Duncan to Basil Williams, 14 Mar 1923, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, E41.7.}

\footnote{190}{Wyndham raised the matter again during the 1914 session See the Debates of the House of Assembly, 10 Mar 1914, col 1110.}

\footnote{191}{Debates of the House of Assembly, 11 Feb 1913, col 222-23.}

\footnote{192}{Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA. See also Maud Wyndham to
the Rokeby Venus ought to get '5 lashes with the cat' and she shrugged off the news of Mrs Pankhurst's 'usual whinings ab' her cell being uncomfortable.' Maud would have liked to have 'put her in one full of flees & ankle deep in water & give her the cat once a week.'

The first suffrage debates were held in the parliaments of Natal in 1891, and the Cape Colony in 1892, 1907 and 1908. On each occasion, these were stalled by strong opposition. Merriman believed that women ought 'never be in a position to send, by their votes, men to dangers, which they themselves cannot share and Molteno, who objected on the grounds that it would break up the home. Lady Selborne, although assuming a non-political stance while her husband was proconsul in South Africa, strengthened the franchise case for the dominions after their return to Britain.

In South Africa, the women's suffrage, although not assuming the violence associated with the movement in Britain, was made controversial. In the first place there was an apparent divide between the formal movement, led by 'the largely English-speaking enthusiasts of what was projected as an empire-wide movement', and Afrikaner women, who 'preferred rather to blend older notions of maternal piety with ideas about women's duties as members of a racially, linguistically and religiously defined volk.' And, secondly, the Labour Party, which tabled motions in 1912 and 1913, politicised the issue. Disagreeing that female suffrage would lead to the 'reign of socialism [Andrews] seemed to predict', Wyndham supported the bill. The debate was eventually adjourned until February 26 and was then postponed until March 5, when a division rejected the
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193 Lady Leconfield, 4 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA ('Those beastly suffragettes ...').
194 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
195 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
196 Combined Suffrage Bodies of the Union of South Africa, 'Brief Outline of the Woman Suffrage Movement in South Africa', UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A23.4. Woman first received the vote in South Australia (1894) and Western Australia (1899) and after 1901 the vote was granted in rapid succession throughout the rest of the states of the Commonwealth of Australia. Questions of Round Table (f. 63), BLO: Ms Curtis 824.
197 J.X. Merriman to Goldwin Smith, 26 Oct 1907, in P. Lewsen (ed), Selections from the Correspondence of John X. Merriman, p 54.
198 Rachel Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 11 Sep 1910, HHA 2/5/1.
motion by 70 to 30. Those that had voted for the suffrage motion, included a mix of MLAs from the government (Sauer, Schreiner, Fremantle and Hull), Labour (Andrews, Boydell, Cresswell), and the Unionists (Smartt, Wyndham and Duncan).\textsuperscript{201} As in Britain, the parties' leaders would not commit their organisations to a course on which they were divided internally.\textsuperscript{202} And, for the Unionists, party union, when they alone stood for the maintenance of the imperial connection, was ranked more importantly than female suffrage. However, if they managed to avoid disunity over the suffrage question, another more dividing issue, in the form of a series of industrial and related strikes, soon threatened to tear the Unionists Party asunder.

4. Industrial Unrest: the strikes of 1913 and 1914 and the deportations

There were no major white labour disputes before the Anglo-Boer War; in fact no labour organisation existed until the formation of a union in 1892 to resist the employment of black convict labour in the mines. The convicts did not arrive and the union soon dissolved. However, a strong miners' organisation was established soon after the resumption of mining in 1901, and in May 1907, a strike was called to resist changes in working conditions. Smuts, then colonial secretary of the Transvaal Colony, called in imperial troops, to protect the scab labour and mining property, and the strike failed to achieve its object.\textsuperscript{203}

In July 1913, labour discontent came to a head in a general strike. The trouble spread from the New Kleinfontein mine on the East Rand, where the management introduced a change in working hours which deprived some men of their Saturday half-day. The strike spread from mine to mine and became increasingly violent, culminating in acts of sabotage, arson and bloodshed in Johannesburg on 4 and 5 July.\textsuperscript{204} The Worker declared the start of a war in which:

\textsuperscript{201} Debates of the House of Assembly, 11 Feb 1913, col 234; 19 Feb 1913, col 364; 5 Mar 1913, cols 652-53.

\textsuperscript{202} George Wyndham to Leo Maxse, 8 July 1910, in J.W. Mackail and Guy Wyndham (eds.), Life and Letters of George Wyndham, p 660.


\textsuperscript{204} D. Jacobsson, Fifty Golden Years of the Rand, 1886-1936 (London 1936), pp 86-87.
'victory means bringing the South African public, and in particular the Union Parliament, to its senses and its knees, and extorting substantial legislation in the worker's interest. ... now it is war, the shoe has got to be made to pinch.'

The situation got out of hand. Gunsmith's shops were looted by rioters, who now sniped at the military and police forces called in to clear the streets. Nineteen rioters were killed and some 150 members of the security forces were wounded, some seriously. Botha and Smuts brokered a settlement, which included the reinstatement of the strikers and compensation by the government for the strike breakers.

The *Rand Daily Mail*, the friend and supporter of white labour, ran headlines that read: 'A Night of Horror; Terrible Strike Scenes; Park Station Burnt; Star Office Destroyed; Attack on Corner House; Wholesale Looting of Shops; Shooting in Streets; Railway Traffic Paralysed; Battle around Rand Club; Soldiers fire on Crowd.' The issue, plainly stated, the *Rand Daily Mail* later proclaimed, was 'whether South Africa [was] to be governed by constitutional authority, wielded by properly elected representatives, or not' and it called upon its readers, at the start of the 1914 strike, not to side 'with those who prefer revolution to evolution.' But Smuts, unwilling to take any chances, had surged ahead with the organisation and equipping of the Union Defence Forces; next time he would not have to rely on imperial troops.

The Wyndhams had been abroad for much of the latter half of 1913 and returned to a Johannesburg that was 'so dreadfully frightening & lonely.' There had been an attempt on Lionel Phillips' life and the Rand magnates – Abe Bailey included – were nervous. This, although creating 'a tremendous stir', had, Wyndham placated his mother, 'nothing to do with the last strike nor yet with labour unrest in general', but a
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205 'Topics of the Week', *The Worker*, 3 July 1914 as quoted in W. Visser, 'The South African Labour Movement's Responses to Declarations of Martial Law, 1913-1922', *Scientia Militaria* 31(2) 2003, p 144.


207 Quoted by J. Mervis, *The Fourth Estate: a newspaper story* (Johannesburg 1989), p 97. Maud Wyndham thought the following of the *Rand Daily Mail*: 'the paper that as a rule takes a very ill conditioned view of things & is an organ of Abe Bailey's & abuses Li Phi specially & other magnates too.' See Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 8 Sep 1914, HHA 2/36/68.


209 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 18 Dec 1913, HHA 2/36/25.
simple 'working off of a personal spite.' However, a fortnight later, with industrial unrest imminent, the rich of Johannesburg packed their china, sent their silver to the banks, made inventories, and braced themselves for a strike.

1914 had started like any other year, with much visiting and entertaining. Hugh Wyndham and Jack Lyttelton spent much of New Year's week at the oval, the English XI beat South Africa, and, with Gladstone and Paget (his ADC) watching the 10th defeat a brother regiment at polo. Both Gladstone and Paget stayed with the Wyndhams on the night of the Polo ball and returned to Pretoria the next day. January 7 was Gladstone's birthday and the day dawned to the news that a railway strike was to start that night. Gladstone's sister, Mary Drew, described the news as 'a Bombshell.' And, although perhaps unintentional, it certainly had implications for Government House. The shoe was pinching. The Johannesburg guests would arrive by special train and not be able to return except by road, which, as Maud noted, would 'be foully hot & bumpy.' 'There are many more preparations than in July', she told her mother. The mails were written and despatched a day earlier, in advance of the coming strike. Special constables were sworn in through the day and the Colonial Office bag left Government House early in the hope of catching the mail.

At the Government House that night, as the dance music filled the air, Mary Drew was taken back to 1832 and the Apsley House ball, when the windows were smashed by the stones flung by the people outside. But Smuts was not a man willing to leave matters to chance. Fifty soldiers were posted at Government House to guard the revellers and many of the guests, including Hugh Wyndham, were sworn in as special constables in the
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210 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Dec 1913, WSRO: PHA.
211 See for example the diary of Marguerite Chaplin, 1-22 Jan 1914, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, A.
212 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 8 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/28.
213 Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 7 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), *Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew)* *Her Diaries and Letters*, p 471. The strife, starting on the Natal coalfields, spread rapidly by a general railway strike throughout as a protest against retrenchment, directed, it was complained, against trade unionists.
214 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 7 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/27. According to Wyndham, only 16 of the some 200 Johannesburg people, who had confirmed acceptance of the invitation 'braved the dangers of the strike' and went to Pretoria. See Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Jan 1914, WSRO: PHA.
215 Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 7 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), *Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew)* *Her Diaries and Letters*, p 471.
early hours of the morning. The revellers drifted home, to take what precautions they could, leaving the piquet at Government House. The Union Defence Forces was called out on January 9. The move of the Governor General’s party to Cape Town was delayed for security reasons (dynamite was said to have been placed on the railway lines) and so the Wyndhams and their circle continued attendance of the fourth cricket test match, as the industrial unrest spread to the Cape and order was maintained through the defence force.

The Wyndhams continued to live in their bubble. Some Johannesburgers ordered in ‘vast stores of coal & stuff’, but Maud and her friends agreed that the strike, having made very little impression, would fizzle out. After all, ‘the men’, she reported on 8 January, ‘have no grievances.’ But, expecting alarm in the British press and anxiety from her family, she despatched a reassuring cable to Hagley. This was a great comfort to the Cobhams, who were ‘so jumpy.’ Lady Cobham had visions of an attack at Wyndhams, but consoled herself with the idea that the house was not isolated and, being Hugh’s, who she thought ‘so popular’, would be a rendezvous for supporters rather than arsonists. She related further:

‘... we only trust you have got in provisions – as we did here! & stored meal in the stables until rats got in!!! We conveyed the sacks by night & in secrecy, so as not to alarm people!! Father always is prepared for the worst, & will prophesy native risings & only longs for you here in safety, so pray take every care & sleep with pistols if necessary, as I used here!’

However, little could convince the Wyndhams, and certainly Maud, that the strike had been little more than ‘a flat affair from the beginning.’ The leaders, they thought, had ‘forced it on long before [the workers] were ready’ and the government and security
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216 Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 9 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters, pp 471-72; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 12 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/29.

217 Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 10, 12, 13 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters, p 472.

218 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 8 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/28. This view was supported by the Archbishop of Cape Town. See William Carter to Algernon Lawley, 16 Jan 1914, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Papers.

219 Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 15 Jan 1914, HHA 5/12/16.
forces ‘were quite ready with various cold water douches.’ The prompt acts of the Govt. and the efficiency of the Defence Force’, Mary Drew thought, ‘seem to have startled the strikers.’ The leaders (‘swine all of them’ Maud opined) were arrested for sedition, just as the defence force, on its first real deployment, swung into action. Hugh, rather prudently, postponed a tub thumping in Turffontein and ‘thousands of burghers’, including ‘old Delarey at the head of his troop’, arrived to guard the mines and mine owners.

However, the events turned dramatically just when the propertied classes thought the industrial action over. The Transvaal Federation of Trades, then in control of the labour organisations and according to Mary Drew ‘pure Syndicalism’, called a general strike on 13 January. The news came that the ballot ended in wholesale strike action and Mary Drew reckoned they were ‘in for war’. The Government replied immediately with a declaration of martial law. In the early hours of January 14, a motor arrived at Government House with a proclamation for Gladstone’s signature and at the dead of night martial law was proclaimed.

The next day Maud reported home that ‘another strike’ had commenced. While she hoped it would not ‘be a bad one’, she was happy for the excitement it would bring – the proclamation of martial law had been ‘quite thrilling’. The Wyndhams had dined with Major Bagot on 13 January, who was ‘run up all the time & much enjoying it’. The railroads, threatened to be dynamited, were guarded by Boer patrols. All the bars were closed. And, even at the Carlton, no wine was supplied. There, Maud observed,
people have to arrive with their drink in a medicine bottle labelled “at mealtimes only”.' Yet, she still thought the strike was ‘all about nothing’ remaining confident that the government would stand firm and ‘do well.’ Nonetheless, everything was at a standstill. Other trades had joined the strike and coal could not be transported away from the pits. Wyndham’s coal mines at Vryheid had to bunker excavated coal.229

Although these were exciting times, they were sometimes mixed with frustration. The mail letters, having to come up along the threatened rail lines, took longer to come through. Wyndham’s seed potatoes, in rail trucks, would arrive too late for planting and his horses, all going down to the farm when the strike started, were caught in Johannesburg, ‘instead of being free & happy’ on Kromdraai. Johannesburg was already suffering food shortages and all provisions were placed under municipal control. Hugh, seemingly wanting to feel the shoe pinch, refused to order in extra food or coal. He cut off the boiler at Wyndhams and so, as Maud told her father, ‘we either wash in cold water or not at all, except hands.’230

But much of the annoyance was offset by the thrill and keen anticipation. On the inside of the events the Wyndhams had a reasonably clear understanding of what was happening. They knew by January 14, only a day after the deputy police commissioner had submitted to Smuts a list of possible deportees, that H.J. Poutsmma (‘a v. ill-conditioned Hollander’) was to be deported.231 Having contact with Labour Party parliamentarians, they knew, too, that the strike leaders had forced the pace of the industrial action, the SALP wanting to wait until the government was away in Cape Town for the session.232

The movement was promptly crushed, the closing scene taking the form of a siege on 15 January of the Johannesburg trades hall, where the executive of the federation and a body of supporters had barricaded themselves. Those inside surrendered without resistance. Wyndham was pleased with the result. The government had not only ‘really

229 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 14 Jan 1914, HHA 5/12/3.
230 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 14 Jan 1914, HHA 5/12/3.
231 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 14 Jan 1914, HHA 5/12/3; and J. Hyslop, Notorious Syndicalist, p 234. This only became public knowledge on January 27. See ‘Strike leaders taken from Fort; Sent off by special train; Destination Unknown’, Rand Daily Mail, 27 Jan 1914. This article broke the news to the world.
done very well for once', but he was also very encouraged by the result of the mobilisation of the Active Citizen Forces and their deployment into Johannesburg. He held a meeting in Turffontein and on January 28, he and Maud hosted a party in the constituency, which had been postponed due to the strike, and, with parliament about to convene, they moved down to Cape Town for the start of what promised to be a busy session. The defence force had passed its first test with flying colours and Botha's position was strengthened by the prompt action of the government, both of which, it was expected, would lead to the improvement of relations Anglo-Afrikaner relations. And, a satisfied Mary Drew noted, this was not due to the threat of a 'black peril'.

However, during the night of January 26, the nine strike leaders who were not of South African birth were deported to Britain. The move was described by Maud, who appreciated 'a touch of the picturesque in today's politics', as 'a glorious dramatic step', which 'might have happened in the days of Louis XIV.' But the Unionist Party was immediately drawn between two positions — support for the quashing of what was cast as a syndicalist revolt and the upholding of individual, human rights.

The Wyndhams returned to Cape Town at the end of January and moved into the Mount Nelson, which was packed with MLAs and their families, including the Leonards and Jack Lytteltons. Arriving just in time for the opening of parliament at the end of January, they witnessed its stormy first days. The government had introduced a bill to indemnify its actions during the strike and legalise ex post facto the deportation of the
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238 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA; Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 6 Feb 1914, HHA 2/36/35.
239 Mary Drew, who was in the house on January 29, 'found it all of a quiver.' The air was 'electric' and 'Cresswell, fresh from his midnight ocean flight after the Umgeni, was the centre of attention.' 'From the look in his eyes, one felt a pistol might easily be in his pocket, at any moment to be let off at anybody. But he spoke more calmly than I expected. The Labour speeches, however, carried no weight, as they disdained to put the case at all for the authorities.' See Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 30 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters, pp 474-75.
nine strike leaders. The house was split across party lines, although practically everybody was, as Maud noted, ‘whole hog for the Govt nearly.’

Yet, unsurprisingly, Smuts’ action triggered an outcry. Wyndham and Duncan, with Merriman, a senior member of the governing party (who considered it ‘a fatal error’), the nine Labourites and a few other MLAs, were solidly against the deportations. For Wyndham this was a matter of principle. He told Maud that ‘he might be deported himself on Smuts’s ruling at any time.’ Although by no means a Liberal, the Lytteltons and Wyndhams in Britain, equally Tory, did not share in Wyndham’s opposition. Lord Cobham, in a striking letter to Maud, was quick to highlight the possible consequences had the government not acted in the way it did:

‘If the Govt had been caught again as in July you would now probably have been on your way back to England with Ld Aiglon & such possessions as you might have saved, or else you would have been below the Turf.’

And Cobham realised too, that, while Botha and Smuts had ‘made a good slice of history’, the end was ‘not nearly in sight.’ Their actions would not only have an impact upon South Africa, but on the empire, too, and the wider position and posturing of labour. And these were issues, Lord Cobham warned, ‘of no inconsiderable magnitude.’

For three days, Smuts defended the government’s action. Revolutionary syndicalism, he argued, had led the unions to declare war against the State, with the deliberate intention of starving the public into surrender. It was an attack on the whole country. He conceded that the deportations lacked legality, but explained that the food shortages on the Rand, the depreciating security situation and the threat to life and property, and the alleged syndicalist plot to seize the state, had made the proclamation of martial law necessary.
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The cross benches then took the podium. Duncan and Crewe led the debate for the Unionists, the first arguing against the deportations and the latter for. Duncan was joined by Wyndham and, together, they attempted to show that the government’s action was illegal, although the deportation of the men without trial was, Wyndham conceded, ‘an exceedingly difficult one.’ Seldom had more highhanded action been taken and he was surprised that it received the approval of papers like the Daily News. Personally, he thought the government had failed to make their case to justify their action and, moreover, he was concerned that parliamentary sanction would create a dangerous precedent, ‘which may quite well be used by the Autocracy loving Boer in the future, against any of us.’ The strike was over – ‘in fact’, Wyndham thought, ‘it never had a chance of getting started’ – and the men deported and ‘we are now asked to approve of it.’

This, Wyndham and Duncan and ‘a handful more of firm constitutionalists’ refused to do. They argued that the men should first have been tried by a special tribunal, if necessary, and then all the strike leaders, some of whom ‘were as venomous’ as the foreign-born nine, would have been tried and punished too. Yet, having been born in South Africa, the others had got off free and it was this deporting of ‘political undesirables’ of alien birth that created the dangerous precedent. Not satisfied that Smuts had proved a syndicalist conspiracy, at least to the extent requiring deportation without trial, Wyndham read up on Syndicalism and fine tuned his speech as he awaited his turn on the list of speakers.

Vere Stent, the editor of the Pretoria News, took a different view, opining that no precedent would be created. The nine deported men were ‘poisonous fellows’ and ‘high above all law and above all principle [stood] that supreme law, the safety of the people.’ Stent castigated Duncan and Wyndham (‘you lovers of principle’) for not speaking out.

impressions see William Carter to Algernon Lawley, 6 Feb 1914, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Papers.
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when the Natal Colony was ‘shooting Natives like dogs.’ ‘Surely’, he argued, it was ‘less a violation of the liberty of the subject to banish than to execute.’ Compared with ‘the horrors of the Mome Gorge [the] hand of Martial Law under General Smuts’ was comparatively tender.\(^\text{252}\)

Feeling ran high and Johannesburg, in particular, was up in arms. Every parliamentarian received ‘sheaves of telegrams telling him what to think & how to vote.’\(^\text{253}\) Duncan received an anonymous letter branding him a traitor for deserting his party, the government, and his class and encouraging revolution.\(^\text{254}\) However, the stand made by he and Wyndham drew mostly positive responses.\(^\text{255}\) They were implored to fight the clause implying that ‘all home born British subjects are by implication put into the same category as aliens’ and make a stand for the personal liberty of the subject. However, although many Unionist supporters did not like the idea of perpetual banishment and wanted this limited to a certain number of years to prevent further injustice, they would also ‘be very sorry to see them back.’\(^\text{256}\) Yet, as an outraged J.E. Forrest objected, ‘the principles of British justice’ had been violated and ‘behind and beyond all this (mostly sham) alarm on the part of the Government; is an astute political move; to checkmate Hertzog; re-arm the brens; re-establish Krugerisms in a far worse form; and secure the rehabilitation of an incompetent and discredited cabinet.’\(^\text{257}\) Smuts had had a history of expelling and deportation.\(^\text{258}\) D.M. Whyk wrote to Duncan exploding that these were the tactics of the ‘General Smuts of twelve years ago, & not a responsible minister of the crown today’, tactics that seem ‘to have been “made in Germany” & stamped in the Star Chamber.’\(^\text{259}\)

The suffrage debate was reopened while the furore of the deportations still raged.

Lady Selborne, taking up the cause of dominion adult suffrage and engaging with Lionel
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Curtis, distributed a questionnaire throughout the Round Table organisation early in 1914. This circular, which arrived on Wyndham’s desk (he was chairman of the Round Table in South Africa) together with pressure from female constituents and his sense that he needed to draw some of the accolades claimed for this by Labour, led Wyndham, on February 17, to introduced a private member’s bill for the enfranchisement of women.

Patrick Duncan seconded on the motion and when Wyndham moved that the bill be read for a first time, this was negatived. But, when Wyndham called for a division, the result (Ayes – 42; Noes – 43) was surprising. Nobody would have predicted that this would have been defeated by one vote only. Maud, not the fieriest suffragette, fired off letters to Lady Leconfield, Lady Cobham and Margaret Wyndham immediately. A large number of suffrage supporters had been absent from the house: Theo Schreiner was having tea with a suffragette on the roof and most of the Labour members were at the docks seeing off the wives of the deported strike leaders.

In the meantime, the deportations debate in the house went on, many MLAs wanting to speak and many taking several hours to say their say. The whole of the sitting was, for the moment, concentrated on the deportations and the debate, after ‘a week of uninterrupted oratory,’ was likely to be prolonged for another fortnight and no other government business was before the house. Many of the orators, including Merriman and Jagger, hotly opposed the deportations, but ended their speeches by announcing that they would vote for the second reading of the bill. Only the Labour Party provided a united front against the bill, although Wyndham thought that they were secretly glad ‘to see the last of the deportees, who are only rivals of theirs for leadership.’

260 Questions of Round Table (ff.57-62), BLO: Ms Curtis 824. Lady Selborne tried to canvass support for adult suffrage from Lord Cobham, who would not be drawn. He saw ‘no logic or principle in the matter’ and changed ‘some pretty passages’ with her. Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 24 Apr [1914], HHA 5/12/38.

261 Hugh Wyndham to The Editor, The Round Table, 4 Feb 1914 (f. 86); and Coupland (?) to Lady Selborne, 24 Feb 1914 (f. 84), BLO: Ms Curtis 824. See also Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA; and Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, undated [March 1914], HHA 5/12/19.
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The Labourites, he thought, wanted to block the bill until the S.S. *Umgeni* arrived in England.\(^{266}\)

Wyndham had decided to vote with the Labour Party and was prepared to do so even if his was the casting vote and so make the government bring in an Indemnity bill, to indemnify them for Martial Law, separately from a bill condoning the deportations.\(^{267}\) Wyndham’s opportunity to speak came in the evening, on 19 February. He stood firmly for liberty and justice and individual freedom, founded as they were in English law and custom. And, to his credit, arguing that these principles cemented the empire together, he canvassed their extension to Britannia’s black subjects.\(^{268}\) He wrote to his mother from the house the following day, explaining his position. He would vote against the second reading, as a protest against the deportations, although he quite agreed that martial law was necessary, for which the government had to be indemnified, but, as the bill combined the indemnity with the banishment of the nine men, he could not support it.\(^{269}\) He and Duncan, Vere Stent had said, would never make good politicians: ‘A politician needs strong Party prejudice, and not too much ability to see the other side.’ Duncan and Wyndham, ‘so possessed with the judicial instinct’, were seeing too much from the other side.\(^{270}\)

The controversial clause, dealing with the deportations, was number 4 and Wyndham hoped to count on a minority of 30 voting against it. The rest of the bill was opposed by the labour party only.\(^{271}\) At the beginning of March, when the house divided on the perpetual banishment of the deportees, he ‘got 29 people to vote in the cause of elementary justice.’ One other would have voted with them, but was absent paired. So the number stood at 30. The house was now ‘very tired of the whole business’, having sat continuously for 28 hours from 2 pm on Wednesday to 6 pm on Thursday.\(^{272}\) ‘The air was exhausted & so was everybody’, Maud wrote, but the labour party, longwinded and
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\(^{266}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{267}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 17 Feb 1914, HHA 2/36/47.
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\(^{269}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{270}\) Vere Stent to Patrick Duncan, 10 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A8.12.
\(^{271}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{272}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
showing wonderful powers of endurance, put up a very good fight and bore the brunt of the obstruction.

The Indemnity and Undesirables Special Deportations Act (1 of 1914) was eventually passed, despite the voluble protest of the Labour Party and the reasoned objections of a minority of Unionists, and the deportees were declared undesirable, a ban was placed on their return and the government was indemnified for its actions. The government then introduced a Peace Preservation bill, which, Wyndham noted, 'in point of severity & repression completely outdoes any coercion or Crimes Act ever passed for the benefit of Ireland.' In this matter again the Unionist Party was torn with dissent. Wyndham, again with Duncan, argued that repressive legislation was counterproductive unless remedial legislation was enacted concurrently. Wyndham wanted to see the legalisation of the status of trade unions, the protection of non-unionists, and the creation of conciliation boards. But, the threat to basic citizen's rights having welded opinion in the house, the bill was withdrawn and the Riotous Assemblies Act was passed instead, which targeted trade unions specifically and limited their actions.

The strike and the subsequent events surprised many Britons. Lady Cobham thought it all very different from what she remembered – the peace and sunshine. Punch carried a cartoon on the deportations (which Maud thought 'very amusing'). Yet the Lytteltons and their friends could not imagine why Hugh voted against the Indemnity bill. Wyndham had Maud remind them that in South Africa they lived 'under a Dutch Govt who've no conception of British ideas of liberty, & that the deportations are really the culminating point of a series of more or less autocratic & lawless actions.' Wyndham sent Lord Cobham a copy of the Peace Preservation bill to give him 'some idea of the lengths to wch they are prepared to go.' Having studied the bill, Cobham
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opined that it seemed no stiffer than some of the Irish coercion bills he had helped to pass! Yet, he carried on, if one could maintain law and order without such measures, all the better. And the same applied to the deportations.281 He suspected that the deportation of the nine was a mistake and that 'too much' had been made of these men 'who collapsed like the wind bags they were when the "guns began to shoot" (or before).282 However, this he qualified, saying that when a government 'has just saved one's life & property, I should probably have been found not Spartan enough to condemn them.'283

Wyndham feared the impact that the debate and the public differences in opinion would have on the Unionist Party.284 Smartt, their leader, thought the deportation of the nine 'the bravest thing ever done by any Govt.'285 George Farrar, although having retired from politics, did not see eye to eye with Wyndham and Duncan;286 while Wyndham, not fond of Abe Bailey, did not 'trust him further than [he could] see him.'287 And then the majority of the party, for the moment at least, were with Smartt in support of the government.288 Wyndham heard very different reports from Johannesburg on the status of public opinion on the deportations, although he was convinced that opinion would turn increasingly against the deportations. As one supporter informed Duncan, the Unionist Party would discover their mistake in supporting the deportations at the next elections.289

On March 13 Wyndham spoke at a meeting at Liesbeeck, a constituency of Cape Town, where a bye election was being held to fill a vacancy created by the retirement of B.K. Long, the Unionist incumbent. The row was deafening and the chairman was obliged to close the meeting. And the same scenes were enacted in Johannesburg, also on March 13, the organising secretary of the Unionist Party, was beaten on the head with a knobkerrie and stabbed in the leg. All this, Wyndham told his mother, was due largely to the ill-

281 Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 24 Apr [1914], HHA 5/12/38.
283 Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 24 Apr [1914], HHA 5/12/38.
284 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Mar 1914, WSRO; PHA.
285 Mary Drew to Dorothy Parish, 31 Jan 1914, in L. Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew) Her Diaries and Letters, p 475.'
286 Farrar argued that they could not turn the boat back at Las Palmas and allow the nine 'to be received with Labour honours in Cape Town [and] tried ... with all the consequent unrest all over as well.' George Farrar to Patrick Duncan, 9 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A8.9.
287 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 Feb 1914, WSRO; PHA.
288 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Feb 1914, WSRO; PHA.
289 J.E. Forrest to Patrick Duncan, 8 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A8.5.
feeling provoked by the deportations and the introduction of the Peace Preservation bill.\textsuperscript{290}

As Wyndham noticed, in addition to the principles involved, there were very practical political considerations too. The value of the deportations to the Labour Party was proved at the polls. They had already won two seats in Durban and another in Bloemfontein, and, with the provincial council elections looming, were expected to sweep Johannesburg. Wyndham expected the Labour Party to be ‘very much stronger next time’ and ‘if 6 of them can block the whole business as at the present time, 15 of them will be able to do it far more effectively after next general election.’\textsuperscript{291}

Moreover, the majority of these gains were expected to be made at the cost of the Unionists, who had developed a severe credibility problem. With little to distinguish them from particularly Hertzog’s Nationalists when it came to practical politics, the Unionists were regarded in some quarters as feeble and unnecessary. And, furthermore, the Young Unionists, fired by Arthur Barlow, were growing in power within the party, and threatened to break away if they would not be heard. Smartt, like many of his party stalwarts, seemed unable to take a longer view on the deportations, forget short-term prejudice, and position the party for long-term gain. A. Pollock, a member of the Transvaal Executive, siding with Duncan and Wyndham, looked ahead to the next general election, when the party would ‘have to face the charge of subserviently condoning all that the Govt has done to destroy the liberties of the people.’ ‘Those who acclaim the Govt’, he opined, ‘are moved by personal feeling which will evaporate, & leave no permanent impression.’\textsuperscript{292} The best position for the Unionist Party, therefore, was to assume, at the next election, the position of those, who, while loyally ranging themselves on the side of law and order during the crisis, did their duty thereafter by refusing to ratify the kidnapping of citizens without charge or trial. The Unionists would then be regarded as the defenders of popular rights and the chances for success at the polls would be improved.\textsuperscript{293}

\textsuperscript{290} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{291} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{292} Pollock to Patrick Duncan, 11 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.17.
\textsuperscript{293} Pollock to Patrick Duncan, 11 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.17.
In March 1914, at the height of the deportations debate and dissent among the Unionists, the Unionist Party seemed sure to split.\(^{294}\) The acquiescence of most of the Unionist MLA’s in deportations had the effect of alienating a great majority of Unionist voters, particularly in Johannesburg and the large cities, and turning them, temporarily at least, into Labourites. Gradually, more of the Unionists in parliament realised the need to oppose the government, play the role of an effective opposition, and demand that remedial legislation be enacted with the ‘purely repressive.’\(^{295}\) However, the results of the Transvaal provincial council elections, in March 1914, confirmed the suspicions. Labour, winning every seat but three, swept the board and was expected to win most of the urban seats in the parliamentary election the following year.\(^{296}\)

Great change seemed sure. The ‘old’ Unionists, Maud told her father, were ‘very angry’ with Wyndham and Duncan and accused them of ‘wrecking the party.’ But, as she noted, the party was crumbling anyhow and most of the old guard were expected to join Botha at their first opportunity.\(^{297}\) Duncan, Wyndham and a few others, encouraged ‘by overwhelming weight of opinion on the Rand’,\(^{298}\) would form a new party.\(^{299}\) This, Maud thought, would as a result be ‘practically a Rand party’ and ‘probably without a single magnate in it.’\(^{300}\)

Wyndham’s suffrage bill was presented again on a quibble. It survived a first reading with the help of the South African Party\(^{301}\), but was talked out on 1 April, when Wyndham rose and, amid cheers, moved the second reading. The bill, he claimed, enjoyed the support of some 24 different organisations with a membership of 2600, in addition to the full support of the Women’s Christian Temperance Union and its various

\(^{294}\) Patrick Duncan to Vere Stent, 16 Mar 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.32; and Vere Stent to Patrick Duncan, 16 Mar 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.33. See also Patrick Duncan to A. Pollock, “Transvaal Leader”, 12 Mar 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.29.
\(^{295}\) Richard Feetham to his mother, 19 Mar 1914, RHO: Feetham Papers, Box 3, file 2, f.30. See also Arthur Barlow to Patrick Duncan, 17 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A20.5.18; and L.M. Hastings to Patrick Duncan, 10 Feb 1914, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, A8.11.
\(^{296}\) In the Provincial Council elections in Johannesburg, 23 Labourite were elected and two Unionists. Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 26 Mar 1914, HHA 5/12/24.
\(^{297}\) Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 26 Mar 1914, HHA 5/12/24.
\(^{298}\) Richard Feetham to his mother, 19 Mar 1914, RHO: Feetham Papers, Box 3, file 2, f.30.
\(^{299}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Mar 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{300}\) W.K. Hancock and J. van der Poel (eds), Selections from the Smuts Papers, Vol III: June 1910-November 1918 (Cambridge 1966), p 172; and Debates of the House of Assembly, 4 March 1914,
branches, which numbered upwards of 1800 members. Having, therefore, the support of more than 4500 active workers in the cause of political and social reform and in view of the petitions presented during the previous session, bearing no fewer than 12000 signatures, he demanded that the bill receive a ‘respectful hearing.’ The speech was well-received, although Hugh was disappointed and thought his performance poor. But the Suffrage movement was pleased with the points he made. However, the date set for the second reading had brought rounds of laughter and on the day, ‘the April 1st joke lasted the whole afternoon.’ Maud, who was present in the house, recorded how, ‘in the Library after & other rooms bursts of fresh laughter were heard; it had to be explained to some of the backveld.

At the beginning of April the Wyndhams went up to Johannesburg for three weeks, where they spent Easter, went to the agricultural show and attended the races. On April 16 Wyndham attended the general council of the Unionist Party, when an attack by the ‘Young Unionists’, soon to be disbanded, was warded off. The Unionists in Johannesburg were in a sorry situation. Labour was strong and there seemed no end to labour gains in sight. However, Wyndham consoled himself in the fact that, not only did the Labourites now show ‘signs of quarrelling amongst themselves’, but that their recent victories had been confined almost wholly to Johannesburg. Labour had little hope of substantial support outside Johannesburg and Pretoria (they had only two seats in Natal and one in the Cape and one in the Orange Free State) and the deportations would wear off as an election cry.

Returning to Cape Town, he settled down again to the daily routine of parliament. Although some time was made for walking and sketching and other leisure

---
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pursuits, Wyndham remained busy in the house and, both he and Maud ready for a change, looked forward to 'get away up country again.' Maud was growing closer to Hugh and both, enjoying the Lyttelton offspring, were sorry not to have children. Maud however refused to become like Marguerite Chaplin, who treated her 'crowds of pets' (birds and squirrels) as substitute children.

By May 1914, the session was 'becoming dismal beyond words, & gives one the feeling of flogging a dead horse.' The Government, attempting to move ahead with the financial business ('we are engaged with the usual flood of oratory on Budget'), referred all the legislation on the table to select committees, with the idea, Wyndham thought, of 'limiting discussion when the bills come before the Committee of the House.' Hugh did not think this would work and doubted whether the Government’s Trade Unions bill and Riotous Assemblies bill would pass during the session. All this made Wyndham doubt ‘as to whether Parliament [was] the best place to do anything for one’s country’ and he wondered whether one could not do more by staying outside. For him, however, this question would be decided at the next election ‘as ... a labour man is bound to be returned for Turffontein next year.’

Wyndham wanted to get back to the Transvaal, to visit the farm and his constituency. Transvaal politics were at sixes and seven. The Labour Party had control of the provincial council, a majority of one, which they used to force through what Hugh considered ‘exceedingly revolutionary legislation.’ However, as long as they limited themselves to constitutional means, there was little to say. A series of events was planned for July to mark the anniversary of the Johannesburg of the previous year. These, Wyndham related, were to take the form of ‘a procession headed by the red flag draped in black, followed by the widows & orphans (real & spurious) of those who lost their lives in the street fighting.’ The idea of holding a short strike of three days in honour of the event was abandoned, but Tom Mann, the British syndicalist, was to visit for the

---
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occasion. Lord Cobham, however, was convinced that Mann, 'little more than a blustering wind bag', would, thanks to the iron of Smuts, 'keep on the safe side of the law.'

5. Johannesburg and Kromdraai

Wyndham secured a pair, enabling him to miss the last fortnight of the session, and he and Maud moved north at the end of June. He had wanted to visit the farm again and nurse his constituency. There were rumours that Botha, wanting to capitalise on his post-deportations popularity, would call a snap general election that August and reconvene parliament in October. Wyndham, however, reckoned that Botha would 'cling to office till the last moment.' He hoped so. He wanted to visit Britain in October and had 'no desire to fight an election' in 1914. The Labour Party would be less strong in 1915.

Maud was now having second thoughts about leaving Cape Town. Johannesburg would be cold and 'a howling wilderness' as everybody 'has gone away for good or for the time.' The Gladstones had left and so, too, the Phillips and the Chaplins, who had sailed for England before assuming the governorship of Rhodesia. However, the prospect of pending boredom did not last. Before leaving Cape Town they received the 'thrilling' news that Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife had been assassinated in Sarajevo. And, in any case, there was a new round of visitors and friends and acquaintances to make. John Cavendish (Lord Chesham), Lady Cobham's prodigal nephew arrived in South Africa to join the 10th Hussars in June 1914 and the Lytteltons wanted the Wyndhams to do what they could 'to keep him straight.' The Buxton's staff
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321 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Jun 1914, WSRO: PHA.
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was also due to arrive. They included Maurice Ponsonby and Basil Blackwood, who had been a fringe member of the Kindergarten, but, due to the outbreak of war in 1914, had to return to his regiment. As Maud noted, the new staff were ‘nice & full of possibilities.’ Wyndhams in Parktown was also being furnished much to Maud’s satisfaction. She had ‘a good many pictures’ in her sitting room, including a Zoffany, and in the dining room a Woolton, a Raeburn and a Zuccarelli. She was happy with her home, but, missing her circle, would ‘be pleased’ if she could ‘transplant the whole house to the heart of London.’

They motored down to Kromdraai on their first weekend in the Transvaal and noted the development. The road was now signposted and occasional vehicles were passed along the way. Wyndham thought Kromdraai was in good order. He was particularly pleased with the horses, whose quality had improved over the last few years. He had considerable hopes of winning both the Derby and the Oaks. However, they were suffering from drought and he was obliged to sink another well to replenish the water supply. (The drought had forced Maud’s cousins, the Algernon Douglas-Pennants, to sell their farm and return to England.) The animals were doing fine and the Wyndhams, having established a herd of cows, planned to consume their own milk, butter and cream. They were also manufacturing cream cheeses, which were marketed to Johannesburg. Maud, wanting to send some to London, feared that ‘they’d arrive on foot — or rather feet.’ But the electric engine was malfunctioning and Kromdraai house was cracking. Maud wished it would burn down so that they could replace it with ‘a nice little cottage farmhouse.’

Kathleen Villiers, Maud’s closest friend, was due to sail at the end of July up the East African coast, accompanied by her brother, Galbraith Cole, who had been deported from Kenya, and Helen, the eldest of George Farrar’s six daughters. Maud had wanted
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to host a party for the voyagers, but finding that none of the 10th Hussars or the Royals could attend, had to postpone. The regiments were on manoeuvres, which no begging could convince Colonel Barnes to put off, as the commander-in-chief would attend. Maud therefore postponed the Wyndham dance to Friday, 31 July. Kathleen and Helen would have already left, but, with war looming and a reduction in the imperial garrison in South Africa a distinct probability, Chesham and his regiment were expected soon to be ‘all gone for good’. The Wyndhams, sensing the emptying of Johannesburg and an impending dearth of company (‘all or nearly all the soldiers will be gone & hosts of other people too’), wanted to host an event. This, Maud sensed, might be their last opportunity and, in any case, she wanted to do something for Chesham, who, contrary to the family’s expectations, was now ‘keen on the regiment’ and popular among his brother officers. They had also lost a number of friends and relatives of late. Herbert and Dolly Gladstone had left and the Buxtons, their replacements at Government House, were due to arrive in August, a fortnight before the Wyndhams sailed for England. Maud hoped to see them before their departure, to make the acquaintance of the new vice regal couple and maintain their contact at Government House.

In the meantime the war in the Balkans appeared to be expanding. Its prospects horrified Maud. She longed to know the ‘ins & outs’ and wondered whether the Austrians, masters at grand strategy, were waiting for a crisis in Ulster and ‘Russia all in revolt’ before delivering their blow. Count Berchtold was clever. Yet it would ‘be an appalling thing if England & Germany & Russia & France & Austria & Italy all fight - & might be the beginning of several other wars on their own.’ But, with a dance to plan, Maud’s thoughts were drawn mostly to lighter things. She enlisted the assistance of Mrs Christopherson and Charlotte Albu to arrange the rooms and ‘collect girls’ to partner the

331 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 23 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/41.
332 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 14 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/42.
333 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 25 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/43. The Gladstones had already left as had the Schummachers and Honnolds, and Kathleen Villiers had sailed that week.
334 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 14 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/42.
335 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 25 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/43. The Wyndham were booked to sail the Armadale Castle at the beginning of September.
336 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 23 Jul 1914, HHA 2/36/41.
337 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Jul 1914, WSRO: PHA.
officers. The drawing room and hall were cleared for a dance floor, an awning was put up outside along the stoep, bridge tables were set up in Hugh's room, and Maud's sitting room, which she had altered to open out of the drawing room, and the library were prepared for 'sitting out rooms.' The front door stoep was covered for a men's cloak room; while the servants' room was converted into a men's smoking and drinking room. This was 'a convenient house for entertaining but', she noted, 'there won't be anybody to entertain after this year.'

Hugh, who had been on a ten day business trip to Delagoa Bay and Swaziland, returned the night before the dance. 'He loves being host', Maud told her mother. In the meantime the war news was 'too grim & ghastly.' Maud could not believe a war would break out and, if so, hoped it would last no more than a week or so. In Johannesburg the Austrian consul, who was expected at the dance the next day, was calling in the reservists. 'I suppose he'll be practising at a target instead.'

6. Conclusion

Wyndham spent the first four years of his parliamentary career fighting the perceived excesses of the Botha government. In 1914, in particular, he came out of the stalls to fight for individual freedom and maintenance of basic human rights for white subjects in South Africa. Yet he was a curious stalwart for Lady Liberty. And in Britain, the hard hand of Botha and Smuts drew favourable comment from the nobility, besieged at that time by a flood of liberalising legislation, the loss of their traditional power, the loss of income, and the loss of their Irish estates. Lord Cobham, hearing the complaints emanating from his relatives in South Africa, had advised that 'Smuts [was] far better than Lloyd George, & Botha than Asquith.'
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Botha, as prime minister of a united South Africa, had to balance the demands of English-speaking South Africa with armed opposition from fellow Afrikaners, many of whom demanded the restoration of the status quo ante bellum. Rejecting the new South Africa, a common South Africanism and feeling alienated in the new state structures, they drifted in increasing numbers to Hertzog and the National Party, which was established in 1914. Hertzog's action, aimed at the reorganisation of the political landscape on the imperial issue, was sure, Wyndham thought, to lead to another war. However, as he noted to his mother, 'wars, whether industrial or civil, [were then] quite the fashion' and so, on this score at least, South Africa would be 'up to date.'

For the Unionists 1914 was a bad year. Lacking credibility and party unity, they were about to split that July, but were saved by the outbreak of the First World War and, as a result, if Wyndham spent the first four years in parliament opposing the government, he, together with the other Unionists, spent the following four attempting to keep Botha in power in the face of nationalist, anti-war opposition.

Yet, for the moment, like everyone else, the Wyndhams went on largely unconscious, absorbed as they and their relatives were in the Home Rule controversy in Britain and the matter of the deportees in South Africa, until 'the bolt fell', and one by one all their young male relatives and friends were drawn into the war machine.

---
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CHAPTER SEVEN
War levels all, 1914-1918

‘Hugh is becoming quite placable about what he calls the Lyttelton habit of saving half sheets, string etc - & even invests in train tickets & other little economies which he used to assure me were impossible to a born Wyndham. War levels all.’

Maud Wyndham, 24 Sep 1917

The First World War was first and foremost a great levelling experience, accelerating pre-war social reform programmes and forcing the embattled aristocracy, in Britain its upper echelons still most comfortable with their pre-industrial values, into the twentieth century. Yet the Hugh Wyndhams, like so many of their class, amidst the whirl of social and political engagements, were in 1914 oblivious to the impending floods of change.

They enjoyed entertaining and hosted a dance at their Parktown residence on Friday, July 31, for a company that included Lord Chesham, Colonel Barnes and the officers of the 10th Hussars. Some eighty guests in all danced the evening away in the drawing room and hall and along the veranda with its sweeping views over the veldt toward Pretoria, breaking away for a buffet served in the dining room or bridge played in Hugh’s room. Six of the 10th’s bandsmen provided the music and Maud Wyndham records that ‘they danced till past 3 with gusto tho the soldiers quite expected to be called away in the middle by telephone & we compared it to the ball before Waterloo.’ Colonel Barnes and his officers were not called away, although the Wyndhams, caught up in the wave of bellicose enthusiasm, telephoned the newspaper offices for the latest news. Nobody spoke of anything but the war. The Hussars expected to leave shortly for France; the young officers, ‘wildly excited’, longed for battle, and dreaded be left too long in South Africa.

---
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1. **Beating the drum and waving the flag**

On Sunday, August 2, France, Germany and Russia entered the war; and, the following day at the races, Wyndham heard a rumour go round the ring that Britain had declared war. "God Save the King" was sung at the end of the race schedule and this was followed by "Rule Britannia", which was bellowed "three times running." That evening the Wyndhams and their house guests went to a play, after which the two anthems were again sung lustily. Great scenes of patriotism permeated Johannesburg. Union Jacks were flown from the clubs, motor cars and houses. Yet, for the Wyndhams, the first direct impact of the war came on the domestic front. On Wednesday, 5 August, Wright, their butler, walked into the sitting room at Wyndhams and announced that Britain was at war. It was all 'too thrilling.' Maud went to the Albus for lunch that day, where she found the family quietly torn: the Albu daughters loved England, but their parents, Maud noticed, 'must feel German.' This sentiment, which naturally cut across class lines, was shared by the Wyndham's German cook. Since the assassinations in Sarajevo, life on the backstairs had become quite unbearable for the fraulein, who, although excelling in the kitchen, had to go. As Maud noted 'big things & little things all hang together.'

The newspapers, anti-German and stirred by popular imperialism, were full of news from the fronts in Europe. Patriotic fervour, particularly among English-speakers, was
rising. They insisted on joining the fight against Germany. Wyndham went to a patriotic meeting at the Unionist Club where speeches were made in French and English, and a suggestion was made that they go and demonstrate at the German Club. This Wyndham deplored and he heard murmurs behind him implying his sympathies were German. Wyndham, far from having German sympathies, considered it South Africa’s duty, as a loyal dominion, to freely support the British war effort. In fact, during the 1912 defence debate, he and fellow Unionists predicted that the time would come when South Africa would not only have to assume responsibility for her own defence, so freeing British assets for service elsewhere, but also offer the “old country” the support of a South African expeditionary force.

At the beginning of August, South Africa duly offered to take care of her own defence. This freed the majority of imperial troops for service in Europe and their posts were manned by members of the Union Defence Forces. Wyndham feared that garrison duties and the manning of home defences would be rather dull for troops, some of whom were anxious to form a South Africa expeditionary force or join an imperial outfit. Yet, to his mind, the despatch to some distant shore of much of the UDF, still inexperienced and possibly needed locally for the suppression of an African rising or industrial unrest, or to deal with the German troops stationed in neighbouring South West Africa, would be nothing short of madness.

In fact, the German wireless station at Windhoek and the smaller coastal installations at Swakopmund and Lüderitzbucht, lying astride sea communications with the east, numbered among many imperial concerns at the start of the war. The station at Windhoek could communicate with the stations in Togo and Cameroon and, in favourable weather conditions, directly with Berlin and German ships on the high seas. On August 7, Britain queried whether South Africa would be willing to capture the wireless stations at Windhoek, Swakopmund and Lüderitzbucht. To this, after much
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deliberation in a divided cabinet, South Africa assented on August 10. And so, within a matter of months of the outbreak of war, Britain drew on the human and material resources of all of the settlement dominions.

Wyndham's reservations, like those of many others, were not unfounded. The UDF was small and relatively young and lacked both small arm and artillery ammunition, which now had to be sourced from Australia and India respectively. Although appreciating these difficulties, London pushed Pretoria towards an early expedition. Knowing that the Germans in South West planned no grand offensive, Smuts, who had already commenced preparations that July, deployed a force under Brig Gen H.T. Lukin to Steinkopf near the Orange River, while the railway line was extended north from Prieska, and the seaborne elements were mobilised in Cape Town, while they awaited a Royal naval escort for the assault on Swakopmund and Lüderitzbucht and Smuts for parliamentary approval of his plans.

Parliament was summoned for a special session on September 9. The movement of troops was observed, but, with a blanket of censorship thrown over the press, the public knew little of South Africa's war plans. Wyndham, longing to know more ('Nobody yet knows what our government is going to do,' he wrote to his mother), had heard rumours, emanating from the Union Buildings, that the government had 'important & effective plans for doing their share.' He expected this to be the seizure of German South West Africa and higher taxation as a consequence. He was later proved right on both
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21 Lord Harcourt to Lord de Villiers, 8 Aug 1914 and 23 Aug 1914, NASAP: PM 1/1/32, file 4/97/1914 War German South West Expedition & Supply of Ammunition & Guns.
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accounts. Suspicions were confirmed on September 9, when Botha and Smuts addressed the house just as the German spearheads were being pushed back across the Marne. Hertzog, with the support of eleven members (described by Maud as ‘a most hopeless gang ... ignorant & bigoted racialists like himself & discredited self seeking politicians’), strongly opposed any military activity outside the country’s borders. The house divided 92 for and 12 against a motion justified by defence and not conquest, and, with senatorial approval following shortly afterwards, South Africa entered the war on 14 September.

Yet broad-based public opinion stood in sharp contrast to the parliamentary division. Botha and Smuts, confidently mobilizing troops long before parliamentary ratification, did not carry the mass of Afrikaners with them. Drunk with war hysteria, the English-speaking community embraced the comfortable notion that their Afrikaner countrymen welcomed the opportunities for nation-building and patriotism presented by the war with equal enthusiasm. Wyndham, misreading the situation entirely, reported that:

‘The feeling amongst the Boers out here is excellent. They are volunteering for service in large numbers. I only hope it won’t effervesce when they find they will mostly have to perform garrison duties.’

‘The feeling’, Maud continued to her father, ‘can never go back to what it was before that’s certain.’ The war, for the English-speaking community and moderate Afrikaners, was a nation-builder; whereas for what Nasson has termed ‘the non-loyalist strata of
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Afrikaner society' it presented unique opportunities for party-politicking and their far-right hoped to seize the chance to restore a Boer republic.  

The tides of fortune can turn quickly, particularly during war, and late 1914 witnessed an amazing bouleversement. This was described by Maud as a sequence of events 'which each one of them hang in the most extraordinary way upon each other & each one of which would make the sale of any newspaper go up in times of peace - & here they are herded into one or two issues.' The war. The resignation (and later drowning) of Beyers. The hunt for two local murderers, which ousted the war as the issue for a few days. The suicide of both murderers, the killing of several policemen and the shooting by mistake of General de la Rey. The opening of the Afrikaner Rebellion. The Macbeth-like hesitation and treason of several officers, including Kemp. And the appointment of Wyndham on 21 September as Chief Intelligence Officer for South Africa, in which post, he received a first-hand view of the functioning of the defence structures he had helped design two years before.

2. 'It's funny how work suits him': Chief intelligence officer of the Union

Wyndham, unlike many British expatriates, did not volunteer for service with a British regiment in Europe. He thought it his duty to remain in South Africa and 'help look after this portion of the Empire' and believed that a South African expeditionary force would be of far greater value if it were available for service in Egypt or India. Wanting to volunteer in some capacity, he busied himself through August and much of September in getting his own affairs in order as he waited for matters national to become 'more crucial.' It was, Maud noted, 'no use wasting y' time in camp, when there's lots to

---
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be done outside.' Kromdraai, doing well, supplied milk to the Johannesburg Relief Board. He had few horses in training, but hoped they would all win and 'make some money for the pot.' Wyndham also assisted the government with at least two horses, which went to South West with the I.L.H.

On September 21 the newspapers reported Beyers' resignation. A flood of resignations followed, including that of Jan Kemp, and Smuts, seizing the opportunity, swept the defence force of dissent and appointed a team of staff officers on whom he could rely. Although some of the September appointments sparked trouble, Wyndham's was in many ways sensible. He was the only member of the Union Defence Force to have formal intelligence training and, with a university education, was deemed well-equipped for the tasks relating first and foremost to the analysis and synthesis of information.

Wyndham reported to Pretoria on 21 September for duty as head of the small intelligence section at Defence Headquarters, where he was tasked, Maud noted, with 'sifting news & rumours & collating it.' Although happy to think the posting 'quite safe', she nonetheless felt 'quite a pang to see him in khaki.' Wyndham enjoyed the work, although 'boxed up in an office all day', as it gave him a window from which to view happenings both in South Africa and at the front. Wyndham submitted his first intelligence summary on his first day in office, and this gave a summary of happenings over the past fortnight. Thereafter he submitted a daily summary, updated to 10 p.m., each of which was sent by the Staff Officer Citizen Force to the commanders of the expeditionary forces and the intelligence units in the field. Wyndham's daily summary was an improvement on
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previous practice as the first summaries of the war had covered longer periods, amounting to at least several days, with the result that information was always dated.  

Hugh worked in a Pretoria, very hot and normally moribund, but in October 1914 quite alive and ‘bustling with nearly nearly all men in khaki – walking, on horses, in motors or bustling along on motor cycles.’ Maud stayed in Johannesburg, going through to Hugh on weekends, he sometimes returning the visit. She longed to know more, but Hugh would not, she complained, divulge anything. Maud surmised, and with some accuracy, that he was part of a machine that was kept ‘very busy hunting down German spies & conspirators.’ She admired his capacity for the work (‘all day has his nose to the grindstone in a stuffy office – unpaid’) and his ability to ‘keep his own counsel.’ She reported to his mother:

‘Its funny how work suits him. He never looked better, even in that horrid hole of a Pretoria – so you can think of him being as safe as in time of peace, & only pursuing the rebels with pen ink & paper. People come to him at all moments with mysterious hints & messages abt some seditious speech they’d heard somebody make.’

There was, after the parliamentary debate and the flood of resignations, a great deal of disaffection in the country districts, which was ignited further by armed propaganda and the negative publicity generated from a military reverse at the front.

This happened when Lukin’s van was repulsed by a superior German force at Sandfontein on September 26. The battle at Sandfontein, ‘a nasty little reserve’ according to Maud, highlighted several deficiencies in the UDF. Wyndham had warned in his summary of two days before that reliable information had been received from two sources indicating ‘that the enemy are preparing to oppose our advance at Kalkfontein and that several train loads of troops have proceeded from Keetmanshoop southwards.’ This intelligence did not reach the senior South African commanders in time and, some days later, Smuts wrote caustically in the margin that the report would ‘have been more useful on 25/9/14 or
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earlier. While blame is difficult to apportion for the setback, which necessitated increased recruitment to replace casualties in the field, there can be no doubt that the mobilization had been compromised by poor military organization and planning, a circumstance exacerbated by the outbreak of the rebellion. Wyndham, observing the military compromise of 1912 at work, lamented the lack of military organization, which he thought at times ‘positively grotesque.’ As he explained to his mother:

‘We have at the present time two entirely different military organizations operating side by side in the field. One is the commando system, which in reality is no organization at all, & the other is a somewhat faint copy of the British system.’

And so, although very interesting, Wyndham’s work in the intelligence section could also be ‘rather trying at times.’ However the work kept him very busy. He could not get down to Kromdraai, which was in need of attention, and there were several caesuras in his otherwise dutiful correspondence with his mother. Maud, who was due to leave for Britain in October, put off her voyage at the last moment. She did not want to miss the ‘exciting things’ she expected to happen in South Africa, although Hugh warned her that in this she was likely to be disappointed. And here he was correct. Maritz’s rebellion did not amount to much, despite the sedition and disloyalty in the country districts. The Imperial Light Horse, travelling by rail through the Free State that October, had been jeered at every station. For this reason Maud, who reckoned they needed ‘a taste’ of German rule, thought it better to be in South Africa rather than Canada or Australia, ‘where are no war problems at all.’

By December the rebellion was being rolled back steadily. Delarey had been accidentally shot, and Beyers drowned on December 8, and on the following day the remaining leaders in the Free State surrendered. De Wet with 3,600 burghers were in the prisons of the Union. Inside South Africa there was ‘still some police work to do clearing
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up the odds & ends of desperate adventurers who have to lose except their liberty'\textsuperscript{52}, but the mood in the Defence Department, Wyndham noted, was ‘altogether more cheerful’ and the improved security situation was reflected immediately in the work passing through Wyndham’s office, which by December 9 had already ‘fallen off enormously.’\textsuperscript{53}

However, with the restart of operations in German South West, military security was maintained through strict press censorship and, through the regulation of information by the government, a strong hand was kept on suspected sedition. After the suppression of the Afrikaner rebellion, Hertzog and the National Party largely confined their struggle to parliament. Of greater concern in January 1915 was the Labour Party, a splinter of which, calling itself the War on War League, had declared itself ‘neutral’ on the question of the war.\textsuperscript{54} Identifying itself with pacifist socialists abroad, the League printed a four-page weekly, the \textit{War on War Gazette}, the first number of which had appeared on September 19. The \textit{Gazette}, denouncing the war effort and the declaration of martial law, attracted the attention of the authorities.\textsuperscript{55} Wyndham, acting on instruction from Smuts, submitted the \textit{Gazette} ‘to a rigorous censorship’\textsuperscript{56} and forced it to close on November 28.\textsuperscript{57}

The Defence Department now concentrated once more on the invasion of German South West, which, believed to have been a springboard for the rebellion, had now to be occupied to prevent a repetition.\textsuperscript{58} The General Staff, assisted by the chief intelligence officer, familiarised themselves with ‘the peculiar difficulties’ associated with desert operations. The operations of the Boer commandos, their mobility over waterless country and with no transport, drew Wyndham’s admiration. ‘Kemp’s march across the Kalahari with a following of 1600 rebels’, he told his sister, ‘will always remain as one of the most
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marvellous performances’ and particularly as the military reports on Wyndham’s table ‘limited the number of men it was possible to move at a time to 50!’ 59

However the campaign had barely got underway, when the press, adhering to the censorship regulations, drew the attention of the Defence Department to the issue of officers’ appointments. The editors of the *Friend* (Bloemfontein) and the *Transvaal Leader* (Johannesburg) had received letters complaining of favouritism and nepotism in the appointment of officers. 60 M.J.L. Weston, of Brandfort, in a letter to the *Friend*, argued that ‘the fact that individuals once held commissions in the Imperial army, or that they are held to be jolly good sports by bar room frequenters does not obviously qualify them ... [and] yet, in the case of some officers, more substantial qualities are not apparent.’ 61 Similar views were expressed to the editor of the *Transvaal Leader*. A reader voiced ‘disgust [for] the manner in which the regiments have been raised and appointments made.’ Speaking of the officers, he argued:

‘It is difficult to conceive under what system they were appointed by, to the ordinary observer, it must appear that aptitude for commanding and for handling men on the field was not regarded so essential as certain club or social qualifications.’ 62

This was a serious matter, the officers required the confidence of their men at the front and high morale at home, and so it was referred to Wyndham. But the latter was not impressed by the arguments made, although he confirmed some of the statements. 63 That there be no necessary correlation between social status and military rank, did not occur to Wyndham. His family had run the local volunteers and civil defence of Sussex for generations and he himself had played a similar role in colonial Transvaal. 64 He therefore agreed with Bourne
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that the letter ought not to be published and the latter, using Smuts’ name, informed the editor of the *Transvaal Leader* accordingly, saying that the criticisms were ‘to a very great extent unfounded’ and that they contained ‘wholly unwarranted aspersions.’

However, only months after Wyndham’s appointment, his military career took another dramatic turn. Botha, branded a ‘jobber’ by Lord Selborne for benefiting protégés and members of his quasi-feudal web of kin, had Leipoldt gazetted as Chief Intelligence Office on his staff in March 1915. This caused some confusion at Defence Headquarters at the time. Leipoldt had no intelligence training and as Captain Blainey at the defence secretariat noted this was ‘the designation of Lieutenant Colonel Wyndham’, whom, as Blainey confirmed, had also received intelligence training at the War Office. However, being Botha’s wish, as another defence clerk noted, ‘nothing remains but to insert in Orders.’ And that was that. Wyndham, whether a scapegoat for the Sandfontein disaster or a casualty of Boer nepotism, was transferred back to the Reserve of Officers on 25 May 1915.

3. ‘Watching the Government forces slay each other’

The parliamentary session of 1915 was comparatively brief; but not without interest. The war finances of the country were arranged and several other war bills were passed, including restrictions on trading with the enemy. Anti-German sentiment, very strong in 1914, increased in bitterness through 1915 as the public were seized with horror at the unrestricted submarine warfare and the sinking of merchant and passenger ships. Wyndham,
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writing at the end of March, thought most of the Germans quite harmless. However, in the wake of reports of submarines 'circling round & watching people drown', Wyndham, too, became more intolerant and only a week later adopted, for the first time in his correspondence with his mother, the term 'Huns'. However, as Wyndham predicted, much of the session was consumed by endless speeches on the rebellion. These had two effects.

Firstly, it exacerbated the 'great bitterness' of the Nationalists. With the rebellion over, the Union Defence authorities turned their attention to the resumption of the campaign against German South West Africa. Wyndham hoped for a speedy victory as the internal political situation was still far from settled. As he noted to his mother:

'The majority of the Boers don't in the least see why they should go and sacrifice themselves for an Empire for which they have very little sympathy, & for a cause which they do not consider to be their own. Botha has been obliged to commandeer men for the purpose & if the relations at home are called upon to make any big sacrifice in the loss of their men folk public opinion may be very much stirred. It is difficult to make a people fight for a cause they do not care about.'

A speedy victory in SouthWest and the notion that the Entente would defeat Germany were crucial for political stability in South Africa. The combination of good rains in SouthWest, which partly solved the water difficulties, and the additional grazing for the horses would, Wyndham expected, reduce the duration of the campaign materially. However, the House was inundated with oratory on the rebellion and an associated indemnity bill. A blue book was tabled giving the history of the rebellion written by Leo Fouche. A select committee, on which both Duncan and Wyndham served, was appointed
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to enquire into the rebellion.\textsuperscript{77} This, as Duncan predicted, was ‘a long [and] very unsatisfactory affair.’ It was not only ‘too soon to begin enquiring into the causes’, but ‘most of those immediately concerned [were] either on service in German S.W. or in prison awaiting trial – some on capital charges.’\textsuperscript{78}

Secondly, the rebellion and the speeches that followed in parliament produced the final break between Botha and the Afrikaner far-right. Having been responsible for the outpouring of oratory during the session, the Nationalists canvassed the backveld during the recess, spending time on party organisation and avoiding cooperation with both the rebellion commissioners as well as the commission of inquiry into war stores.\textsuperscript{79} However, despite the ensuing bitterness and political turmoil, this ‘splitting [of] the solid ranks of the Dutch’, Wyndham cheered, was ‘not to be regretted.’\textsuperscript{80} Wyndham sat with fellow Unionists on the opposition benches and ‘watch[ed] the Government forces slaying each other.’\textsuperscript{81} The Hertzog section in advance of the election organized itself as a separate party and in August 1915 the SAP congress accepted the Hertzog-skeuring as fact.\textsuperscript{82} Wyndham was convinced that the breach would ‘not be healed for at least a generation’ and, although unlikely to lead to much peace, was ‘a good thing.’\textsuperscript{83} It provided the moment for which the Unionists had been waiting.

Furthermore, as the session ended, the news from the front improved, which brought a buoyant mood to the House. However, before the session ended, Wyndham received orders to stand ready for GSWA. As chief intelligence office and an MLA, he had a good picture of what was happening and understood the local German war aims. These he explained to his mother as follows:

‘We are expecting further news from German South West Africa at any moment as Botha is at the present time engaged on further operations. The idea of the Germans there seems to be to hang on as long as possible, so that they may still be

\textsuperscript{78} Patrick Duncan to Howard Pim, 9 Mar 1915, Wits: A881 Pim Papers, BL.1.
\textsuperscript{79} Carel Britz to Secretary, War Stores Commission, 26 Jun 1915, and Henry Dickson to Secretary, War Stores Commission, 18 Sep 1915, MAP: DC, Box 1, file 12 Members who took part in debate in Parliament.
\textsuperscript{80} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 Dec 1914, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{81} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Mar 1915, WSRO: PHA.
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holding out when they hear of the final victory of the German arms in Europe. This they seem to expect at any moment. Of course they have been fed on almost daily wireless messages giving them the most astonishing accounts of victories, & they poor dears, no doubt are full of hope. I think if they heard of a German defeat they would not trouble to hold on much longer.\(^8^4\)

Lady Leconfield, having already lost one son and a further two wounded in France, was understandably concerned. Wyndham, having allayed his mother’s fears (following the German retreat to the north, he would be ‘250 miles away from nearest enemy’\(^8^5\)), arrived at Lüderitzbucht at the end of April in the company of Smuts. They occupied the premises of the German diamond company and there they lived ‘on the fat of the land.’ Wyndham worked on the diamond commission and his experience of the campaign was therefore quite understandably not ‘of a very exciting character.’ ‘Modern war for most people’, he complained, ‘seem[ed] to entail a painfully stationary existence.’\(^8^6\)

In June, with the session and the GSWA campaign over, he and Maud left for Britain, where, with Edward and Humphrey on leave from France, the brothers were temporarily reunited.\(^8^7\) In July Maud accompanied him to Italy, where he hoped to secure some business, between touring the sights. The first was rather disappointing, while the second was rather oppressive: ‘One begins to regard anything later than the fourteenth century as so modern as to be unworthy of attention.’\(^8^8\) On the return trip to London, Hugh faced a decision. He was unsure whether to return to South Africa that August, or take a post in Britain, or go to France as an ADC.\(^8^9\) However with the ADC-ship no longer available, the Wyndhams left Plymouth on the Balmoral Castle on August 23. The voyage was businesslike, the captain taking all precautions. The lights were kept very low, the lifeboats were readied in case of a torpedo attack and blankets and provisions were piled at the top of the companion ladder. Less agreeable was the closing of all portholes, done to keep the ship
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\(^8^9\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Jul 1915, WSRO: PHA.
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afloat as long as possible if struck. However, there were lighter moments too. There was a Mr and Mrs Wyndham in the second class, he performed on the cello at the concerts and Hugh underwent ‘some chaff in consequence.’ There was also a German aboard, who, saying he had been naturalized, rose ‘with care every time God Save the King [was] played.’ The boat docked in Cape Town on 9 September and, arriving in Johannesburg, Wyndham found himself at once in the middle of the electoral campaign. He was struck both by the remoteness of the war in South Africa, where it was by no means the only constant topic, as well as the strength of Hertzog’s National Party.

Wyndham recognised too that Turffontein needed attention before the election. The Unionist Party was the official opposition, but was at the same time committed to Botha’s war policy. Despite pressure from Natal, the Unionist leadership would not ‘rush unconditionally into an alliance with Botha’, but remained committed to their principles as Unionists, emanating from the national convention, and their declared protection of the principles framed in the constitution. Wyndham would not budge politically and expected, if he got in again, to represent ‘a little wee party.’ He expected strong opposition in Turffontein from Labour, but, with consideration from the SAP, predicted a narrow victory. However, while he was in Europe, C.F. Stallard, an English-speaker who had embraced Botha, had entered the lists too. Some of Wyndham’s electorate rallied. One of them, a certain McDonald, wrote to the press:

‘Support General Botha’s war policy and give him credit for past services by all means, but for heaven’s sake let us temper idol worship with moderation. Other members of Parliament, including our representative at Turffontein, have done their little bit for King and country equally well, but such men do not parade in the glare of the footlights, and, as there is no blowing of trumpets, there is no corresponding applause.’
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McDonald predicted disappointment for Stallard as there was (he wrote) in Turffontein a large number of people ‘who appreciate the services of Lieut.-Colonel Wyndham to the Empire and his sterling qualities as a gentleman.’ The net result of Stallard’s actions would be to split the pro-war vote and lose Turffontein to Labour. Kay, joining the fracas, expressed Turffontein’s appreciation of Wyndham and his understated significance:

‘It has already an ideal representative in Lieut.-Colonel Wyndham, a good sportsman, and one of the best type – and they are few in this country – of old English country gentlemen. One of the characteristics of this class of man is that they do not advertise. Consequently their names are not everlastingly in the papers. No; they “do good by stealth and blush to find it fame.” Turffontein, a centre of sport, peopled in the main by loyalists to King and country, could not – and does not – desire a better representative than the quiet, studious, and gentlemanly (using the word in its best and original sense), Mr. Wyndham.’

An agreement was eventually reached between the two pro-war parties whereby the Unionists would not contest country seats, where the SAP might pip the NP, and the SAP would not contest the Rand seats, so allowing an easier Unionist victory against Labour. With the agreement in place and Labour reeling since their December resolution on neutrality, Wyndham was now confident of a safe seat. Furthermore, being a racing man helped with the racing world and his having voted against the deportations stood him in good stead with many Labour people. Kay, in supporting Wyndham’s candidature asked ‘the Labour men’ of Turffontein:

‘never [to] forget that Mr. Wyndham was one of the few Unionists who had the courage to oppose the deportations in the House of Assembly, on the ground that the procedure was un-English, and an undue interference with the liberty of the subject. Let them remember that Mr. Wyndham will never consent to be a mere delegate of
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any party. He has the mind, the education, and the courage to think for himself. We could do with more, instead of less, of this stamp of man to-day.\textsuperscript{101}

Unsurprisingly several former Labourites joined Wyndham's committee and, with a Nationalist candidate in the field, Wyndham's anti-war opposition was split along language lines.\textsuperscript{102}

For the next month the Wyndhams attended every event in Turffontein, some socials, others business meetings. Maud had brought out from Britain a respirator and some anti-gas solution, which she displayed at ladies meetings, where they were 'quite a feature' even though she felt something of 'a fraud not having experienced any part of a Zeppelin Raid.'\textsuperscript{103} On September 28 Wyndham held his first public meeting in Turffontein. This Maud reported as a great success, 'very full & just the right amount of opposition' & plenty of heckling wch he loves, & afterwards everybody was enthusiastic.' A lady told Maud afterwards that Hugh had been so witty in his replies that she could hardly remain in her seat. Wyndham spoke in the constituency again on September 29, when he took the stage with Patrick Duncan. He was asked by a farmer whether he could arrange a proper price for a bag of maize. Hugh responded explaining that the war made export difficult and, in view of the freight and railway charges, South Africa had a surplus. Wyndham advised that he feed his cattle with it and so make the 'mielies walk to market.' This, an old Standerton joke, was much enjoyed in Turffontein. Another man in the audience, referring to the July 1913 strike, asked Wyndham 'what party the candidate would vote for two years after he had been shot down in the streets.' Wyndham replied 'no doubt for the angel Gabriel', to the renewed joy of Turffontein. Wyndham's public-speaking, Maud reported, had vastly improved and the risk now was that his meetings would be 'too unanimous & tame, for if they do he gets dull too.'\textsuperscript{104}

Wyndham was now expected to win Turffontein comfortably, something that, G.B. Steer, his Labour opponent, seems to have conceded. Sensing a loss of support, Steer exploded at a public meeting that the Turffonteiners were such snobs that they 'would
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follow a doll if it had the word “Honourable” attached to its name.105 A sensation followed in the press and a dutiful Maud forwarded the cuttings, including the following poem, to Lady Leconfield.106

The Turffonteiners, sad to say,
Are quite a hopeless lot –
For honest worth they do not care
A solitary jot;
The homy-handed son of toil
Who tries to win their grace
Is looked upon with cold disdain,
And gets the frozen face.
They hurl quite rude remarks at him,
Coarse observations pass,
Such as, “Oh, what a horrid voice –
The fellow is no class!”
“Such awful manners, too, my dear,
Such lack of – well, say breed;
Oh, certainly he’s not the type
Of M.P. that we need!”
So, on the whole, it seems as if
That district soon will be
Associated closer with
The Aristocracy;
It’s very hard on Steer, it is,
That Hugh is in the Peerage
And so should be esteemed First-Class,
While G.B.’s only Steer-age!

Steer was forced to recant, stating publicly that he knew that Wyndham was a ‘conscientious & thorough gentleman.’107 However, there can be no doubt that Maud, at least, played the coronet card, secretly enjoying the attention given by Turffontein to family photographs in the fashion pages. And Sir George and Lady Murray recounted to Maud’s mother how, at a garden party given in Pretoria in 1912, everyone was asking whether ‘Mrs Wyndham’ was coming and that when Maud appeared ‘in white with a large hat with feathers’ people flocked to see her walk down into the garden ‘like royalty.’108 Such theatricality
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was purposeful; if it may equally have been unappealing to men like Steer eager to escape the stiff, exclusiveness of the British class system.  

On October 14, Wyndham reported that his prospects in Turffontein looked better than ever and the Unionists, having doubted him in 1910, were confident that Wyndham would retain the seat. Elsewhere, the prospects also seemed better than they had been just months previously and Wyndham was sure that Botha, stamping the ground after his triumphal return from Windhoek, was gaining ground. However he did not doubt the great amount of bitterness, evidenced by the attempt on Smuts’ life at Newlands. This, together with better news from the front in Europe, brought some Afrikaners around. Still, at the same time, he did not doubt that the results were never before as uncertain or ‘the stakes at issue more important.’ However, generally speaking, Wyndham noted that country-wide there was less fighting at political meetings. More was expected, especially in the country districts, and he hoped that, Botha getting a majority, the country would settle down again.  

Maud, on the same day, writing less reservedly and with almost a sense of the absurd, which she made no attempt to curb when writing to family and close friends, conveyed scenes of ‘fisticuffs & rotten tomatoes & eggs thrown & “you’re another” remarks.’ Some Afrikaners, believing a restoration of the republics would follow, hoped for a German victory. Maud wished they could experience German rule for five years – ‘they’d be very different men at the end.’ Yet, these Afrikaners also had, Hugh noted, ‘a healthy desire to be on the winning side.’ It was therefore important for them to see clear proof that Britain would win the war – ‘loyalty to the Empire will become more popular.’

As the election approached, Wyndham’s schedule intensified. He spoke in Turffontein, where he meetings were reasonably unanimous – ‘almost to dullness’, as well as elsewhere in support of other Unionist candidates. Maud spent hours in committee or opening exhibitions. She thought the Turffontein constituents ‘very nice’ – ‘not fine – or riffraff just straightforward middle class.’ These people, riding a wave of pro-war
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enthusiasm and buoyed by Wyndham’s support of labour issues, voted him in again with a larger majority (table 7.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>No. of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.A. Wyndham</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.B. Steer</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. van Niekerk</td>
<td>Nationalist</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unionist majority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>567</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: Votes cast in the Turffontein constituency, 20 October 1915, South African House of Assembly
There were seventeen spoilt ballot papers.
(Source: Schoeman, p 63.)

Despite the pre-election forecasts the Unionists increased their representation. Wyndham held Turffontein without difficulty and all but one of the Unionist candidates on the Reef got in. Wyndham attributed this to the ‘complete debacle of labour ... due to their shifty attitude on the question of the war’ and in many cases the Nationalist vote on the Reef was larger than that of Labour. Botha did not get his outright majority and was forced to work with the Unionists. Wyndham, nonetheless, was happy with the ‘overwhelming loyal majority in the House, [which was] ready “to see the war through”.’

The Wyndhams spent the first weekend in November with the Buxtons at Government House. Hugh was writing an election article for the *Round Table*. He presented the data together with deductions and left the literary finish, if necessary, to the group at Chatham House. The matter was delicate enough for Wyndham not wanting to be identified with the article. Clearly Botha had lost vast support to the Nationalists. Hertzog swept the Free State and made inroads into the Transvaal and the Cape, where D.F. Malan left the pulpit to lead the Cape nationalists and edit a nationalist newspaper, *Die Burger*. The size of the nationalist vote concerned Selborne, who thought the Boers ‘a very strange people.’ ‘The truth’, he told Howard Pim, was ‘that there are very few of
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them who could write down in an intelligible manner exactly what they want. It is an 
instinct of discontent, partly racial, partly ecclesiastical, partly political, but, I suspect, 
mainly economic, and ignorance in its widest sense has a great deal to do with it.\textsuperscript{120}

Wyndham went down to Cape Town for a special brief session of parliament on 
November 15, leaving Maud in Johannesburg. At thirty-five she was having serious 
maternity issues. Edward’s wife, Gladys, had just presented him with a son, to whom the 
Leconfield inheritance would eventually pass if she (Maud) could not provide a son for 
Hugh. She desperately wanted children. Not having a child made her feel ‘a useless old 
carcass.’ She told Hugh on at least one occasion that she wished he could ‘marry a girl of 
25.’ Hugh’s reply to this suggestion was benevolent, if not somewhat dismissive: ‘But 
supposing I don’t want a girl of 25.’ This cheered her somewhat, but time was creeping 
and she desperately wanted to give Hugh a son.\textsuperscript{121}

Wyndham stayed with Duncan and Feetham in Baker’s house at Muizenberg for 
the first fortnight of the November session and then moved to the Mount Nelson.\textsuperscript{122} The 
election had been a severe disappointment to Botha, who, without an outright majority, 
could only continue his war policy with the support of the Unionists. This, however, 
remained an unhappy union, Botha keeping the Unionists in the dark, but expecting them 
to support his government unconditionally. ‘The intentions of the Government’, 
Wyndham had occasion to complain, were ‘wrapped in impenetrable mystery.’\textsuperscript{123} The 
unselfish, wartime support of the Unionists endangered their own political survival, a 
sacrifice made at times reluctantly, but always with a view to imperial interest.

And so, Botha remained in power, somewhat reluctantly, but confident in the 
support of the Unionists and still continuously seeking rapprochement with the 
Hertzogites. The Nationalists, however, immediately proposed a no-confidence vote. 
This, much to Wyndham’s chagrin, consumed much time and lengthened the session 
unnecessarily. He had given up hope of a short session before even leaving
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Johannesburg. However, Botha, impatient and annoyed by adverse criticism, was driven into the arms of the Unionists. He stood firm on the question of amnesty for the rebels and announced that individual cases would be treated on their merits, and that there would under no circumstances be a general amnesty. The Hertzogites, very angry, even suggested further trouble. The bitterness was certainly very great.

Wyndham, like Botha and the rest of their parties, hoped for good war news to solidify the country and undermine the belief, in some rural areas, that Britain was going to be defeated. They, too, wanted to prosecute the war more vigorously; steps which, as Botha feared, alienated Afrikaners even more. The call for conscription in particular and the mobilisation of the society and economy for the war were anathema to the Nationalists, particularly as the Unionists made the cry synchronic to events in Britain. In the House, matters moved along, despite the bitter attacks of the Hertzogites. Wyndham sat that November on the opposition benches observing the split between the two Afrikaner parties widening at a rate. This he found satisfactory as, although not a ‘very edifying display to the outside world’, the splitting of the Boer phalanx, as Milner had predicted in 1907, presented the Unionists with an opportunity to deal with moderate Afrikaners. And so, as Wyndham saw, they had to do everything and anything to intensify the differences between Botha and Hertzog.

That November a recruiting campaign commenced to Cape Town to raise 10,000 troops for German East Africa. These together with the men sent to France brought South Africa’s contribution to 20,000 troops, although, Wyndham lamented, they would not be paid entirely by South Africa. Cape Town was suddenly plastered with recruiting posters, as London had been the previous summer. But the results, Hugh feared, were going to be very disappointing. On November 24, at the start of the campaign, only twenty men enlisted.
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Wyndham returned to Johannesburg for Christmas (where he found several copies of Curtis' report on the problem of British imperialism with instructions for distribution to his fellow Round Tablers in South Africa\(^{130}\)) and, with Maud, returned to Cape Town on February 11 for the start of the 1916 parliamentary session. Ending on 17 June, this session was marked by increasing Unionist support for the government as well as the attempts made by the Nationalists to delay the passage of war measures. Again, the members were in the dark as to what the government meant to do and as to how long the session would be. However, Wyndham, noting a general consensus of opinion that as soon as the necessary financial measures were passed they would adjourn, hoped to be back on the Rand by Easter.\(^{131}\)

This was wishful thinking. The Nationalists were most dissatisfied with the amnesty granted to the rebels and Wyndham did not think that they would take a more compromising attitude until there was better news from the war fronts. De Wet, released from prison in 1915, visited Botha in February, much to the anxiety of the Unionists. They had reason for concern. 'Hereeniging' between Botha and Hertzog would lead to political division along 'the old strictly racial lines'.\(^{132}\) However, in the meantime, the Unionists were resigned to their reluctant role of keeping Botha in power, sometimes having to sacrifice principle in order to do so.

The resolve of the Unionists, to support Botha even when principle was at risk, was tested early in 1916 on the issue of the overseas pay of the South African troops sent to Europe. On February 12, the three remaining Labour members introduced a motion to increase their pay. This, as Wyndham noted, was a very vexed question. Each dominion paid its troops according to its own rate. The South Africans in East Africa were paid 3/6 per day, while those sent to Europe were paid by Britain at the imperial rate of one shilling per day. Botha was in favour of making good the difference. However, the Afrikaners would not accept it. They wanted to send no troops to Europe at all and the Cabinet was divided. Botha, unable to carry his cabinet and his party caucus, threatened

\(^{130}\) The Secretary, Round Table to Hugh Wyndham, 21 Dec 1915, BLO: Ms Curtis 802, f. 246.


\(^{132}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 10 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA. This eventually happened with the Pact Government of 1933.
to resign should the house divide on racial lines and lead to further fission in his party.

When the motion came before parliament, Smartt, who answered for the Unionists, said that though they wished for the higher pay they saw it was impossible and would not vote against the government.\footnote{Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA; Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA; and Diary of F.S. Malan, undated, pp 22-23, NASAC: A.583 F.S. Malan Collection, vol 23.} As Hugh related to his mother: ‘To get out of the difficulty Smartt moved the previous question, so we all voted that question should not now be settled, only 3 labour members being in the minority. So any crisis was averted.’\footnote{Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA.} This baffled the Nationalists, who, although not in the least in favour of higher pay, had determined that the Unionists would vote in favour and had decided to do the same just in order to turn Botha out. In this way the Unionists averted what Buxton described as ‘much the most serious political crisis’ since his posting to South Africa.\footnote{Lord Buxton to Bonar Law, 17 Feb 1916, as quoted by N.G. Garson, ‘South Africa and World War 1’, Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, VIII 1979, p 76.} And so the government of Botha was saved again. Maud, who met Botha in the lobby, broke out about ‘these damned Nationalists they are more pro-German now than they were last year.’ Each day he was losing ground to them in the country districts. Wyndham and the Unionists were prepared to back him increasingly, but, at the same time, remained aware that Botha would always try to reconcile with his own people.\footnote{Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA; Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA; and Diary of F.S. Malan, undated, pp 22-23, NASAC: A.583 F.S. Malan Collection, vol 23.} Two of the most important matters before the House in 1916, apart from the measures relating to the war, were the university and miners’ phthisis questions. F.S. Malan, the education minister, introduced a series of bills, one for the planting of a university in Cape Town, to be developed from the existing South African College, and another for giving a charter to the Victoria College at Stellenbosch. The latter, Feetham predicted, would tend to be a narrow racial institution, but, as the South African College had always had Afrikaans students, he thought the former would not and therefore develop as a national asset.\footnote{Richard Feetham to his mother, 27 Feb 1916, RHO: Feetham Papers, Box 4, file 1, ff. 17-23. See also Diary of F.S. Malan, undated, pp 21-22, NASAC: A.583 F.S. Malan Collection, vol 23.} The trouble was that much of the money to be used for the endowment...
was money Johannesburg claimed as its own and, as a result, 'some of the Rand people indignantly demand[ed]' that the Unionists block it. And to make matters worse, and much to Hugh's distaste, the Phillips' sailed into Cape Town at the end of February 1916. Sir Lionel, a trustee of the money Alfred Beit left to found a South African university, was immediately besieged by delegations from Johannesburg and Pretoria. Jealousy between the two capitals, united only in their resentment of Johannesburg, seemed to put even a compromise out of reach. Phillips seemed to enjoy the 'whirl of controversy over the University Bills.' Wyndham informed Lady Leconfield that he had 'seldom seen anybody look happier or more important – sheaves of telegrams & countless interviews which flattered his vanity to quite an amusing extent.

The second important matter related to the mines. An uninterrupted supply of gold was of utmost importance to the financing of the war effort. However, this and the gravity of the war situation in 1915 and 1916, did not stop industrial labour activity and strikes had to be averted by making concessions across the board on such matters as working hours, leave dispensations and discipline and control at the workplace. Here, Wyndham, wanting to secure the supply of gold and appease the working class on the Rand, raised his voice yet again on behalf of labour. In 1912, during the debate on the Miners' Phthisis bill he had called for employers to accept responsibility for health and safety on the mines and particularly with regard to ventilation. The simple payment of compensation, as Labour was demanding, while necessary, was not enough. He insisted on the implementation of compulsory preventative measures and, invoking the measures taken in Britain, supported the suggestion that a miners' phthisis board monitor the mines and, as necessary, determine the compensation to be paid to miners. At Wyndham's suggestion, the bill was referred to a select committee on which he served.
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Wyndham’s ideas were contained in the Miners’ Phthisis Act, but many of its provisions were diluted during the war. In February 1916, while the Labourites were absorbed with overseas pay, Wyndham, with full information from a workers’ organisation, raised the matter in parliament in the form of three focussed questions. On the first, F.S. Malan, the Minister of Mines, confirmed that the Randfontein Group had ceased underground dust sampling. However, in response to Wyndham’s three questions, Malan claimed that the dust sampling on the Witwatersrand was insufficiently extensive to form accurate comparisons between mines. He, however, repeated the Randfontein claim that, because the Randfontein mines were wet and the stoping was done manually rather than by machine drilling, their mines were less plagued by dust than any other mine on the Rand.

These answers, as Wyndham knew, were far from satisfactory and he immediately followed them with a further set of questions. Although Malan would not lay copies of the inspectors’ reports on the table (‘if the contents thereof were made public it might tend to stultify the reports of Inspectors in the future and such reports would become formal and valueless’) he reported that there were machine drills in use on the Randfontein mines and 249 of them! Sensing victory, Wyndham asked Malan two further questions. On the first, whether the reports confirmed the Randfontein claim that their mines were freer from dust than any other mines on the Rand, Malan stated that they did not contain sufficient data to allow an effective comparison. However, with regard to the second question, regarding the results of dust sampling carried out on Randfontein mines before the cessation of sampling system, Malan reported that the dust in the Randfontein mines had been considerably worse than the average on the Witwatersrand. As a result of Wyndham’s efforts, dust sampling restarted on the
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146 Government Mining Engineer to Acting Secretary for Mines and Industries, 23 Feb 1916, NASAP: MNW 326, file M.M.1418/16 Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham.
147 Acting Government Mining Engineer to Acting Secretary for Mines and Industries, 23 Feb 1916, NASAP: MNW 326, file M.M.1418/16 Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham.
148 Acting Government Mining Engineer to Acting Secretary for Mines and Industries, 3 Mar 1916, NASAP: MNW 326, file M.M.1418/16 Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham.
149 Government Mining Engineer to Acting Secretary for Mines and Industries, 23 Feb 1916, NASAP: MNW 326, file M.M.1418/16 Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham.
150 Acting Government Mining Engineer to Acting Secretary for Mines and Industries, 3 Mar 1916, NASAP: MNW 326, file M.M.1418/16 Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham.
Randfontein mines on 30 March. The Labour party became a clearing house for some of the phthisis claims.

The session was particularly productive. Numerous bills were passed, much entirely unconnected with the war, and, as Wyndham noted somewhat sardonically in June 1916, South Africa was ‘the only country that has indulged itself in a session which cannot be described as a “War” session.’

4. Big things and little things

Miners’ phthisis and the university question seemed very South African, narrow and unimportant against the backdrop of a world war and the vital imperial issues with which the conflict was associated. The Nationalists continued their ‘unending oratory ... against this country taking any further part in the war.’ Wyndham could only hope that eventual British victory would bring them to their senses (‘they are most anxious to avoid coming out on the wrong side’). Their anti-war agitation Wyndham thought ‘all a very barren & useless discussion.’ On the short term it allowed them to sweep the bye elections in the backveld, but it would not influence policy. South Africa was committed to the war and her troops were serving in East Africa and the Middle East and soon in Europe too.

Moreover the failure of the Germans before Verdun raised hopes. Wyndham had never wavered. Although the newsprint lamented the French retreat, yard by yard, which seemed a repetition of Mons, Wyndham had, from the start, been delighted with the German move. The Germans, as he predicted, spent themselves in the process. He had written to his mother at the end of February:
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152 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 18 Mar 1916, WSRO: PHA.
153 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 23 Mar 1916, WSRO: PHA.
"We are all of course much taken up with this great offensive of the Germans at Verdun. I can't (sic) help thinking it is a good thing they have started the offensive this Spring, as their losses must be very heavy, & it helps us in our policy of attrition. The French seem to be doing very well, retreating steadily & inflicting all the damage they can in the process."154

And it turned out as he foretold. However, the nationalists remained unconvinced.

The Wyndhams went up to Johannesburg for the Easter recess and Hugh, leaving Maud on the Rand, returned to Cape Town on May 1 in the hope that the business of the House would move along a little faster as the members become 'more & more exhausted & bored.'155

Wyndham had, in the meantime, received news of the armed Easter uprising in Ireland, which reminded him vividly of the Afrikaner rebellion of 1914. Ireland, poverty-stricken and, with the exception of Belfast, largely agrarian, was in many ways comparable to South Africa.156 Civil war threatened in Ireland shortly before the outbreak of war, as it had done shortly after in South Africa. Asquith, the cautious British prime minister, decided to enact his Irish Home Rule bill, but, 'with the proviso that it would not become law till the end of the war, when there would be an amending act to make possible the exclusion of the six Ulster counties where Protestant sentiment was strongest.'157 The Conservatives, angered, stormed out of the Commons. The Irish nationalists, not prepared to wait on the war, took to the barricades. In both Ireland and South Africa, Wyndham thought, the government concerned was forced to pay 'the penalty of many years of weak & vacillating administration.'158 The British Army suppressed the Dublin uprising, 'very summarily' Wyndham noted. But he could not help feeling that the same should have been done in South Africa in 1914.159 Botha's irresolution and apparent weakness with regard to the rebels, would, moreover, force him

---
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157 A. Marwick, The Deluge, p 181.
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159 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 May 1916, WSRO: PHA. See also Humphrey Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 7 Aug 1916, WSRO: Maxse Papers 455.
to ‘pay it again.’ He doubted whether Botha’s dealings with the Afrikaner rebels, although held up as an example for Ireland, would ‘prove the best in the long run.’ On the short-term they had ‘not resulted in a diminution of the Nationalist and Anti-English movement, which was what was hoped for.’

The political situation was far from satisfactory. At the beginning of May 1916, Wyndham sent his mother a cutting from the Rand Daily Mail ‘giving [he told her] a good example of Nationalist oratory.’ This, he opined, was on the increase, but, without arms and having ‘had enough of rebellion for the time being’, Wyndham expected them to ‘confine themselves to speechifying & political intrigue.’ Reading the cutting, Lady Frederick Cavendish dismissed the utterances as ‘merely the outpourings of a small minority.’ This ‘amused’ Wyndham, who noted that this was what had been said about the Sinn Fein just before the Easter rising and what many English-speakers had said in South Africa before the outbreak of the Afrikaner rebellion. It was, Wyndham reckoned, ‘the old system of hiding one’s head in the sand.’

Wyndham naturally had mixed feelings about Botha’s attempts to heal the rift within Afrikanerdom. Politically, he did not want to see hereeniging, but realised that Botha had to do something to stem the tide of rampant nationalism. This, he and others had predicted, would happen when Britain won her first large victory. The news of the naval engagement off Jutland seemed positive and, Hugh reported, ‘even the Nationalist Press now claim it was a British victory.’

However, within weeks, ‘the air [was] thick with rumours’ of a second Boer rising. Another rebellion, as Wyndham realised, for the want of arms and ammunition and the absence of a good leader, was certain to fail, although, as many appreciated, the spirit was ‘willing enough.’ Botha nonetheless took the precaution of meeting with the commandants whom he could trust. It was ‘all very disturbing’ and, moreover, Smuts, with the troops raised in 1915, was in German East Africa. Wyndham looked forward to

---
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their return. However, by late July the silence from German East Africa was "becoming rather ominous." Botha left for Tanganyika, where he could do little but note the situation, which was stalling. Wyndham wanted him to return soon to focus on regaining some of his political position. However, Smuts, unable to bring the Germans to a decisive engagement, seemed far from achieving the quick victory needed to impress the backveld. The date of Lettow's defeat, first fixed as August 1916, was "postponed until Xmas." Wyndham was convinced that the undertaking of the East African campaign was a mistake. He favoured a direct approach and concentration on Europe. This was in tune with imperial thinking.

The news from France was more encouraging, although, as Wyndham noted, the percentage of officers appearing in the casualty lists was "very remarkable." The Wyndhams revelled again in the war news. The great Somme offensive produced interesting accounts, all "very good." The fighting was bitter and stubborn and Lukin, the South African brigade commander, recognised that there was "a lot of fight left in the Huns [who] contest every yard." The Allies risked another Verdun. Yet, as Lord Cobham remarked, Britain was:

"jogging along quite pleased with itself, losing 5 million pounds & 5 thousand men a day – who would have thought it 3 years ago? The Boshes must be losing many more men, - with the Austrians probably double, & this can't go on long."

The men sent abroad seemed to be paying a tremendous price, exposed either to the malarial jungles and rigours of East Africa or the trenches and brutalisation of industrial warfare in France. Wyndham had decided to remain in South Africa, where, he

---
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reasoned, he was more ‘useful.’ Although life in South Africa went on ‘as smug & comfortable almost as if there was no war’, it was dreadfully dull in comparison in what the Wyndhams knew was the staple in Britain and France. Maud was convinced of his usefulness in South Africa.175 ‘He does work away at all he undertakes’, she told his mother, and, moreover, there were, by May 1916, so few men left to undertake some projects. Her husband too, Maud reasoned, was ‘in almost a unique position’, having no ‘axe to grind’ and in true aristocratic fashion having the ‘leisure to do things.’ Other men were consumed with ‘business of sorts that takes all their time’.176

This changed by mid-1916. Demestre, Wyndham’s manager at Kromdraai, had heart trouble and as a result Hugh had to step in. He was now immersed in business and according to his wife enjoyed it immensely, more than politics she thought:

‘So odd how business does attract men – it’s all very well so long as they equally attract business - & so far all seems to go fairly well with occasional brilliant expectations wch may turn into something great someday. That’s what makes it so interesting – the possibility of development.’177

The possibility of development kept Wyndham very busy, with trips to Middleburg and Vryheid for his coal interests and to Swaziland and Mozambique on agricultural business.178 In June 1916, a school was built on a portion of Kromdraai, two morgen in extent and within 300 yards of the station.179 Wyndham went down to Standerton in August for the opening of the school. A Scottish teacher was appointed, whom the local Nationalists wanted ‘removed and a Boer appointed in his place.’ ‘This’, he complained, was then ‘the regular process in the country districts, & does not lead to educational

175 Maud had once doubted Richard Feetham’s usefulness on the front. Yet, having trained ‘a coloured corps’ for service in German East Africa, Feetham was transformed by the war. He had been ‘remote & pale & severe to all but intimates’; but was now ‘hearty, sunburnt, and very keen on soldiering.’ This led Maud to wonder whether ‘all these years a marshal’s baton has been concealed in a lawyer’s green bag.’ See Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 2 Oct 1916 and 7 Oct 1916, WSRO: PHA.
176 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 May 1916, WSRO: PHA.
177 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Jul 1916, WSRO: PHA.
178 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Jul 1916, WSRO: PHA; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 Jul 1916 and 21 Jul 1916, WSRO: PHA.
179 Ministers’ Minute 2982, 7 Sep 1914, NASAP: URU209; and Completion Report P.W.18, dd 29 Jun 1916, NASAP: PWD 3571, file 11672 Kromdraai (76) School and Quarters Standerton Erection.
efficiency, & the Boers in the long run will be the chief sufferers, as the children are
growing up practically uneducated.  

Wyndham now also renewed his interest in land settlement. He, like Duncan, was
eager to reintegrate returning soldiers as well as secure for South Africa a portion of the
migrants expected to leave Britain after the war. For the latter, they hoped to elicit the
support of Milner and Selborne and Rider Haggard, all of whom knew South Africa and
recognised the importance of British migrants in ‘counteract[ing] & in time destroy[ing]
the evil influence of the backvelder.’  

Many gassed soldiers convalesced on the
highveld, where the climate suited lung complaints. The Wyndhams hoped many would
stay. However, with no support expected from the South African government, they
realised that, if anything was to be done, this would necessarily be by private enterprise.
The difficulties would be many, but both Duncan and Wyndham argued that a scheme,
even if small, would bear dividends.

A settlement committee was also formed in Cape Town under Jagger to foster
immigration, of which Wyndham was the Transvaal representative. However, there were
doubts concerning its effectiveness. John Duff, in a letter to Duncan, questioned the
ability of Jagger and Wyndham and instead suggested grandiose schemes, including the
setting up of a new committee, the raising of large sums, the buying of land on a large
scale and the getting of settlers out. Yet, such schemes, as Duncan replied, were
impractical and unlikely to succeed. Both he and Wyndham had ‘seen something of land
settlement from the inside’ and knew that nobody but the government could undertake a
scheme of such magnitude. It was costly, particularly when there were two or three bad
seasons to face, and, the veldt being ‘hostile’, the settlers would require social and
cultural attention, too. The most feasible route was by way of small settlements, which
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could be nursed by a successful local farmer: it was better to settle a few settlers successfully than encounter masses of failures.184

Deciding to commence with a small practical scheme, but at the same time attempting to draw governmental support, Wyndham offered the government 500 cultivatable acres on the northern end of Kromdraai for the settlement of two returned South African soldiers. He was willing to lease these for a nominal rent for 21 years, subject to the land being ‘only occupied by men who have served in two campaigns (excluding the rebellion) in the present war.’ Wyndham was also prepared to transfer the ground to them should they ‘become satisfactorily settled’ and at the same price as it was sold to him.185 As Maud noted, Hugh’s conditions would ‘avoid the possibility or rather probability of having some rebels dumped down upon it, as a douceur to them for keeping quiet.’186 Wyndham’s offer was accepted. However, as there was no way for the government to give advances to persons located on private land, Wyndham, seemingly at the prompting of the Minister of Lands, withdrew his offer in June 1917.187

On August 29, 1916, South Africa heard that Romania had entered the war as an associated power. This Wyndham thought, rather optimistically, was sure would shorten the war and quieten the nationalist rhetoric. The National Party had recently held their congress in Pretoria, when they ‘indulged in an orgy of anti-British & anti-Botha oratory’ and re-elected Kemp, then still serving a sentence for his part in the rebellion, to their executive. And, to make matters worse, all the while reports confirmed that they were gaining in strength in the country. Botha’s announcement that there had been ‘an attempt at a second rebellion’ was described in South Africa as a bombshell, but Wyndham, who had known of it for some time, was convinced that, although the Nationalists grew steadily in strength politically, there no chance of another uprising.188

184 Patrick Duncan to J.E. Duff, 16 Nov 1916, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D15.11.5.  
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Botha, with the erosion of his electoral base and despite his dependence upon the Unionists in parliament, remained fixated with the idea of hereeniging and the fielding of a SAP candidate in the Yeoville bye election in October 1916 signalled the end of electoral cooperation between the SAP and the Unionists. This Wyndham reckoned a very low down thing to do and he resumed his Dutch lessons so as to understand the speeches in Parlt.

He remained convinced that two things would dispel political ferment. Good rain, sufficient to break the heat and drought and so satisfy the farming community, was the first of these. Yet, as he well knew, the prospects for a good season were poor. The second was military success, of sufficient strategic significance to convince the Afrikaner people that Britain was going to win the war. Here, too, the prospects were poor. The Somme offensive, much proclaimed at first, had petered out and very mixed reports were received from German East Africa. Some proclaimed that the campaign had already been concluded, seemingly confirmed by the transfer of the pay department from Nairobi to Durban. Wyndham, however, no matter Maud’s excitement, maintained an attitude of disbelief and endeavoured, according to Maud, to prove that the transfer meant nothing. This attitude, she complained, reminded her of her Aunt Emma and cousin May, who when one approaches them with a choice on dit, invariably reply “I don’t believe it, but tell me what you heard”, which was so damping to one’s conversation.

Yet, even if, as Hugh reckoned, the slow progress of the campaign in Tanganyika and subsequent complaints regarding the irregularity of the South African supply organization there undermined Botha’s standing in the country, he remained uninterested

---

189 Patrick Duncan convinced Davies to withdraw his resignation and wrote to Louis Botha. “While the supreme issues involved in the war are being decided it seems to me essential that those who hold the same views with regard to these issues should avoid any unnecessary cause of division, that they should cooperate in parliament and in contested elections where there is danger of a seat being won by a party not sharing those views.” See Patrick Duncan to Louis Botha, 12 Oct 1916, UCT: Duncan Papers, A1.1; and Louis Botha to Patrick Duncan, 17 Oct 1916, UCT: Duncan Papers, A1.2.
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in coalition government. Botha wanted to play up to his own people, but the reactionaries among them, through their newspaper attacks and columns on the German East campaign, wounded him severely. However, attuned to the difficulties faced by the Unionists, Botha realized that their support for him in the house resulted in their loss of credibility among the electorate. The Unionists now knew where they stood. They would have to support Botha’s policy in parliament, but without reward. Theirs was the role of a mistress; good for short-term use, not marriage, and all the while depreciating in the eyes of the community. Wyndham and Duncan saw this, other Unionists did not.

In November 1916, Wyndham was appointed to write what became the first official history of the campaign in German South West Africa. Smuts had been under pressure to produce a history for some months. In Wyndham he seemingly had an ideal historian. Wyndham, a volunteer soldier with a university education, knew something of the historical process and had the military-technical skills deemed necessary for the work. Furthermore, being under military discipline, he would not require strict supervision and would have, in theory at least, unlimited access to official sources. Moreover, his term as Chief Intelligence Officer had given him a close and very intimate knowledge of the campaign, while his seat in parliament had given him a window from which to observe the intrigue that had cloaked government circles before the commitment of South African forces and the outbreak of the rebellion in 1914. And, of course, for a personal point of view, Wyndham was a man of leisure, seeking some military role during the parliamentary recess.

Wyndham was therefore delighted with the work, although he professed to ‘always loathe’ Pretoria (‘at the best but a stuffy hole’). The offer had come from Smuts, but at the prompting of Roland Bourne, a fringe Kindergartener and now
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Secretary for Defence in Pretoria. Before Smuts' approach, Wyndham had already responded to Bourne's overtures and indicated a willingness 'to work up [the] available material' and 'supplement it where necessary' from his own personal experiences. Bourne thought that Wyndham's manuscript would be revised later by Collyer, who would also add portions that dealt particularly with Botha's operations.

An early start was important. Wyndham expected the work to 'take at least a year' and he had also to return to Cape Town for the opening of Parliament in February 1917. Wyndham was attached to the Adjutant General's Section at Defence Headquarters, but had no staff. He, personally, had to trace and work through all the sources and make his own analysis and synthesis without clerical assistance or an interchange of ideas with other Empire historians working on the war. The working up of the material proved difficult for other reasons, too. Wyndham experienced problems typical of any contemporary historian. The most significant of these was the state of the available material. This was, he told Maud, chaotic - 'few if any written orders or documents of any sort were kept.' While this might have been partially true, Wyndham soon discovered that much official material existed but was unavailable.

A second problem therefore related to the state of the existing documentation. Although Bourne had ordered the centralisation of all documents relating to the South West campaign, the records of the earlier stages of the campaign and of all the invading forces were in an unsatisfactory state, lying in various centres from Windhoek through to Cape Town; and, as Wyndham soon discovered, records were inaccessible in other respects, too. A number of regiments and units presented difficulty to him regarding access to their records and, on at least one occasion, the Secretary for Defence had to intervene on his
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And then, to complicate matters even more, Bourne’s operating files, which he had handed to Collyer during the previous year – when Collyer had intended to write the history – could not be immediately traced. These files contained all the telegrams between the forces in the field and Smuts at headquarters. Collyer, furthermore, had in his possession all of the records of that part of the operations which were under the personal and immediate command of General Botha. The problem of official documentation in private possession has plagued countless historians, many of whom, no doubt, have been unaware of their existence and ascribe the hiatus in the documentary residue to reduction by neglect, accident, water, fire and pest. Wyndham, however, was aware of their existence and their unavailability must have been a cause for irritation. It also shows that, contrary to opinion, even official historians do not have unlimited access to records.

Wyndham spent November and December 1916, wading through records. This was ‘quite interesting’, Maud thought, ‘but otherwise his life there sounds dull.’ Eager for news she questioned him closely, but after ‘subtracting some flowers of wit’ such as Hugh’s dining with Poincaré at the Elysée, she gathered that he saw few people. Despite limited time (only two months) and the difficulties regarding some of the sources, Wyndham nonetheless produced a campaign history, which, never published and now unavailable, with the exception of excerpts, is not easy to appraise. However, he seems to have had a reasonable understanding of the new nature of warfare and the challenges facing anyone attempting to make sense of the complexity of the whole. In February 1915, when he read Reginald’s diary, he appreciated that, while ‘most interesting’, it showed ‘how very little a man can judge of what is going on in a modern battle.’ Any observer saw only the smallest picture and the generals, those supposedly with the strategic view, were mostly chateaurd far from the front and entirely out of touch with their troops in the trenches. In German South West, however, the picture was different. The campaign was not only shorter and smaller numerically, but most of the officers
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served right at the front and many produced diaries. To some of these Wyndham had access.\textsuperscript{210} Yet a large hiatus in Wyndham’s research was surely the inaccessibility of the German military records, which, after the conclusion of the Southwest campaign, were arranged and catalogued by a certain Major von Lagiewsky of the former German Staff in Windhuk, but were still inaccessible when Wyndham completed his manuscript. Leipoldt, who had succeeded Wyndham as chief intelligence officer in May 1915, was tasked in November 1918 to add further material from the now accessible German records.\textsuperscript{211}

However, both Leipoldt and Collyer, who also made later revisions, apparently sanitised the Wyndham manuscript, too. Wyndham had been very critical and therefore had ‘never expected [Smuts to] publish the whole of my account of the German South West Campaign.’ In fact, he told his mother, that ‘much of it ought very properly to be suppressed.’\textsuperscript{212} His work was nonetheless appreciated. Smuts himself told Lady Leconfield that Hugh had been ‘accomplishing great work of late in South Africa’ and that his campaign history was excellent and very interesting.\textsuperscript{213} However, it was much too frank and, in view of the delicate political situation, unsuitable for public consumption.\textsuperscript{214} Even so, Maud hoped it would be published; after all, she remarked, the muddles and misfortunes were ‘far less miserable than Gallipoli, Mesopotamia & German E.’ Yet, as she noted, ‘we have got to continue thinking Botha & Smuts & the Boers are far finer folk than the poor British – people & generals who can be abused & degraded without fear of consequences.’\textsuperscript{215}

Wyndham, while working on the SouthWest campaign, spent the week in Pretoria, going to Johannesburg for weekends. He stayed with Bourne in Pretoria and dined occasionally with the Buxtons, and so was not short of news, some of which may have been confidential. The news from East Africa, of difficulty with regard to transport

\textsuperscript{210} See MAP: SAMR, Box 1044, file 516/89 War History of G.S.W. Campaign being written by Col the Hon H. Wyndham.
\textsuperscript{212} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Jun 1917, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{213} J.C. Smuts to Lady Leconfield, 7 May 1917, WSRO: PHA 9579; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Jun 1917, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{214} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Jun 1917, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{215} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1917, WSRO: PHA.
and commissariat, was given political currency by the Nationalists. The subject of the "starving troops" in German East joined the list of anti-war grievances: the overseas pay, the conduct of the campaign in Tanganyika, poverty on the East Rand, the national food question, and the employment of black Africans in Europe.\textsuperscript{216} A mass meeting was held in Johannesburg at the end of November, when, Hugh told his mother, 'all we wretched members of Parliament came in for a good deal of abuse.'\textsuperscript{217} The opportunity was seized by the Labour Party, eager to regain lost influence. Moreover, the 'great demonstration of friendship between the 2 Dutch parties' at the funeral of M.T. Steyn ('a dangerous schemer\textsuperscript{218} made the Unionists nervous. However, they were bound to Botha on the war issue, and any political crisis was sure to return a stronger National Party.\textsuperscript{219}

The Wyndhams arrived in Cape Town in mid-February for the session. Some mines appeared in the harbour at the same time and the city, now also teaming with 'troops from everywhere', was suddenly alive to the war.\textsuperscript{220} Wyndham expected an exciting session. They were to discuss amnesty for the rebels and the question of the pay of the overseas contingents, but, in addition to these 'old threadbare subjects', the government proposed to introduce controversial legislation, including a Native Land Act, which, Wyndham despaired, 'ought never to be introduced in War time.'\textsuperscript{221}

Wyndham laboured for much of the session on the Public Accounts Committee, which Maud empathized sounded 'a dry subject.' Her attempts to learn more met with the reply: 'We do Public Accounts.'\textsuperscript{222} The list of social engagements was equally unappealing. Faced with the realities of war-time shrinkage in society, the Wyndhams saw more of ordinary society. Between visits with the Buxtons and talk with foreign visitors and ambassadors, they dined with the Duncans and Fairbridges and spent an occasional weekend with them. Hugh had never liked Dorothy Fairbridge. He disliked the colonial trait, mastered by Miss Fairbridge, of becoming 'quite the friend of the family.'

\textsuperscript{216} J.X. Merriman to Lord Buxton, 5 Dec 1916, in P. Lewsen (ed), \textit{Selections from the Correspondence of J.X. Merriman}, pp 285-86.  
\textsuperscript{217} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1916, WSRO: PHA.  
\textsuperscript{218} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 10 Dec 1916, WSRO: PHA.  
\textsuperscript{219} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 25 Nov 1916, WSRO: PHA.  
\textsuperscript{220} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Feb 1917, WSRO: PHA; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Feb 1917, WSRO: PHA.  
\textsuperscript{221} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 19 Feb 1917, WSRO: PHA.  
\textsuperscript{222} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 Mar 1917, WSRO: PHA.
She had met several of Hugh's relatives and talked 'incessantly' of Hugh's mother and his siblings, referring to each as if on first name terms. This, for Hugh, was 'quite unbearable' and on one occasion he admitted that 'the more she expanded the more I fear I contracted.' Matters had not improved over the years. He now loathed her.224

Botha, positioned somewhat uncomfortably between the Nationalists and the Unionists, was having a more interesting, if equally uncomfortable session. The bitterness between the two Dutch parties seemed steadily to increase with each session. The acrimony spilled over in 1917 on the matters of the war vote, the contribution of £1,000,000 towards the general cost of the war, and the wool crisis. The first and second was passed with the assistance of the Unionists, the third solved through a series of concessions made by the British government with a view to keeping Botha in power.225

Smuts at the time was receiving an ovation in Britain. This the Wyndhams thought rather ironic. Not only would he not be in government without Botha, but, he was not appreciated in South Africa, where network linkages eliminated any consideration of merit. After the war he would have to return 'to littleness among little men after being the big man among big men.'226 But his reception in London was nonetheless 'amusing', even welcomed. Hailed as a man of destiny, his utterances on the future organization of the empire were to be welcomed, solidifying the cleavage among Afrikaners.227 Yet to many a British officer, South Africa was still perceived as the beaten enemy. Brigadier General A.E.J. Cavendish, the commander of the imperial garrison in South Africa, described Smuts in a speech on 2 November 1917 as 'that modern miracle' who 'for (the) beaten enemy ... had a very nasty knack of asserting himself at times.'228 Cavendish, yet another of Maud's cousins, was recalled. The wave of republicanism and the reaction brought further division and Hugh could rightly think 'racialism' worse in 1917 than it was.

---

223 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 6 Mar 1915, WSRO: PHA.
224 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Apr 1917, WSRO: PHA; and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 May 1917, WSRO: PHA.
225 N.G. Garson, 'South Africa and World War I', Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, VIII 1979, pp 77-78; and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Mar 1917 and 5 Apr 1917, WSRO: PHA.
226 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 20 May 1917, WSRO: PHA.
227 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 May 1917, WSRO: PHA.
228 Speech made by General Cavendish at a meeting of the St. John's Ambulance, 2 Nov 1917, MAP: DC, Box 1142, file DCDB 2394/7 Suggested recall of Brigadier General Cavendish G.O.C. South African Military Command and appointment of General Martyn.
before the outbreak of the war in 1914. The whole country, Maud complained that July, was:

'seething with sedition & if the Germans won & the Boers had arms there'd be a rising at once — As it is they won't believe we are winning & it will only be when the Hun is squashed that they will subside. The Transvaal & O.F.S. think they want the old Republies back tho' the intelligent ones know it's impossible. What they all clamour for is for S.A. to stop helping in the War in any way & where the root of it all is to be found is jealousy of Botha.'

Merriman's speech in parliament, which confirmed the tales shared by Britons in South Africa with relatives abroad, surprised Britain. For the first time real notice was taken of Afrikaner republicanism, which had been discussed 'as an academic topic' throughout the war, but with increased temper towards the war's end. The Nationalists, Wyndham grumbled, used the principle of freedom of speech guaranteed throughout the British Empire, an empire they undermined. Lord Cobham had been maddened somewhat too:

'I believe that if one is to hope to win a big war, the whole country, colonies & all, should be put under military law, as Germany is. I wonder what the Boshes think of allowing Hertzog to carry on a pro-German or at least an anti-British campaign under the protection of the law & with the help of state railways, telegraphs etc?'

Yet, for the moment at least, Unionist leaders accepted Nationalist rhetoric as part of the normal political process, regardless of the war. This they did to save Botha, but it could not last. Many of 'the British', Maud noted, angered by a recent nationalist pamphlet 'raking up all the old concentration camp business', were 'getting v. restive at the Nats & Republicanism & want to get up anti-Republic societies.'

Riots broke out in Johannesburg in April 1918 between the Nationalists and what the Wyndhams termed 'Loyalists', who had for some time objected to Hertzog and his

---

229 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Jun 1917, WSRO: PHA.
230 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Jul 1917, WSRO: PHA.
231 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Jul 1917, WSRO: PHA.
233 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Jul 1917, WSRO: PHA.
234 Maud Wyndham to Margaret Wyndham, 1 Aug 1917, WSRO: PHA.
'pernicious piffle.' An alleged insult to the Union Jack triggered emotions and the Nationalist Party club was sacked. Commandos formed in the country. Some 8,000 Afrikaners were said to have sworn 'a secret oath', which seemed to signal another armed rebellion. Incensed, an over-zealous Scot assaulted Hertzog on the steps of the House and what Hugh described as a 'really a paltry episode' followed. Colin Steyn engaged the assailter and they both fell down. A 'very truculent little wife of a Unionist member' then belaboured Steyn and Wyndham pulled her off. The Scot was arrested. All that remained on the scene afterwards, 'such a sign of the times', was 'a woman's broken umbrella.' Wyndham, over the following days, received several telegrams and letters from Nationalists, thanking him 'for his protecting "our general"'. Maud expected 'anonymous letters of abuse from Jbg from stalwarts in the constituency.' Hugh at any rate was pleased for the way in which the incident cleared some of the air. The Nationalists in parliament, he thought, had been seriously concerned at how far matters had deteriorated, but noted that such incidents always occurred at times when the war news was particularly bad. He was convinced that the German spring offensive and the retirement of the Allied armies after the attack of March 21 had 'had a bad effect on the Boer.' However, he argued, this increased the probability that when Britain won the war, the tide in South Africa would turn again in Botha's favour.

The sniping from both the Nationalist and Unionist jingo, both at each other and converging often on Botha, made Botha's position more difficult. The Unionists of Duncan's frame of mind wanted the forging of a common New South Africanism, based on the constitution, which they accepted a fair, if not perfect settlement, providing also defence and economic guarantees within the imperial framework. This was dismissed by Hertzog, who rather saw the acculturation of Dutch values through the rest of the population and the gradual adsorption of English-speakers into Afrikanerdom. If the
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235 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Apr 1918, WSRO: PHA.
236 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Apr 1918, WSRO: PHA. See also P.C. van Niekerk, a district secretary of the National Party, to Louis Botha, 24 Apr 1918, NASAP: PM 1/1/48, file 4/75/1917 European War, Resolutions re War, in which Van Niekerk objects strongly to the 'Handelwyze van het gepeupel te Johannesburg, in zake de Nationale Klub, en de lage aanranding op wye hooggeachte Generaal Hertzog te Kaapstad.' Other petitions on this file are informative.
237 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Apr 1918, WSRO: PHA.
238 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Apr 1918, WSRO: PHA.
239 Duncan in a letter to Hertzog stated that: 'The Act of Union ... laid down a fair [if not perfect]
latter was anathema to the Wyndhams, the first, promising a more open society, catering less for social distinction, was hardly bearable. Yet the British world was changing, irrevocably and becoming less comfortable for leisured classes.

5. **No small affair: ‘a staggering bill’**

If the first immediate impact of the war was one of new purpose, the second was one of economy, both nationally and within each household. Recognizing the coming distress if the war stopped supplies, the Wyndhams took the decision to live very quietly – ‘We shall have no parties of course at all’ – and husband resources. Money would be tight. Being a remittance man, Wyndham expected a disruption in his British stream of income – based as it was upon shares and dividends – and made the decision ‘to close down the house a good deal & expenses of all sorts.’

Although he relied a good deal on his British remittance for the maintenance of a genteel lifestyle, Wyndham had now to fall back on the revenue generated by Kromdraai and the stud, in particular, as well as his parliamentary salary of £400 per annum. However, by comparison, these streams were either erratic or too much of a trickle. Wyndham’s horses won the occasional race, bringing in both winnings and sales. For example, on August 3, 1914, as the war erupted, Wyndham got a second in a race with a horse that he immediately sold for £175. And, amidst smallest successes, Winnipeg won for him the South African equivalent of the 2,000 guineas that December and was still

---

240 See, for example, Maud Wyndham’s comment on class, race and the influenza epidemic in her letter to Lady Leconfield, 20 Oct 1918, WSRO: PHA. For the position of nobles on the official table of precedence in South Africa see Hough to Horsfall, 18 Jan 1917, and Secretary to Governor General to Senatus Cape Town, 29 Jan 1917, NASAP: GG 1271, 34/577 Honours Precedence Question of precedence of the Hon Jean de Villiers, the Hon Hugh Wyndham, Commander the Hon S. Hay and Lady de Villiers.

241 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1914, WSRO: PHA.

242 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Aug 1914, WSRO: PHA. See also Frances Guest to Lady Cobham, Monday [c. Aug 1914], HHA 2/24/3.

243 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 2 Aug 1914, HHA 2/36/44.

244 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 2 Aug 1914, HHA 2/36/44.
winning races two years later.\textsuperscript{245} Such successes pleased Wyndham as did the impact of the war on the South African coal industry, which, to some extent, made up for the losses in dividends from Britain.\textsuperscript{246} The same could not be said for Kromdraai. The lands, laid waste by drought in 1914, were flooded in early 1915 and so, for the second consecutive year, the yield in crops was poor.\textsuperscript{247} And, to make matters worse, the water supply, which had failed in August 1914, had to be upgraded with a new borehole\textsuperscript{248} and the foundations of Kromdraai House, which were giving way, demanded attention. Hugh, at first, would not have pigs and poultry,\textsuperscript{249} but, cash-strapped, he was forced to diversify and even elected to leave the house to crumble and replace it later with some rondavels and ‘live there in more simple surroundings.’\textsuperscript{250}

With income from the stud unpredictable and the farm demanding more money than it produced, the Wyndhams were forced to reduce their lifestyle dramatically.\textsuperscript{251} They had to close their Parktown residence a good deal and save on expenses where they could. Maud dreaded the ensuing frugality: there would be fewer luxuries, no new outfits:

‘We shall have no parties of course at all, & my wardrobe is reduced to 16 gowns counting every rag summer & winter & nine hats ditto - & one gown I had made thinking I was going to England & now shall not want it -- being a cloth coat & skirt.’\textsuperscript{252}

Entertaining on scale at Wyndhams ended immediately. ‘We shall have nothing but an occasional person to stay & tea parties wch cost nothing’, Maud informed her mother.\textsuperscript{253} They hosted a small lunch for their first war Christmas, for a small group that included
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Feetham and Duncan and 'Wags', Maud's former governess and now housekeeper for the Buxtons. They served chicken instead of turkey and this was followed by the standard plum pudding. Following the lead of relatives in Britain, where food and lifestyle economy was more severe, Maud instituted 'more or less war rations' in July 1917. They now had meatless lunches, bread and cheese and jam, and no puddings at lunch, only at supper. Maud was however convinced that the austerity did not extent to the servants' rooms and felt it was 'useless pointing the obvious moral.' In any case, she felt 'far better on less meat so no sacrifice comes in at all, only [she thought] it's nice not to feel so much like Dives & Belshazzar rolled into one at every meal.' Maud professed to enjoy the process of getting on a businesslike footing and 'seeing what we can do without.'

Kromdraai was also brought onto a war-time, profit-making basis. By February 1917, the electric light engine, once Hugh's pride, was switched off and candles only were in use. More farmland was put under crops than ever before. In July of that year, deciding that the stud was an expensive luxury, Wyndham sold his remaining horses and retired from horseracing altogether. Kromdraai was now run on a strictly commercial basis and, without the drag of the stud, started to pay. The Ayrshire herd was also sold. Wyndham planned to focus on crops and beef cattle and pigs. That July Wyndham had a record crop of maize, much of which was destined for Britain. Farmers elsewhere in the Transvaal were making similar adjustments, both for economy and in view of good rains, and Wyndham's Agricultural Supply Association was besieged for seed wheat and potatoes and, indeed, all sorts of crops. The acreage under wheat increased nationally by at least 25% in 1917. Wyndham planted wheat too, but this was flooded and he could reap only a tenth of the crop he expected. Rain, either too little or too much, interfered with farming operations on Kromdraai, reducing the harvest and Wyndham's purse.
South Africans, most of who were not as dependant on dividends and monies from Britain and perhaps accustomed to a lesser lifestyle, did not feel the pinch quite as soon as the Wyndhams did and therefore felt no immediate need for economy. Wyndham, like many of his relatives, facing the call-up of his chauffeur and a declining income, gave up his motorcar in 1914. Maud was cross over the way they were always asked why they don't have a motorcar. In vain she would say that there was a war and the chauffeur had gone to fight. She thought the people thought them 'mad & miserly & soon doubtless will add bankrupt.'

The Wyndhams undoubtedly made both forced and voluntary cost-cutting measures. Hugh told his mother in December 1915 that he was selling horses — 'cleaning out' the stables, 'for the sake of economy, clearance & cash.' At the time of the 1917 session, Wyndham's wardrobe was in a poor state. Maclean, Maud's lady's maid, providing her with regular reports, declared that Hugh's shirts were 'nearly all worn out' and that he had 'only 2 fit for wear.' On a previous occasion, a valet at the Mount Nelson, brushing Hugh's clothes, 'went thro' the seat of his trousers' so frail had they become and the news had disseminated so quickly that Maud, going downstairs, was confronted on each landing by 'a grinning menial.' Hugh was also, according to Maud, adjusting to financial prudence, taking the tram for instance and even buying season tickets and implementing other small cost-cutting measures, which he used to assure her were impossible to a born Wyndham.

Yet, it is also true that the Hugh Wyndhams were more attune than most South Africans were to what was happening in Britain, where cutbacks were the rule. In 1915 Lord Cobham closed in the hall, and the family sat exclusively in the library with only one fire. The new taxes took substantially more than half of his income, and he predicted that many people would go under over the next year. However, his industrialist interests, particularly in Rustless, a company producing copper casing for the front, eased his

263 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 23 Sep 1915, WSRO: PHA.
264 See, for example, Ivor Maxse to Violet Cecil, 28 Oct 1914, BLO: Violet Milner Papers, Box 15, C1/6; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 30 Oct 1914, HHA 2/36/73.
265 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Oct 1915, WSRO: PHA.
266 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 23 Dec 1915, WSRO: PHA.
267 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 Feb 1917, WSRO: PHA.
268 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Sep 1917, WSRO: PHA.
situation.\textsuperscript{270} As the war progressed, the South African public was called upon to make greater sacrifices and, at the end of 1917, Hugh complained of the new range of proposed taxes, including a house tax calculated on the number of rooms, which led Maud to consider converting one of the bedrooms into a bathroom to save the five shillings.\textsuperscript{271}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.2.png}
\caption{Figure 7.2: Reduction of servants at Wyndhams, December 1913 – December 1918 (Sources: various letters in the Petworth House Archives and Hagley Hall Archives.)}
\end{figure}

This economising was facilitated by a third impact of the war, also felt immediately: the departure of servants for the front. By October 1914, no fewer than six servants had left the Wyndhams employ for this reason, a cutback welcomed for both economic and social reasons.\textsuperscript{272} Hundreds of pounds were saved each year; while they could also be seen to be doing their bit, forgoing the pre-war high life and luxuries. Maud, on the day of the start of the Somme offensive, professed never to have a white butler in South Africa again – ‘they eat money & are very little use except for entertaining on a vast scale.’\textsuperscript{273} By mid-1917 the staff at Wyndhams was reduced to two white and three black servants in addition to a black gardener, which brought a saving on

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Dec-13 & Dec-14 & Dec-15 & Dec-16 & Dec-17 & Dec-18 \\
\hline
Black & 6 & 6 & 5 & 5 & 4 & 4 \\
White & 6 & 4 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{269} See, for example, Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 10 Jan 1917, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{270} Lord Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 8 Oct 1915, HHA 5/11/2/8.
\textsuperscript{271} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Nov 1917, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{272} Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 30 Oct 1914, HHA 2/36/73. See also Humphrey Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 7 Aug 1916, WSRO: Maxse Papers 455.
\textsuperscript{273} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 July 1916, WSRO: PHA.
the house in Parktown, in wages alone, of between £510 and £520 a year. The reduced lifestyle with fewer servants suited the Wyndhams financially and they could feel to be making the necessary wartime sacrifices and so share the deprivations suffered by relatives in Britain. In this sense, the war was amusing.

Towards the end of the war, all the talk in England was focused on food and rations. South Africa, where the consumer could still acquire Swiss cocoa and bottled Heinz’s beans and sauces, sent assistance in the form of maize and butter as well as regular shiploads of meat. The Wyndhams supplied their relatives in Britain with fruit and other farm produce, which, grown in the southern hemisphere, ripened when the scarcity was greatest in the northern hemisphere. Maud sent Lady Leconfield a parcel of prunes and raisins and later some bush tea, which could travel as ‘herbs’, other teas being forbidden. Raisins and currants and fruit cakes were sent to Petworth, Hagley, Forthampton and Falconhurst, although all sugar was confiscated. However, in South Africa, they were confronted with shortages of imported goods, and prices inflated, often artificially, by opportunistic shopkeepers and Wyndham help passed a Profiteering Bill. In both hemispheres Britons and their subjects were called upon to make ever greater sacrifices.

By late 1917 Wyndham’s finances were pinching severely. That September Maud noted how he was ‘becoming quite placable about what he calls the Lyttelton habit of saving ½ sheets, string etc.’ Having lost his chauffeur in 1914, Wyndham first resorted to taximen, but now invested ‘in train tickets & other little economies’, which, he used to
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281 NASAP: JUS 315, 1/239/14 Complaints re Shopkeepers raising cost of foodstuffs; Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Jun 1918, WSRO: PHA; and A. Marwick, The Deluge, p 42.
assure Maud ‘were impossible to a born Wyndham.’ The war and the associated uncertainties made financial planning impossible. The cost of maintaining Wyndhams and the additional accommodation cost in Cape Town during the session were astronomic. Yet, they did not want to let Wyndhams while they were in the Cape; instead they elected to take ‘a hovel’ in Cape Town and avoid the bills at the Mount Nelson, which cost Wyndham more per month than the maintenance of Wyndhams. And so, for the 1918 session, the Wyndhams took a small house in Newlands, which had been secured for them by the wife of the archbishop. The whole household went down with them, leaving Wyndhams deserted except for the gardener. Although conveniently close to Westbrook, the Buxton’s country house in Cape Town, it was a longish walk to the station and the Wyndhams could not dash into town easily making night sittings rather awkward for Hugh. The war was certainly something of a leveller.

The enormous human losses of the Great War were also less amusing. Before long, the names of relatives and friends swelled the casualty and honours lists. The war decimated the aristocracy and the Wyndham family was no exception. Hugh’s brother, Reginald, was killed in Flanders in November 1914. He and Hugh had always been close, especially since their days together at Eton. The news was dreadful, yet Hugh, comforting himself and his mother, believed that it was the death Reginald ‘would have chosen.’ Regy’s death meant that Hugh was now heir presumptive to the Leconfield title and estates. A flood of nephews and cousins followed and many more were wounded.

---
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290 Wyndham lost at least one nephew and nine cousins (see genealogy 6): Percy Wyndham (1914), George Wyndham (1915), Edward Wyndham Tennant (1916), Ivo Charteris, Richard Stanhope, and Hugo Charteris (1916), Philip Yorke (1917), Neil Primrose and George Hope (1918). Both of his surviving brothers at the front (Edward and Humphrey) were wounded, as were cousins too many to mention.
Maud's family was by comparison left relatively untouched. Lady Cobham, who attended the thanksgiving service in the church at Hagley on the day of the armistice, looked up at the list of congregants that had left for the front and felt 'supreme' to see the six Lyttelton names without a red †. No real damage had been done, although Jack, who had been invalided home, had been severely shell shocked. However, the family had been rocked that January with the suicide of Maud's sister, Frances Guest. The Lytteltons longed to be together, but, prevented by the circumstances of the war, had to resort to mail letters, which, as Rachel Lyttelton noted, were at such times 'a desperate recourse.' Hugh, who was particularly fond of Frances, did not write immediately. He was clearly touched and marvelled at how active death had been 'amongst those who [were] not subjected to the risks of war.' It was 'a case of "c'est la guerre" with a vengeance.'

6. Conclusion

Those who survived continued to serve King and Country. In South Africa, Wyndham served on the anti-corruption and 'Native liquor' commissions as well as the returned soldiers and pensions select committees. But, faced with further industrial unrest and rampant Afrikaner separatism, post-war South Africa seemed decidedly unappealing. Although the troops were mobilised in July 1918 to protect the mines and a general strike was averted, Wyndham wanted dramatic security intervention and was disappointed when nobody but 'a comparatively harmless international socialist called Bunting' was arrested for 'Bolshevism.' Moreover, the reaction to a talk he gave on

291 Bertie Tomlinson to his father, 5 Jun 1917, HHA 2/2/1; Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 12 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/3; and Jack Gibbs to Maud Wyndham, 22 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/7.
292 Henry Guest to Lady Cobham, 20 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/5; Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 21 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/6; and Lavinia Talbot to Maud Wyndham, 26 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/10.
293 Rachel Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 30 Jan 1918, HHA 2/2/12. See also Lady Cobham to Hugh Wyndham, 6 Mar 1918, HHA 2/2/22.
294 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 Jan 1918, WSRO: PHA.
295 Rachel Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 17 Feb 1918, HHA 2/2/18.
296 Alfred Hennessey to Patrick Duncan, 19 Sep 1918, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.18.7.; and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Sep 1918, WSRO: PHA.
297 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Jul 1918, WSRO: PHA.
Australia and the empire in August 1918 seemed to indicate that even Australia might not be saved for the empire.\textsuperscript{298}

The world had changed. Throughout the war the British aristocracy suffered blows on the political, economic and social fronts, and Britain and the empire seemed to fare little better.\textsuperscript{299} The British world, Lady Cobham grumbled, appeared ‘all very upside down.’ It was all so unsmug. After the South African War, Britain settled down and normality returned ‘in a minute.’\textsuperscript{300} However, Britain, she comforted herself, had ‘a weird way of “settling down” again – Last year we had “settled down” to the war.’\textsuperscript{301} After 1918 they would have to ‘settle down’ to the peace and what it brought.

\textsuperscript{298} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Aug 1918, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{299} Lady Cobham to Hugh Wyndham, 21 Dec 1918, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/17/12/1.
\textsuperscript{300} Lady Cobham to Hugh Wyndham, 21 Dec 1918, UBL: Masterman Papers, CFGM 1/17/12/1.
\textsuperscript{301} Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 26 Jan 1917, HHA 2/30/12.
CHAPTER EIGHT
Domesticity and servitude: Parktown and Kromdraai, 1901-1923

'It is difficult now to believe that when Lord Derby died in 1893 he left £62,000 to be divided between his 727 servants, gardeners, and the staff of the various branches of his estate, and still more difficult for me to believe that I lived in an era when such munificence was possible.'

OLIVER LYTTELTON, LORD CHANDOS, 1962, COMMENTING ON THE YEAR OF HIS BIRTH, 1893

'The servant class is passing away. The world is getting more democratic and a democracy is very bad soil in which to grow domestic servants.'

A.F. COX, JOHANNESBURG, 1920

As these quotations suggest, households across the British world underwent a dramatic transformation between the late nineteenth century and the period immediately after the Great War. The British Empire at the turn of the twentieth century was a complex organism, a vast interconnected but unequal world; with a layered social hierarchy at home that was replicated on the imperial periphery. Society – from Jamestown to Jodhpur and Johannesburg – was still divided into the servant keeping and serving classes. Yet, despite the great transformations played out within the walls of millions of homes, historians have mainly neglected the study of home life and domesticity in South Africa.

This is caused by the isolated nature of family homes and the difficulty to generate data: chiefly from the diaries, letters and memoirs of both the servant keeping and serving classes. As Charles van Onselen has pointed out in an insightful study that ends in 1914, in South Africa the class-race-literacy problematique places such personal records at a premium.\(^5\) And this is particularly the case of those records generated by the serving classes as literacy levels seemingly followed closely the social order. Such records are also very difficult to assess, for conditions varied greatly from house to house according to the social status, occupation and character of the employer. Yet, rare finds, such as the Hugh and Maud Wyndham correspondence in the Petworth House and Hagley Hall archives, allow exploratory conclusions.

1. **The Serving classes**

Servants were in themselves a distinction of wealth. Their endless work, preparing the houses, moving the household, looking after the family, providing a hospitable welcome for an endless stream of guests, made leisure possible. They - particularly their numbers and functions - were a mark of a man’s success and symbolized that he and his wife had a genteel lifestyle. The higher his social status the more likely a man was to have servants and servants in an abundance of specialized roles. Well-heeled families employed as large and varied a staff as they could afford.\(^6\) The Drummond Chaplins, fellow Unionists and close friends of Hugh and Maud, had a large household. In addition to a housekeeper and butler, there were at least seven lesser servants and a gardener with a staff of eight ‘garden boys.’\(^7\) This tally of 17 was marginally larger than that at Wyndhams, which, before the war, may have been as many as 12. (Table 8.1).

---
\(^7\) Diary of Marguerite Chaplin, Christmas 1912, UCT Libraries: BC831 Drummond Chaplin papers.
Hugh initially kept only a cook and housemaid and hoped to maintain 'a limited & very select household' after his marriage to Maud and their move to Hull's house, which they purchased late in 1909. Maud arrived in December of that year, and, finding that 'Hugh has made a sad hash of it,' she set about getting the house into order and appointing additional servants, whose numbers by 1914 had grow to at least twelve. This was not abnormal on the Rand or even South Africa, most families in the upper and middling classes keeping several domestics. As might be expected, the leading businessmen, financiers and industrialists kept the largest domestic staffs: the Dale Laces of Northwards in Parktown, for example, maintained a staff of more than twenty, comprising 'six white servants (cook, butler, coachman and three housemaids), and twice

Table 8.1: Three Wyndham brothers and the size of their households at the turn of the twentieth century (P. Blackwell, "An Undoubted Jewell": a case study of five Sussex country houses, 1880-1914, Southern History 1981, 3, pp 183-200; Lord Egremont, Wyndham and Children First, p 14; supplemented by data gleaned from correspondence in the Petworth House and Hagley Hall archives.)

Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Nov 1909, WSRO: PHA.
Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 15 Nov 1909 and 11 Dec 1909, WSRO: PHA.
Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Dec 1909, WSRO: PHA.
as many black servants." And even Thomas Boydell, the Durban Labourite, kept servants; an 'umfaan' or 'kitchen boy' and a so-called 'girl.'

2. Hiring and firing: the recruitment and severance of servants

For many working-class men and unmarried women, domestic service was the most available source of employment and as late as 1911, it remained by far the largest single category of female employment in Britain, having almost doubled in size during the period between 1851 and 1911 to 2,127,000 (39 per cent of the total occupied female population). The empire brought increased opportunity for such employment and at the turn of the twentieth century vast swathes of the serving class were migrating to the settlement dominions.

Servants as a whole were a highly dependent group and servanthood demanded, and therefore also taught, docility. The servant was told to be respectful to the master and mistress, which confirmed traditional deference within the working class. They could not risk protest; they had at least to pretend subservience. Employers and their recruiting agents furthermore sought servants who had 'something' in their antecedents worthy of recommendation: ideally having already held stable, long-term employment and at 'good establishments.'

The Wyndhams recruited servants in several ways, one of which was directly from other good households. Hugh's chauffeur had driven H.C. Hull, the Minister of Finance, and, in 1913, he appointed a cook who had served the Bishop of Marlborough for six years and then the Bishop of Winchester at Farnham Castle. Government House, frequented by the Wyndhams, was also scanned for talent. In 1902 Hugh recruited the parlourmaid at Government House, Cape Town and in February 1916 the head kitchen

---

12 Eva Boydell to Thomas Boydell, 2 Nov and 4 Nov 1918, NASAP: A75 Thomas Boydell Collection, vol 1.
14 'I have run the advertisement: her name is Elizabeth Emmerton. There is nothing in her antecedents worthy of recommendation: she has only held places for a few months at a time and seemingly no good places.' F.A. Maxse to Lady Caroline Maxse, 19 June 1875, BLO: Violet Milner Papers, Box 15, Cl/6.
maid at Government House, Pretoria, was engaged as cook.\textsuperscript{16} And Maclean, Maud's lady's maid had been with the Buxton girls.\textsuperscript{17} However, good antecedents were not always a recommendation. In 1909, Maud complained to Lady Leconfield that Light, one of the maids, who gave 'a lot of trouble', 'hurled the Earl of Berkeley at me whose parlourmaid she had been.'\textsuperscript{18}

The South African Expansion Committee and its successor, the South African Colonisation Society, together with similar immigration societies, perhaps the preferred means of less well-heeled employers, was another very useful vehicle for obtaining servants and also freeing black 'houseboys' for the mines and developing 'a stable and loyal British working class in the Transvaal.' Such servants were expected to sign a contract for a year or more in return for the passage, and the vetting of the agency supposedly made such servants attractive propositions. Yet, as Hugh experienced in 1902, such recruitment was not without its problems: 'the Colonisation Society failed to supply both the quantity and quality of servant demanded in Johannesburg.'\textsuperscript{19} Having bought his first Parktown house, in Queen Street, he used the Immigration Society to obtain a cook. A certain Mrs Franklin was selected and shipped at Hugh's expense to Cape Town, where, upon arrival, 'she was discovered to be such a low character' that it was found inadvisable to allow her to proceed to Johannesburg. 'The result is', Hugh complained to his sister:

'I am still, after considerable trouble & expense, cookless. ... But how can it succeed if the people at home send out the very scum of the earth. It seems to me it would be better to say at once that a good woman is not available to sending out women who only turn out to be blackguards. ... I shall certainly not deal with them again.'\textsuperscript{20}

He never did.

\textsuperscript{15} Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 17 May 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 28 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/30.
\textsuperscript{16} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA
\textsuperscript{17} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 Dec 1915, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{18} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
A third alternative was a personal visit to the recruiting registries in Britain in the hope of 'finding a treasure.' This the Wyndhams did in April 1912, when practically all the servants were replaced. Lady Cobham, Maud's mother, made the shipping arrangements, sending all second-class. The registry fee was often high for abroad and also as a percentage on the wages, although this did differ from centre to centre. Although a contract-bound servant was something of a guarantee in a labour scarce post-1902 Johannesburg, conflict arose when the expectations created by the registry or society were not met by the employer. This gave rise to 'injured looks' and elaborate respectfulness and talk of broken promises.

The family and social network also produced information and often servants, and Maud, remote in South Africa, was well tapped into the net. Writing to her mother-in-law in 1912, she even advertised the availability of a servant in Germany. And, in 1917, Maud recruited 'two black boys' for Mrs Carter, wife of the Archbishop of Cape Town, and sent them to Bishopscourt. The Hugh Wyndhams were also recipients in this network: in 1912 Hugh's sister and brother-in-law, Ivor and Tiny Maxse, secured for them a butler, a certain Wright, who had served under Maxse in the Grenadier Guards.

A fifth option was to recruit from a family already in service. This Hugh did at Kromdraai, where the whole Spiller family worked for him: Mr Spiller as agent and Mrs as cook. The danger of employing a family group was a mass desertion if there was a fall-out with one of them. This happened in September 1906, as Hugh complained to his mother:

'The Spillers are leaving me in a body. Spiller developed an unfortunate habit of calling everybody on the place (I hope and believe I am excepted) a "waster." It seemed to me therefore hardly compatible with the peace of the place to continue to employ him. I regret this very much, as Mrs Spiller was undoubtedly a really

---

20 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 21 June 1902, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
21 Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 9 May 1912, HHA 2/34/34.
23 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
24 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 10 Nov 1917, WSRO: PHA.
25 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 24 Apr 1912, WSRO: PHA.
26 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 May 1906, WSRO: PHA.
good cook. I don’t know if I told you that [Mrs] Ruxton has come here, & I trust she will remain faithful.\(^{27}\)

Wyndham therefore also had another couple, the Ruxtons, in his employ. Robert Ruxton had been his first agent at Kromdraai and now Louisa Ruxton was cook.\(^{28}\)

Then recruitment was sometimes also left to the servants. There is one reference to the butler’s intervention in a Wyndham household (Lady Leconfield’s), when a footman was fired for making love to one of the maids in the pantry, and another promptly secured.\(^{29}\) There is no reference to the butler at Wyndhams taking a similar line, although Maud clearly appreciated the promptness of the one at 12 Great Stanhope Street, who sounded ‘a treasure.’\(^{30}\)

There were several reasons for the severance of servants. These ranged from bad interpersonal relationships, with the employers and other servants, to the hunt for better prospects and economy. The Hugh Wyndhams also closed their Parktown residence when they left on their regular, extended, pre-war visits to Britain and the continent. This not only saved the household expenses but also gave them an opportunity to replace ‘troublesome’ servants on a regular basis. The servant was invariably dismissed in South Africa, while candidates were interviewed and hired in Britain: the intervening-months were a saving on wages. Those servants who ‘gave satisfaction’ (‘in their horrible vernacular’), were placed at other houses pending the return of the Wyndhams.\(^{31}\)

3. Duties of Servants

There were many types of servants at Wyndhams, all graded according to their function in the household. The highest-ranking Wyndham servant was the butler, who was in charge of the male and female servants and received a salary of £10. His duties

\(^{27}\) Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA. (Emphasis is HAW’s.)
\(^{28}\) Lister to Wyndham, 31 Aug 1903; handwritten note by Wyndham, 30 Sep 1903, NASAP: ZTPD 5/634, f.73/1907; Robert Ruxton to Secretary for Lands, 2 Dec 1904, NASAP: PWD 272, file 6718/04; Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 22 Sep 1906, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{29}\) Lady Leconfield to Maud Wyndham, 14 June 1912, HHA 2/34/45.
\(^{30}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 July 1912, WSRO: PHA.
\(^{31}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Apr 1909, WSRO: PHA.
varied. He was in charge of the silver and plate, supervised their cleaning, and guarded it against theft. He cared for Hugh's clothing, shined his shoes and boots, and made sure Hugh looked good at all times. A good butler was prompt, had an intimate knowledge of the family, and was always at hand but, at the same time, unobtrusive. Failure to attain these virtues sometimes brought ridicule. Maud's brother, Jack Lyttelton, when Selborne's ADC, described the butler at Government House as 'the most fatuous idiot... with the manners of a wart hog.'

The butler was also in charge of the wine cellar. John Wyndham, Hugh's nephew, recounts the way the butler hovered, sometimes unsteadily, over dinners at Petworth in his youth. To the young Wyndhams he was god-like until their Uncle Charles explained 'that one can keep a cellar or a butler, but one cannot keep both.' Pantry work was reckoned the ruin of the drinking classes and servants found inebriated were quickly sent away. While there is no evidence that Wright was ever found 'fuddled', he did have one vice and that was dressing too smartly. Some of the qualifications for butler were good looks and a good physique and, to be sure, to be well dressed himself, but, very important, was not to outperform his master. Wright, the Guards reservist, secured for by Hugh's brother-in-law, General Ivor Maxse, was 'a fine young man beautifully dressed, far better every day than Hugh's best effort', which, by Maud's evidence, was not difficult to achieve.

By all accounts, and even those of the cook, who was his nemesis, Wright was an exceptionally good butler. He studied the Wyndhams, which Maud thought 'a comfort to hear', knew their routines, their wants and their pleasures, and was always at hand to

---

32 Lady Cobham captures the essence of the butler at Hagley and his duties in a delightful letter to her daughter in South Africa. The new butler at Hagley, Charville, was 'very like the comical little tubby clergyman (Mr Tibbetts) at Frankley (but far more stately & gentlemanlike!) so now he is called Tibbetts.' He was an improvement on Harris, his predecessor, folding 'the newspapers when scattered & somehow they are always at hand & on one table: he valets far better & doesn't forget or hide things, but he isn't a clockmaker, like Harris, so many clocks have given up going, but the footmen are already much more brightened up & in hand.' See Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 9 May 1912, HHA 2/34/34.  
33 Jack Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 4 Sep 1905, HHA 2/21/31. Rachel Lyttelton, who visited her sister and brother-in-law in 1910 and knew their chauffeur, noted to her mother that the motor was 'rather dilapidated & Pearson hasn't cut his hair since I last saw him.' See Rachel Lyttelton to Lady Cobham, 3 Oct 1910, HHA 2/5/2.  
provide them. The Wyndhams hoped to retain Wright's services for a long time, but this ended in 1914 when he was called up to serve in the First World War. His absence was felt as, in 1916, Hugh attended the wedding of General Botha's daughter in an oatmeal coloured suit as his top hat could not be found: 'Wright now in Flanders the only person who could apparently unearth it.' So there was always 'a balance of considerations on the subject.'

The highest-ranking female servant in the Wyndham household was the cook, who, earning £9 per month, kept the keys to the store, kept the household books and accounts, ordered in food and supplies, and supervised the maids. She very much ran the house, yet was customarily subordinate to the butler. The cook was most often a widow, but certainly expected to be 'a steady middle-aged woman ... morally exemplary and assiduous to the harmony, comfort, and economy of the family.' Yet, the Wyndhams seemingly encountered several 'troublesome' cooks: from Mrs Booker dismissed in 1909 for overspending and poor economy to Mrs Gray dismissed for her bickering, and then the fraulein who was forced to leave in 1914.

The blurring of duties, of which servant was expected to do what, caused conflict at Wyndhams. This confirms the presence of a rigid hierarchy. When Hugh lost his housemaid in November 1901, the cook, much to her chagrin, was expected to fill in. Maud, at various times, encountered similar protests. The difference between the English etiquette and South African practice was sometimes the cause of the conflict. In 1912, one such argument arose. Maud takes up the story:

---

35 Maud Wyndham to Lord Cobham, 5 May 1912, HHA 2/34/33; Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 May 1912, WSRO: PHA.
36 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 June 1912, WSRO: PHA.
37 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 13 Apr 1916, WSRO: PHA.
38 'Can I come and help you at all about trouble in your establishment? I would come if you desired it - on Wednesday or perhaps Thursday. I may be useful. - I am quite aware that Shaw has become an incubus: he saves you trouble in many ways but he gives it in other forms: he does nothing but "command" - but the command is clearly obnoxious. - Nevertheless he so thoroughly understands & studies all your wishes and ways that I fear you would feel his loss. - There is a balance of considerations on the subject.' F.A. Maxse to Lady Caroline Maxse, 21 Aug 1875, BLO: Violet Milner Papers, Box 15, C1/7.
39 P. Horn, The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant, p 54.
40 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Feb 1909, WSRO: PHA. - 'The present cook is a very nice woman & the bills have gone down appreciatively. I believe Booker has gone to Mrs Schumacher who is sure to keep an eye on her.'
41 Hugh Wyndham to Mary Maxse, 15 Nov 1901, WSRO: Maxse Papers 50.
'This time it was on the subject of who should lay the servants meals. - Did you know in England there is a rigid etiquette about it - the scullery maid lays the breakfast - the footman lays the dinner & supper, & the 2nd housemaid the tea - we follow the rules as far as we can - & I'm not sure [what] the row was about & when I mentioned it to the butler he said with a grin it was a "row all about nothing." However today all has smoothed over & I only tell you because you are amused with these details. I gather the chauffeur who was with Hull has been telling the butler that things are done differently out here to in England. I said I knew that & that an English cook once left Mrs. Hull because she was expected to dust the drawing room. Gray looked just as horrified as if I'd said she'd been expected to steal - & of course a cook who would submit to such an indignity must be a different class altogether - a cook general. Having all the rigid rules & regulations does end in the house running smoothly - tho' there may be ructions at times ..."42

The cook had several kitchen helpers to support her. There was always a kitchen maid to assist with food preparation and a scullery maid (the lowest of the female servants) to clean the pots and pans, a particularly gruelling job after a large party. The butler also had his staff, which numbered at least one housemaid and probably as many as three so-called 'house boys', the latter fulfilling the function of footmen: they laid the table, waited at table, served tea, answered the door and assisted the butler generally. The housemaids swept, dusted, polished, cleaned, and washed from dawn to dusk, often with the help of the 'houseboys.' Surprisingly there seems to have been little difference between the wages of a housemaid and 'houseboy.'43 Yet, a white housemaid was by far preferred, and particularly as a means to limit the corners of the house where 'the houseboy' might penetrate.44 Extra staff was contracted for large events. When the Wyndhams hosted a soiree for the 200 delegates to the Unionist Congress that sat in

42 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, undated [c. Aug 1912], WSRO: PHA.
43 In 1905 a housemaid in Johannesburg might earn between £4 and £5, a wage a 'houseboy' could reasonably expect the same in 1906. C. van Onselin, New Babylon, New Nineveh, pp 215-16.
Johannesburg in November 1912, eight waiters — 'too many [Maud thought] but Wright wishes for eight' - were hired together with an additional cook in the kitchen.45

The cook was often a terror to the other servants; an image sometimes portrayed in fiction (vide Mrs Fairfax in *Jane Eyre*) and this was true for a succession of ladies in the Wyndhams' employ. Mrs Gray, from Maud's accounts, was certainly the most difficult. In June 1912 Maud shared the details of a series of scraps between Gray and the other servants: ranging from Wright, the butler, to the 'pantry boy.' Her tirade began with the delinquencies of the 'kitchen boy' who supposedly stole flour and then those of the 'pantry boy' with whom she had great difficulty to keep 'in his place.' That led to Wright and his unwillingness to help. Gray also had a 'kind of an argument' with Georgina Mason, the housemaid for whom their mistress had a soft spot, on the subject of who should look after the housemaid stores. Georgina had always done this, although not the custom. Gray decided to give in as Georgina had been engaged before her — otherwise she would have insisted on doing so herself.46 Georgina Mason, as Gray probably appreciated, was one of Maud's. favourites — 'Georgina is as ever perfect & seems to mind nothing & be ready for anything'47 — and making issue over such a minor matter for little gain would be a gaffe.

Maud also had the service of a lady's maid, who was her personal attendant. She was responsible for the appearance of her mistress, attended to her boudoir and wardrobe, and repaired her clothes. Maud had an excellent lady's maid in Murphie, who left Wyndhams in December 1915 to set up a dressmaking business in the town. Her new maid, Maclean, who came from Government House, where she had served the Buxton girls, pleased Maud and the following amusing account captures the essence of her duties:

' **My new maid seems v. nice & obliging & neat as neat w’th is everything for me. Very much the typical ladies maid “excuse me M’m, there’s a little too much**

45 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Nov 1912, WSRO: PHA; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 17 Nov 1912, WSRO: PHA.
46 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 29 June 1912, WSRO: PHA.
47 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 28 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/30.
powder by the right eyebrow” – Me going down like a miller. I doubt if she’s as
good a dressmaker as Murphie, but one can’t have everything. 48

The lady’s maid was there to wait on her lady ‘on one hand & foot, button every button & fiddle abt one’s things for ever.’ 49

Servants invariably accompanied the Wyndhams on the migration south. Maud’s lady’s maid accompanied them to the Mount Nelson, and if staying in self-catering accommodation the cook and housemaid were added. 50 High Constantia Maud thought comfortable, though hideous and needing much housekeeping, and she longed for the little bungalow at St James, close to the sea, with room for the family only and the maids in the hotel. 51 In 1914 they were back at the Mount Nelson. 52 Maud was thankful to be free of the servants – ‘at least Murphie & Wright.’ They did not take the car so Patrick stayed in Johannesburg to guard the house with Georgina. The new cook – Gray’s successor – was ‘v. likely going to Lady Albu.’ 53

No domestic servants were maintained at Kromdraai, which was left in the care of Wyndhams agent and his farm staff. Some of the servants accompanied the Wyndhams on their visits to the farm. This they apparently enjoyed – ‘...the servants beaming. Gray is quite another person & hasn’t grumbled once. Webster the electrician comes in & talks every evening & the Gladstone’s cook has been en visite so they have not felt inclined to go “melancholy mad” as Moody did. I hope the rest of the household haven’t gone to the dogs in Jbg.’ 54 ‘The farm is flourishing but v. cold – we picnicked – with a savage to cook. H & I made the bed, which he is quite good at, tho’ he insisted on the door being shut – I suppose to avoid the searching eye of “all Europe” thro out the savage was in the house.’ 55

After moving into Hull’s house late in 1909, the Wyndhams engaged a German by the name of Marsburg to attend to the gardens. Hugh thought him ‘entirely ignorant of

48 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA.
49 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 July 1917, WSRO: PHA.
50 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 27 Mar 1912, WSRO: PHA.
51 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 12 Feb and 17 Feb 1913, WSRO: PHA.
52 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 3 Feb 1914, WSRO: PHA.
53 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 8 July 1914, WSRO: PHA.
54 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 1 Aug 1912, WSRO: PHA.
55 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 28 Jan 1914, HHA 2/36/30.
the art of gardening’, but Marsburg’s capacity for ‘an enormous amount of work, ... the most necessary qualification out here’ was attractive. Nonetheless an expert was engaged for a weekly visit. Sadly, as Maud reports, Marsburg was sent away in February 1912:

‘The only piece of domestic news is that Marsburg our gardener-caretaker up in Johannesburg has gone mad & the police have taken him away & left a constable in charge till arrangements can be made. That’s all we’ve heard yet – by wire. I wonder if they found him wrecking the house – We knew he’d a long & strenuous devotion to the bottle, w[hi]ch no doubt has melted his brain away – I feel the house is safer now he’s gone – it’s well insured that’s one comfort.’

4. Employer-Servant relations

The servants of this period had a tradition of service. It was not necessarily thought servile to serve and many families were for many generations in the service of another. Furthermore, as Oliver Lyttelton has noted, ‘many a butler and nurse or maid were the trusted and loved friends of the family. They taught the youth the standards that were expected of them, and who of my generation did not learn to fish or shoot from some keeper and absorb from him some of the lore and the lessons of the countryside?’

Maud established such a relationship with her governess, Miss Braginton. Affectionately known to her charges as ‘Wags’, she arrived at Hagley in 1893, where she remained as governess to the Lyttelton girls until 1907. They were extremely close and shared an honest relationship, ‘Wags’ telling them on one occasion in 1901 that she had ‘never met such a vulgar minded family as the Lytteltons – never.’ She was particularly close to Maud and was devastated when the time came to leave to Hagley and the family to whom she had become so attached. She told Maud that ‘No place will ever be to me what Hagley is & still less any one take your place in my affection.’ She went on to
express her affection for Maud as well as a longing desire to 'have you near me once more.'

Wags followed Maud to South Africa where, in 1912, she took up the position of housekeeper at Government House for the Gladstones, and then the Buxtons, Connaughts and Athlones. Wags took up where she left off, forever Maud's defender. She was a close friend and regular dinner and houseguest; sometimes staying at Wyndhams with Maud while Hugh was away. And when Maud's favourite uncle died in 1913 Wags was there to console her. She was also invited to social gatherings where other aristocrats were present: during a visit of the Greys, Wags was a great feature and, Maud reported home, 'they have all made great friends.' 'Wags' remained a newsworthy Lyttelton topic. And several other members of the Lyttelton family continued to keep touch and send her photographs of their offspring. She eventually died in 1928 in Maud's home.

Maud's brother, Caryl, reminisced, on hearing of Wags' death, that while:

'she wasn't the best sort of governess for us temperamentally... she was a real cog in the wheel of the Hagley uniqueness when she was there & was by no means an unsympathetic incongruity.'

But, of course, not all servants were adopted in this way. In 1912, Maud, considering her household the nicest she had ever had, realized exactly how little she knew them – 'tho' when I hear them laughing & talking among 'emselves I think how little one knows of any of 'em.' Wyndham had to court labour for Kromdraai, which in 1904 was scarce, and here he had fewer difficulties: 'I have comparatively no difficulty
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in getting labourers on the farm, though I have to pay them what I know to be an excessive wage.\textsuperscript{73} Away from the house the servants had their quarters. In May 1904, Wyndham announced that he just ‘obtained 2 native families to come & squat on the farm & work’ for him. Their first act was to erect dwellings: ‘one out of turf sods with a rush roof, which looks very appropriate - the other family, however, very proudly brought along with them some corrugated iron, which I fear will result in a fearful eye sore being erected.’\textsuperscript{74} Africans did not enter Wyndham’s daily life except as servants or labourers. They were mostly perceived in their occupational role, a one-dimensional perception that denied their human feelings and needs and their having thoughts and opinions.

White servants were treated a little differently. Their work was less menial and, as butlers, farm managers, and personal maids, they were more closely involved in the lives of the Wyndhams. Consequently, we know more about Wright the butler and considerably less about ‘the black boy’ who served breakfast, indeed he remains anonymous.\textsuperscript{75} Yet, while white servants were deemed to have thoughts, even the records and opinions of De Mestre, Wyndham’s manager, in whose trust Kromdraai was often left, had to be vouched for.\textsuperscript{76} Social distance separated the Wyndhams and their companions from all that was ‘dull’ and ‘not a very exciting’\textsuperscript{77} and Maud later admitted that she found it ‘tiresome’ that in South Africa all white women, regardless of background, were ‘ladies.’\textsuperscript{78} In Maud’s world this was a title set aside for the wife of a peer and the daughters of the higher orders of the nobility. Yet in August 1912, several years after Ruxton left their service, Hugh and Maud went to lunch at the Ruxton homestead.\textsuperscript{79}
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Yet, despite obvious class differences and the construction of a good amount of social distance, with their staff the Wyndhams formed quasi-kinship with reciprocal bonds of paternalism and deference. Paternalism was double-edged: servants, like children, were both cared for and firmly admonished. But few servants' diaries or accounts survive to balance the view from the top: none have been found for Wyndhams or Kromdraai. Several members of the family, including Lady Leconfield, became acquainted with the staff during lengthy visits and regular enquiries after them show some attachment. Several of the servants were treated as daughters of the house. Alice, their wartime cook, married from Wyndhams, where she had her wedding breakfast and the champagne was supplied by Hugh and Maud.80

Such bonds did not mean that all was domestic bliss. Conflict arose between the Wyndhams and their servants and for several reasons. First of all, it was dangerous for a servant to attempt to close the social distance. The social pretensions of servants were amusing, but not admired. Lady Cobham, in whose service Gray the cook had been, warned Maud that 'she makes one feel she ought to be in clover always, but doesn't mean it so do take no notice.'81 While not appreciated, servants who inhabited the social gap were tolerated as long they served well. There was, as Admiral Frederick Maxse wrote to his mother on her butler, always a balance of considerations on the subject.82

Of this Hugh and Maud were well aware. A personal servant was expected to study the habits of the employer and so anticipate every need. However, the all-hearing, all-seeing servants brought the risk of gossip, and this was rife among Johannesburg and Cape Town socialites. One of the latter was Mary Drew, the widowed sister of Herbert Gladstone and therefore Maud's cousin. Mary Drew, Maud complained to her mother, loved intrigues and 'diddle diddles of any kind.' She 'tells her maid everything & gets her to tell her - what our servants thought of us for instance - & any little thing she harps on for ever.'83 This was unforgivable, especially as Hugh was a particularly private man. Yet, Maud discussed Mary with Wags, indicating the extent to which her former
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governess had been adopted by the Lytteltons, and otherwise avoided Mrs Drew, cold-shouldering her on several occasions. The servants were apparently not confronted.

Serious, too, was a subtle boycott of the employer’s will when the advice of the servant was dismissed. This Mrs Spiller, the cook at Kromdraai, attempted in June 1906.84 Three months later, in September, the Spillers left him as a group. In general, however, the Wyndhams seem to have been very accommodating. In 1912, Maud even allowed her servants their request that they have the use of her sitting room on a semi-permanent basis.85 They also hired extra staff when needed, although, as Maud recounted, this was not always appreciated.86

There were also strict conventions on what each servant was expected to do. Most servants were intimately familiar with these conventions and some, such as Light, the parlour maid, refused to do anything out of their routine. The old German cook, who was pressed out of Wyndham service by the other servants in 1914, proclaimed, when a new employer wanted her to do something special, that she ‘had never been accustomed to do it at Mrs Wyndham’s’.87 Clearly practice influenced convention and created a hazy arena for domestic strife.

Conflict between the servants often arose, although normally in Maud’s absence88 or when a pecking order was being established among new servants: such as the ceaseless sniping between Gray and Wright. Pleasant servants were a main concern to Maud; they were a prerequisite for a peaceful household and unobtrusive domestic service. Servants that bickered among themselves were ‘rather tiresome’ and, no matter how much Maud tried to take no notice, this did have an impact on their efficiency.89 When the Wyndhams were away, Hugh’s agent went by the house to supervise.

Some conflict followed racial lines. The senior servants were invariably white and many were only too willing to leave the more menial work to their black counterparts.90

This naturally was not well received and the normal reaction, according to Mrs Gray, was
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one of ‘Me no understand Missis.’ Maud seemingly appreciated the complexity of the situation: in April 1912 she recorded that it was ‘quite refreshing to see [the white servants] doing things for [th]emselves & not waiting for a black.’ In time the Wyndhams replaced most of their white staff with black men, although largely as an economy. By 1917 the staff at Wyndhams had been reduced to a cook and a housemaid, both white, and three ‘houseboys.’ The housemaid, Georgina Mason, was very hardworking, never sparing herself. And she expected equally exacting work from the ‘houseboys.’ Sometimes, it would seem, Georgina raised her voice. This led in January 1919 to a deputation, ‘consisting of William the pantry boy & a Zulu houseboy,’ to Maud who was seemingly a mutually acceptable arbitrator.

Gray, who was cook for two years (1912-14), appears to have been the first servant to have canvassed Maud’s support, and for her ongoing clashes with the Wright. In April 1912, they scrapped over jam and the amount of butter the butler used at breakfast. Maud, placed in a difficult position, took the butler’s part. She could not pursue it and hoped that all would blow over, which of course it did not. The ruckus continued. By early July 1912, after only three months, Gray informed Maud that ‘Me & him don’t speak.’ She claimed to have given Wright his place as butler – Maud thought Hugh had – ‘and yet he snubs her.’ This was now becoming ‘rather tiresome’ although Maud still took no notice. Over the next months, Maud continued to be drawn into the storeroom for a tête-à-tête with the cook, which always heralded war. The precipitating event varied from the division of duties to the comments of the other servants on the poor quality of the food Gray prepared for them. Maud hesitated to intervene and countered with her normal response, as she told Lady Leconfield ‘it’s wonderful what platitudes will do.’
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Far more serious, and more tangible, was the theft that resulted from poor housekeeping or the bad monitoring of household accounts. Parktown residents seem generally to have been confronted with this problem.98 The very first issue of *The South African Woman* reminded its readers in June 1920 ‘that no one is a housekeeper naturally, but that it is a business – and a very complicated one – that has to be learnt like any other.’ Housekeeping it went on was just as involved as cooking; the only difference being ‘that, whereas bad cooking cannot be hidden, bad management is only detected when it has gone on for some time.’99 Of all the servants at Wyndhams, the cook, who also kept the household accounts and ordered in the provisions, was particularly well placed to abuse her position. Many employers were less than thorough in their scrutiny of them. But not so Maud: after only a few months at Wyndhams, she dismissed Booker for ‘overspending and poor economy.’100 The cook naturally fell back on poor billing or, as Gray did, the iniquities of the other staff.101 Buying, *The South African Woman* columnist went on, was one of the most important branches of housekeeping. It actively combated theft and gave the housewife the added advantage of discovering daily what was cheap, enabling her to take advantage of the market.102

Bad cooking, unlike poor housekeeping, was immediately detectable. Gray’s poor attention to food preparation and its presentation surfaced again and again. The other servants left Wright to take up the matter with her and when he did Gray would summon Maud ‘into the inner sanctum’ where she would pour forth her woes. By November 1912 Maud had had enough: ‘She’s a v. good old soul but stupid – she will order in vast hunks of meat at a time w[hi]ch she cooks & recooks till one might as well cook boots.’103 The ructions continued and in December Maud, for the first time, expressed the thought of dismissing her. Gray was really a bad cook – not up to the place. She made ‘heavenly scones & biscuits always but anything else is liable to collapse.’ Her soup tasted like ‘something from ‘the Pig & Whistle in a country town’ and moreover she complained that
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the dinner parties, according to Maud ‘I hardly ever have 14 people & never 16’, broke her down. Additionally she was a bad manger and ‘a deadly enemy of Wright’s’ and had resolved ‘never to speak to him again except on business, & she never has.’ This was too tiresome.\textsuperscript{104}

On 21 December 1912 Gray entered the dining room while the Wyndhams were at breakfast and ‘plumped the house books & keys with a dramatic gesture on the table resigning office because [Maud] had written in the books that henceforward [they] sh[oul]d not pay for things [she] had not signed for in the order books.’ Gray and the tradesman had been ordering anything they wanted after Maud had signed. Maud objected. Poor Gray furthermore gave Hugh cold pudding on a hot plate which he resented.\textsuperscript{105} The cook was dressed down. And all ‘was smoothed over for the 11th time.’\textsuperscript{106} In January, having been summoned into the storeroom once more, Maud decided to dismiss Gray after the end of the parliamentary session.\textsuperscript{107} This she did and Gray received her marching orders on 1 April 1913. The cook, with the prospect of going to Maud’s close friend, Lady Kathleen Villiers, took it with marvellous calmness. She said she always meant to take a temporary place when we went back to England.\textsuperscript{108}

In 1914 they were back at the Mount Nelson.\textsuperscript{109} Maud was thankful to be free of the servants – ‘at least Murphie & Wright’ – and, as they did not take the car, Patrick stayed in Johannesburg to guard the house with Georgina. The new cook – Gray’s successor – was ‘v. likely going to Lady Albu’ for the duration of the session.\textsuperscript{110} As for Gray, she disappeared for the moment. She did not contact the other servants – neither Georgina nor Murphie - and did not ask Maud for a character reference. All presumed she had returned to the United Kingdom, which Maud reckoned good as ‘her temper was too bad for out here.’\textsuperscript{111} However, Gray was still on the Reef. She requested a reference from Maud and got a place as cook at a hospital at £10 a month, which, having had a fearful
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row with the matron, she soon lost. Maud’s new cook - a Teutonic marvel in the kitchen - she considered a great success and on 8 July 1914 informed her mother that ‘peace is reigning now with the nice old German.’

This peace did not last long and was shattered, within weeks, by the events following the assassinations in Sarajevo. On 25 July Maud wrote to Lady Leconfield, telling her that with:

‘the Austrians ... biding their time to pounce ... the household [was] far from being at peace & comfortable with the old German cook they all loathe her & ultimatums have been issued that it she stays on they don’t.’

Up till now Maud had quite liked her. The food was homely and very German and Hugh enjoyed her puddings. Yet, the other servants did not have the same appreciation. They scorned the food, saying it was stale and poorly prepared and castigated her as a ‘scandalizer’, gossiping about her past employers. Maud’s problem was that she considered the other servants real treasures and couldn’t bear to part with any of them.

And, in any case, with war approaching a Teutonic cook could be seen as unpatriotic. The German cook simply had to go and fortunately the Wyndhams had only engaged her until 10 September, so they could part in harmony.

5. Impact of the First World War

On Wednesday, 5 August, Wright walked into the sitting room at Wyndhams and announced that war had been declared in Europe. The effect was immediate and, as we have seen (chapter 7), one of the first at Wyndhams to feel the consequences was the German cook. Wartime change and household economy sometimes went hand in hand. At Wyndhams the economising was facilitated by one immediate impact of the war: the departure of servants for the front. By October 1914, no less than six servants had left the Wyndhams employ for this reason. The first to go was the butler. Wright, who was on
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the reserve of Grenadiers, left on 19 August to rejoin the British Army. Maud hoped he would ‘survive & come back to us as he’s a v. nice man.’\textsuperscript{116} Overjoyed at going, and looking very smart & happy in khaki, she wondered whether he would ‘be able to stoop so low’ again. He left with the “Queen’s”, and 2000 other reservists, for Cape Town, wherefrom they departed by boat for Europe and he rejoined the Grenadiers.\textsuperscript{117} In the absence of a butler, Maud’s maid looked after Hugh’s wardrobe. A ‘precise & pernickety person’ she gave Maud regular ‘bulletins of the state of Hugh’s wardrobe.’\textsuperscript{118}

Wright was followed by Webster, the electrician at Kromdraai, and a youth who assisted him. The dairyman at Kromdraai, a Dutch reservist, left his cows and returned to the Netherlands to fight. And then Visagie – the old ‘poor white’ – was commandeered, for service in the rebellion. Patrrick, the chauffeur, was the sixth. He volunteered in October for the German South West front as a motor cyclist. This as Maud explains was ‘rather sporting’:

‘He & a number of other motormen went to be tried with their machines & he wasn’t taken as his machine was the only one of it’s kind, & they only took 4 of a kind – (sounds like poker patience) as otherwise it meant an accumulation of spare parts – so he went & bought one that matched & joined in Pretoria.’\textsuperscript{119}

This enabled Hugh to economise on the motorcar, which was left standing on four packing cases in the motorhouse.\textsuperscript{120} Following their departure, the white male servants were replaced by black servants, male, and who had to work under the maids and cook.\textsuperscript{121}

To Maud’s relief, peace reigned in the kitchen again, the cook, ‘quite different’, was feeding the other servants better and, in spite of arguments on the war, they all got on together all right. Maud now hoped the cook would stay on as she and Hugh were no longer able to leave for their proposed holiday in the United Kingdom and, in any case, the cook had reduced costs to about half what they had been under other regimes. German or not, Maud was content to ‘leave it all to her, knowing that each animal or
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portion of such that comes from the butcher is used from the crown of it's head to the sole of it's feet in various weird dishes which yet are really good, much more so & far cheaper than the vast chunks of sheep or bullock English cooks send up – only varying by being roast or boiled. Warming again to the cook, Maud described her to her mother as 'a nice old goody', a victim of circumstances saddened by the war, with life savings that had been nationalised in Germany, and the target of argumentative, frustrated, jingoistic co-workers. Eventually Georgina and Murphie were too firm and insisted that she go. Maud obliged.

Food and lifestyle economy was well underway in Britain and by comparison South Africa was little affected. Nonetheless Maud instituted 'more or less war rations' in July 1917. They now had meatless lunches, bread and cheese and jam, and no puddings at lunch, only at supper. Maud was however convinced that the austerity did not extent to the servants' rooms and felt it was 'useless pointing the obvious moral.' In any case, she felt 'far better on less meat so no sacrifice comes in at all, only [she thought] it's nice not to feel so much like Dives & Belshazzar rolled into one at every meal.' Maud professed to enjoy the process of getting on a businesslike footing and 'seeing what we can do without.'

The cutback in servants, brought on by the war, was welcomed by the Wyndhams for economic if not social reasons. Hundreds of pounds were saved each year and they could be seen to be doing their bit, forgoing the pre-war high and luxuries. In October 1915 they picnicked on the farm with one black servant and 'a hamper with a ham & cakes & biscuits & jam & eggs & butter.' By February 1917 De Mestre was the only white man on the farm (except for the 'poor white' Visagie) and expenses had been greatly cut down. The electric light engine, once Hugh's pride, was switched off and candles only were in use. By mid-1917 the staff at Wyndhams was reduced to Georgina the housemaid, Alice the cook and three black men – house, pantry and kitchen.
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122 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 Aug 1914, WSRO: PHA.
124 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 26 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA.
125 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 11 July 1917, WSRO: PHA.
126 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 21 July 1917, WSRO: PHA.
127 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Oct 1915, WSRO: PHA.
128 Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 4 Feb 1917, WSRO: PHA.
— in addition to one black gardener. This brought a saving on the house in Parktown, in wages alone, of between £510 and £520 a year. Moreover, except for the motorcar, Maud reckoned they lived exactly as they had — 'in the way of not shutting up the house & having people to stay. We don't want vast entertainments or a gorgeous garden or my glorious clothes — we never did have them at any time so they're no loss.' The reduced lifestyle suited them and they could feel do be making the necessary wartime sacrifices.

In May 1916 Wright returned from the front in the hope of re-assuming his position as butler. Much to Maud's consternation Hugh allowed his return. This Maud, who, less than twenty months earlier, had hoped he would return, thought 'rash.' How, she enquired of lady Leconfield, could the War Office:

'let a young unmarried sound man go, simply because of an old-fangled rule made in time of peace, & all the while they're clamouring for men & near wrecking the Govt over it, & L[or]d Derby raking them in with a small tooth comb — down to the village idiot — as really happened near Hagley.'

She was now 'very much against having him back as butler with literally nothing to do that can't be quite efficiently done by a [black servant] at quarter the expense.' Moreover, his return would alter their whole scale of living. They had economised in various ways. She and Hugh were taking the tram, she 'hobbling in old tight skirts', and now they were to have 'a beautiful being at £10 a month wages to hand us potatoes on our return.' What is more Maud was convinced that when Wright returned, the pretty little 24-year-old cook would cuckold her finance for him. She was not prepared to tolerate such an 'inevitable tragedy' which she would surely occur. What chance, she asked, could the fiancé have 'if a hero girt with glory like Wright appeared'? So altogether she hoped that they would go on as they were and that other employment be found for the former butler.

Alternative employment was indeed found. Wright, when he returned in July 1916, was made a sergeant and went on a recruiting drive to Durban, although this was at Hugh's expense. Maud still regretted not having been at hand to prevent Hugh letting him

---
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return, although facing the prospect of another Afrikaner rebellion, she consoled herself in his possible military use. In any case, for as long as she was in South Africa, she never had a white butler again – ‘they eat money & are very little use except for entertaining on a vast scale.’ In March 1917 Wright returned to England, where he enlisted with the Royal Artillery. He intended one day to return to South Africa and get a job on a mine. So for Maud the matter had resolved itself, and she and Hugh could ‘now confine ourselves to our black brethren as butlers for all time.’ Wright, if he survived, Maud thought would do very well and some day they would doubtless be asking him to dinner.

By mid-1917 the staff at Wyndhams was reduced to Georgina the housemaid, Alice the cook and three black men – house, pantry and kitchen – in addition to one black gardener. The last reduction was Maud’s lady’s maid, Maclean, who came to her from the Buxton girls. She had given Maud a bad time and Maud had been wanting to dismiss her for some time, but, with the war on the go, and no women allowed to sail for England, she felt obliged to keep her if other employment could not be found. Maud scouted her social circle for a place. She spoke to Maclean ‘saying it was war & not dissatisfaction [that] made [her] part’ and told her of a possibility with Mrs Christopherson. Maclean had a fit, lamenting that she was being turned out onto the street and before her month was up. Losing her temper, Maud retorted that ‘she might take her month’s warning & run the risk of losing the place & that if she was going to behave so I shd not recommend her but let her get any place – rich Jews etc.’ Convinced by Maud that she was doing her best for her, Maclean was immediately placated. Maud nonetheless thought that Maclean was unhappy at an apparent ‘loss of kudos’ – coming out to Government House; then to the Wyndhams and ‘ending up with what the species she belongs to terms generically “the people out here”, wch includes black & white, British & foreign, Jew & Gentile, as against scions of the peerage.’ Maud was now looked after by Georgina, her ‘treasure of a housemaid’, who at once agreed to do it and refused to take an increase in wages ‘as I don’t want much & the War’s on.’ This was, of
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course, very pleasing.\textsuperscript{134} It was a relief to be free of Maclean, though Maud knew she would miss her care and she rather dreaded, for appearance sake, having to do her own hair again which Olive Baring once said looked as if she did it with a knife and fork!\textsuperscript{135}

In the end Maclean did not go to Mrs Christopherson. Possibilities offered with both Lady Chaplin, wife of the Rhodesian administrator, and Lady Rose Innes, the wife of the Chief Justice, although Maud thought 'she of course in her heart looks down on both places.'\textsuperscript{136} In the end Maclean chose Jesse Rose Innes, but, refusing to wash her lady's blouses, soon fell out with her new mistress.\textsuperscript{137} Maclean left before the end of the year to be housekeeper at a hotel in Muizenberg, where she had to turn her hand to every sort of work. This Maud thought was 'very good for her.' Dorothea Fairbridge, the Cape historian, told Maud that Maclean used to go weeping to her maids, saying that 'Ly Innes was no lady & that try as she (Maclean) wd, she cd never make Ly I look beautiful. She never did try & if she did more fool she: poor Ly Innes suffered much at her hands.'\textsuperscript{138} Maud attributed this to a swelled head', as she told Lady Leconfield:

'\textquoteleft She always washed mine & fiddled over ironing every morning. ... She has thrown a fly I hear to try & get back to Govt H as Doreen's maid, but Mildred says not for worlds. I've not missed her except pleasurably. I never realized how much I disliked her little personality till she left.'\textsuperscript{139}

The other servants at Wyndhams told their mistress that they had suffered Maclean as much as she. Whenever Maclean caught them laughing she always took it that they were laughing at her. She was jealous, would sulk endlessly, and then in an amazing bouleversement she was 'very nice' again.\textsuperscript{140}

Maud dismissed Maclean for apparent personal rather than economic reasons. She was particularly concerned to keep her remaining servants happy. Georgina, 'the treasured housemaid' and last remaining white maid, was making noises that she was sick of service and wanted to do something else: fortunately for Maud, for the moment she
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didn’t know what. Maud, knowing it would be easier to get someone else during peace, did all to convince her to stay on to the end of war, when she could choose whether to stay in South Africa or return to the United Kingdom.\(^{141}\)

Georgina, however, continued to seek alternatives. Any reference to leaving ‘strikes chill to my marrow,’ Maud complained, but noted that ‘these feelings generally come over her when she has been exasperated by one of the black’ staff. Maud recounted an incidence to Lady Leconfield:

‘We had a terrible one the other day who was one of those civilized educated natives who are terrors & alas getting commoner every day. He told her he was as rich a man as Boss Wyndham & had a wardrobe that cost £30 & other furniture to match - & further that she was only here because no one else wd have her & that the time wd come when the white man wd be glad to work for the black. All this on top of having the cook ill in bed.’\(^{142}\)

Maud attempted to lighten Georgina’s burden. House guests, Wags and another woman at the time, were asked to make their beds and tidy up their bedrooms generally. This horrified the maid – doing things to which they were had never been accustomed – and to prevent it next day rushed upstairs early. Maud tried to assure her she didn’t mind. After all, even Lord Gladstone, being unable to get an artisan, had had to mend his own W.C.\(^{143}\) But Georgina was representative of a broader stream. The war brought an extreme shortage of servants, and right across the globe. As Maud’s mother grumbled, the British world appeared ‘all very upside down.’ Lavinia Talbot summed it up:

‘It’s all so unsmug – of course after [the] SA War things were normal in a minute & just now we are trying to do & feel & think as we should (not as we would).’\(^{144}\)

The world had changed. The aristocracy were now thankful for matches and, in December 1918, could still get no marmalade. Maud’s brother-in-law, Henry Guest, could not find a hotel room and had to stay with a relative. Flats were unobtainable and
the lack of servants made houses difficult. Lady Leconfield was losing staff at Great Stanhope Street, as her parents were at Hagley: 'I suppose now any footman with heart disease or varicose veins or anything is worth his weight in gold.' The men left for the front and the women for munitions factories. As Maud supposed:

'at home even, the nice old nurses we all used to have who called us Master & Miss & wore caps & never had days out or went on holidays except rare occasions wch were marked days in nursery annals – are now extinct as the dodo.'

Those with access to a reliable cook or ‘a real pleasure’ paid premium retaining fees. Henry Guest paid one of his maids £20 a year as a retaining fee in the hope that after the war she would be his housekeeper ‘in a London flat or small house.’ Without the surplus in Britain, female domestics were no longer available for the periphery and the work of immigrant societies, such as the SA Colonisation Society, ground to a halt.

On the contrary, the migration was in the opposite direction. Women were leaving, even Johannesburg with the high wages, and returning to Britain in the hope of even higher wages manufacturing munitions. Others left for Pretoria to take on work in the government offices to relieve men for the front. All was not rosy, as the latter group found. The South African government, by way of economy, paid them £5 a month whereas the men had received £20. Nonetheless, by February 1916, children’s’ nurses were impossible to find on the Rand and kitchen maids – of which they were short at Government House – were ‘not to be had for love or money.’ As elsewhere, the shortages were exacerbated in 1918 by the great influenza epidemic. It swept through South Africa, claiming probably as many as 60 000 victims, many of them from the poorer and serving classes. At Kromdraai, everybody except the De Mestre family was

---
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down with it; while at Wyndhams only the gardener succumbed.\textsuperscript{152} Eva Boydell, wife of a Labour MP, complained that servants were not to be had in Durban either.\textsuperscript{153}

However, as Lady Cobham pointed out in December 1918, with the cutback in the manufacture of munitions, the servants were returning.\textsuperscript{154} This gave Maud hope. Alice, the cook, had given notice that she was leaving to get married and Maud hoped to find, on a coming visit to England, ‘a perfect trio – house, cook & maid.’\textsuperscript{155} Here she was certainly out of step with the national trend: black servants increasingly replaced whites and black females were more and more introduced. In the United Kingdom and South Africa, as elsewhere, white women in need of employment objected to housework. Numerous vacancies existed, but women showed an ever-increasing dislike for housework – especially as regards ‘sleeping-in’.\textsuperscript{156} While the Wyndhams were perhaps among the last to import servants to South Africa after 1918, servants, willing to leave for some distant shore for a lengthy period for domestic service, was no longer as easily acquired.

6. A post-war world

Yet, despite the improved availability of servants after the war, many aristocrats, particularly those without grand country houses, did not reappoint to pre-war levels. Many dispensed with footmen and personal maids, whom they now realised, were unnecessary. Maud recognised that they would ‘never go back to the marvellous cheapness & comfort of pre war days.’\textsuperscript{157} Nonetheless, an effective, if smaller serving staff, was still required. The election of Neville Talbot, one of Maud’s cousins, to the Pretoria see brought the possibility of a new circle of family and friends in South Africa.\textsuperscript{158} The arrival of the Talbots, together with Hugh’s election to the Johannesburg
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Town Council in 1921, maintained Wyndhams as a focus of family and political interest. The house was still a convenient place to entertain family, and friends as well as the circle of local politicians and town councillors.

The household had shrunk from twelve to five servants, of which the majority were now black and therefore cheaper. Other economies were implemented: the house was actually let, for the first time, while the Wyndhams were away in England. This was something that Maud did not relish and hoped to stave off for as long as possible. Hugh reoccupied his house again on 1 February 1920, by which time he hired a new cook and housemaid, whom he thought ‘seem admirable in every way’. Three black male servants – including Tom who had served them ‘for years’ – made up the complement. Georgina Mason helped Hugh get things straight while Maud was still in England. When Maud arrived all was straightened, although she had reservations about the housemaid, a Mrs Suttle, who ‘has not much head piece tho quite good & obliging.’

The new cook, Mrs Low, told Maud that she had heard that Wyndhams was ‘quiet a home’, which Maud thought gratifying ‘as some people have great difficulties.’ Lady Phillips had a maid who was never sober and a kitchen maid, whom she brought out, said almost on landing that she didn’t like the country and wished to return to England again. Maud considered this ‘a judgement’ as Lionel Phillips had staffed his house in 1919 when deserving inhabitants of South Africa could not get a passage. Maud was again happy with her household. All seemed serene. Yet she was wary not to ‘brag too soon.’

Indeed, trouble was not far off and, with the scarcity of servants, this could produce difficulties. After only a month, the peace and calm at Wyndhams was again shattered. Mrs Suttle was seized with acute appendicitis and was hospitalised. This not only cut back on entertaining, but the work was shared among the remaining servants. This may have been too much for the cook, who now gave notice on the grounds that she had never ‘felt settled.’ She felt ‘shut in’, something which Maud could not understand.
and dismissed as the inability of the serving class to express themselves. ‘She can see for 40 miles from her sitting room window & we stand on a precipice, & the houses on either side of us are well out of stone’s throw – She probably means the opposite as she says she likes Pretoria where every house is snugly tucked together in a hole.’\textsuperscript{165} And, as a third contretemps, the new ‘houseboy’ went down with pink eye.\textsuperscript{166}

Mrs Suttle was barely back from her operation when she disappeared. Maud hunted for her, going to the Carlton Hotel, where Suttle had worked. There she was given by the manager’s wife all the gory details appertaining to absenteeism, drunkenness and her bigamous husband. This as Maud admitted ‘rather staggered’ her. And, setting aside her initial impulse to fire, decided to overlook her escape on the condition it never happened again. Maud was hesitant to dismiss her too hurriedly for fear of not-finding a replacement: ‘treasures...are difficult to get & one might get a terror.’\textsuperscript{167} Yet, at the beginning of September 1920, Maud, putting aside the fear and feelings of guilt, ‘got rid of the little idiotic housemaid.’ The decision was probably made after she had secured the services of a friend of the faithful Georgina.\textsuperscript{168} So, within a year, both white servants had been replaced. And soon, only a month later, Maud received notice that the new housemaid ‘was thinking of “getting married” in January.’\textsuperscript{169} And so the cycle continued.

The Wyndhams were far more successful in retaining their black male servants, although we know far less about them and have only the name of Tom, whom it seems was the senior ‘houseboy.’ Tom was, apparently, a very good servant and, as a result, the target of attempts by Maud’s friends to lure him away.\textsuperscript{170} Maud refers to her black servants in August 1920 as ‘all smiling & willing.’ This was important as black servants, were ‘v. difficult to get just now what with the cold & the unrest & then spring coming they’re being to plough I suppose, tho their wives do most of that.’\textsuperscript{171} After 1918 Maud showed greater affinity to her black servants. They were cheaper and by 1918 more
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difficult to acquire. They were also probably harder working, and, in comparison to the white servants, less willing to enter the social gap. For these reasons they were now cherished more than was perhaps the case in the past.

The world had undoubtedly changed and for migrant aristocrats the carefree, leisured life, bar for one or two corners of the empire, had gone forever. This made Maud, still wanting to replace Maclean, feel rather Sybaritic. She sought somebody to look after her clothes (which she professed would be in a poor state ‘after a month or two in my sole care’) and, while in England at the end of 1921, hired a ladies maid, a certain Brown, who she brought out to South Africa with her on the boat. She now had four household servants: ‘a very nice cook (middle-aged & capable), the ‘old housemaid’, her new ‘little maid’ and their ‘precious black butler’.

7. Compensations

The servants generally seem to have felt an attachment to the Wyndhams and the house. The female servants took part in the Women’s Exhibition in Johannesburg in October 1912; Murphie, the lady’s maid gaining second prize for an embroidered nightgown she was making for Maud and Gray the cook got two firsts for pastry and scones, while Maud received a prize for modelling. So, as the housemaid observed, ‘Our house has done very well.’

Servants faced long hours and, although the Wyndhams cannot be classed as abusive employers, theirs was a hard job, scrubbing, cleaning, waiting and cooking. Yet, Wyndham servants enjoyed circumstances vastly different to their eighteenth and even nineteenth century counterparts. They had time off: they had a month of paid holiday. Their rooms were neither cramped nor ugly. Maud acceded to most of their requests: she gave them the use of her sitting room and the female white servants occupied the front rooms of the house. Their diets were plentiful. As we have seen, they lacked for nothing by way of food, consuming vast quantities of meat and were served pudding twice per
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day. Their culinary arguments were with the cook and the manner of preparation, never, it would seem, with Maud and over the quantity of their vitals. They had some free time, although this was normally spent in the house or visiting with other servants. There is no indication that Maud regulated her servants' spare time or forbade them from attending the bioscope or other suggestive influences. Here, the Wyndham servants were probably better off than most others. Smaller, less wealthy householders kept fewer servants, who were expected to help set up the household in the morning and put things to right at night: per servant they probably worked harder and under more trying conditions.

Yet, whether in Parktown or Turffontein, there were compensations. In the first place, though their money wages were low, servants had some economic security, and some were able to save. In combination with board and room, they earned substantially more than counterparts on the factory floor. The women who entered South African government employ during the First World War made only £5 a month: the men whom they relieved were paid £20! This was less than the Wyndhams paid their white servants: the cook received £9 and the housemaids £7. In fact the Wyndhams paid their servants well above the national average.

Some servants sent their savings back to their family. Others saved it toward a dowry, for which unscrupulous men often fleeced these women. Annie Carter, housemaid to one of Maud's aunts, where she had been for 36 years, left to get married in 1912. Her employer, Bishop Edward Talbot, married them and probably remained a paternal figure. In South Africa, Maud's cook, Alice, who had been at Wyndhams for three years, left in January 1919 to marry after a four-year courtship. The length of the wooing, probably induced by the war, was a comfort to Maud as it was no hurried arrangement. Moreover, Alice and her new husband had built a house in Turffontein, Hugh's constituency, and this held the prospect of a vote at the next election Alice married on 28 January and had her wedding breakfast at Wyndhams. Hugh and Maud gave the
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champagne but, as the house was being let from 1 February, they could not accede to the request that the honeymoon be had at Wyndhams too.\textsuperscript{181} Alice was treated also as a daughter of the house. The loss of servants through matrimony was a great concern, and the SACS was derided as a ‘matrimonial agency’.\textsuperscript{182} However, many servants were less fortunate. In 1912, Maud encountered a dressmaker in Johannesburg, who had been maid to Margaret Talbot in India and mistook Maud for her cousin Lucy Masterman. She had ‘a regular lady’s maid manner’ and stayed with the Talbots until she made a ‘very unfortunate marriage as they nearly all do.’\textsuperscript{183}

Nonetheless servanthood was an important means by which servants, and particularly female servants, could make the transition to their own domestic life, and it could be equally helpful in facilitating a commercial venture. A number of Wyndham servants used their savings and acquired skills to establish businesses and so rise in society. Robert Ruxton, Hugh first agent at Kromdraai, entered Wyndham’s service in 1903, at about the age of forty-one, and left to farm for himself. He bought Elandslaagte, also in the Standerton District, was apparently quite successful as he left property worth almost £4000. Hugh and Maud visited them there in August 1912. Maud described the place as:

‘an awful dwelling ... a shanty with no fireplace spaces under the doors & a sort of lean to made of corrugated iron for a kitchen. It was a freezing day – a cat was sitting tight to the oven door – the only warm person – but they all seemed healthy eno’ & an excellent lunch we had.’\textsuperscript{184}

Louisa Ruxton, who at one time cooked for Hugh, died on their farm in June 1915.\textsuperscript{185} Robert married a second time, but this was not a happy marriage and his heirs, the second wife and the children of the first, contested his will.\textsuperscript{186}

Murphie, the lady’s maid, left Maud in 1916 to set up a dressmaking business in Johannesburg. Murphie, according to Maud, had ‘long wanted to go in for dressmaking
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but waited till she had some capital.' The town needed a good dressmaker, the existing practices being either bad or very expensive. Murphie left with Maud’s good will: ‘I hope she’ll succeed. I shall miss her.’ By February 1916, when Maud went to her former maid in town, she was impressed with her room – ‘v. nice & bright’ – and happy that Murphie was ‘already showered with work.’ Murphie’s business flourished and clients had to book her services in advance: by September, in 1917, she was already unable to take any new work for the Christmas season. Her reputation was also soaring, for in November 1917, she received a ‘mourning order’ of five gowns from Mildred Buxton, the Governor General’s wife. Georgina, the cherished housemaid who had ‘seemed so happy & devoted to [her employers’] interests,’ also left at the beginning of 1919. She set up a boarding house when the Wyndhams went to England, where they now had to ‘hunt around at home for a perfect trio – house, cook & maid.’

Other servants, including the cook, Gray, and her German successor, utilised their skills to acquire work at hotels. And, during the war, Maud encountered a certain Ethel Green at the Mount Nelson, who announced proudly to the Merrimans that she ‘was kitchenmaid for 2½ years with Ly Leconfield in Gt Stanhope St.’ She was one of the English replacements for the awful substitutes for German waiters which the Mount Nelson had ‘got in’ in 1914 – ‘creatures with moustaches & spectacles who drank & offered you vegetables with “try some peas”.’

Servants could also imitate some of their employers’ habits and, throughout the correspondence, there are references to servants acquiring fine clothes and even joining in the revelry of country house and other social gatherings. During a weekend of polo in 1910 at the Westminster estate near Bloemfontein, Maud records that the servants were ‘in wild excitement.’ Such socialising with the servants was not foreign to Maud: Her
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mother gave an annual barn dance, which their servants attended. Lady Cobham, accompanied by her son Richard to the 1914 event, noted to Maud that

‘no one came up to the splendour of our new footman who George calls “Rufus Isaacs” – tall dark & dignified & Jewry – in a white waistcoat & white tie, or Dorothy the 2nd housemaid in pink satin & silver! Nan gave her a rich tip for waiting on the nursery, so I suppose this was the consequence!’  

If exposed to parties and finer things, the servants of a travelling aristocracy also gained a taste for journeying, which soon became second nature. In 1913, Pattrick, the chauffeur who had rescued the poor footman at North Berwick, paid his own fare to visit his relatives in England. Maud thought this ‘jaunt to see his family in England’ too opulent for a chauffeur, although he made ‘much more than many a parson of a parish with a wife & family.’

Yet, servants as a whole were a highly dependent group, of which the white Wyndham servants are by no means representative. They were undoubtedly better off than their black counterparts and, with few exceptions, considerably better off than white servants elsewhere in Johannesburg. Servants who could not stand the pressures and, without other work alternatives, sometimes took to drink. Others compensated for a harsh or rigid routine by stealing from their employers or changing jobs or making fun of their masters behind their backs. Others changed jobs often, to maintain a sense of freedom and of control.

In general, the servants at Wyndhams seem to have been happy and most, certainly the white staff, seem to have made a successful transition into society. Georgina Mason’s boarding house was sold over her head. She then set herself up in a tea shop in Johannesburg before moving to Rhodesia, where she was employed as housekeeper at a Salisbury hotel. Murphie’s dressmaking business flourished and Maud remained an active customer. Wright returned to South Africa as he had declared, but not to work on the mines. He served as butler to ‘a millionaire Jew down the road’ in Parktown. Pattrick returned from the war to chauffeur a lady who had come into some money in 1919. Alice
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was happily married and produced 'a son & heir', something that the four oldest Wyndham brothers and their ladies failed to do. Gray disappeared.198

8. Conclusion

As A.F. Cox pointed out, by definition democracy and the leisured, servant-intensive life of an aristocracy do not cohabit easily. Under Lloyd George, that 'brutish' man whom Maud and much of her class hated so bitterly, the democratic attack intensified. He curtailed hereditary power, raised elite taxation and threatened the very existence of the landed estate and the attendant multitudes of servants. By 1920, the gentry, once revered, were cast as a self-serving, monopolistic clique, wanting to prolong an outdated way of life.

For the Wyndhams and their set in South Africa the post-1918 changes were equally acute. The Wyndham household, really a piece of Britain displaced to the periphery, was atypical in South Africa. Household activities, both of the Wyndhams and their guests were largely unique; and, to maintain this lifestyle, they employed a variety of specialised household servants: numbering perhaps as many as twelve and recruited from a variety of particular sources. This labour-intensive aristocratic lifestyle, imitated by the Randlords, was increasingly out of kilter with the rest of the country. Yet, if in many ways askew in national terms, the Wyndhams were true in the transition made during the First World War and thereafter from a staff largely white to one mostly black. A.F. Cox was therefore both correct and incorrect. In 1920 the white servant class was passing away; but black, and increasingly black female, servants were taking their places.199
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CHAPTER NINE
What a sad world it seems to be, 1918-1923

Eva Boydell wrote to her husband, the Labourite MLA, on November 13, 1918, proclaiming that ‘the new world’ had begun the previous day. In Durban ‘the people took a holiday for themselves!’ ‘Things are going to be different’, she went on, ‘the old order passeth. We are living in great times.’ While the British world was ecstatic following the armistice of November 1918, her gentry were less pleased with its prospects and braced themselves for the inevitable post-war changes. Some English aristocrats forecast a wave of revolutions. Maud’s Aunt Henrietta prophesied revolutions both in Britain as well as on the imperial periphery. The English would be driven from South Africa, while Britain itself would be convulsed by ‘a revolution like the French one.’ Lord Cobham, marginally more optimistic, was convinced that Bolshevism was ‘very catching’ and that there would be ‘many complications ahead.’ He catalogued the immediate concerns: the prospect of a Labour government in Britain, the inability to reach a settlement in either Ireland or with regard to Tariff Reform, and the range of labour troubles. ‘The real world threat’, he told Maud, was now ‘Bolshevism, which if we do not take care, may menace civilisation as much as Hun militarism ever did.’

1. It is all so unsmug

There was from 1919 a sense of social turmoil throughout the British world. Ireland, where the Wyndhams had sold their acres in Limerick under the Land Act, was convulsed with dissent, while in Britain itself workers walked out and strikes became a regular feature. A train conveying fashionable society to the links near North Berwick was attacked with stones and Hugh and Maud were in London during a strike.

---
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And then Maud thought the mail letters from England in May 1921, with news of another strike in Britain and the troubles in Ireland, were ‘just like reading of the war over again.’ Britain was subjected to all the deprivations and controlling of wartime, but Maud opined it was worse because it was not war. The strike, she continued to Hugh’s mother, was a dreadful waste as nobody benefited or was any happier for it: ‘The poor wretched deluded miners & folk all think money & leisure in themselves are the panaceas for happiness whereas they are but dross if they don’t know how to use ‘em, & they have no idea.’ She was convinced that the one solution to all this revolution and tumult was ‘for the last trump to sound.’ And she wished it would before things got worse.

The euphoria of the new South Africa had been short-lived and the fault lines, partly racial, partly ecclesiastical, partly political, but, as Selborne expected, mainly economic, had been exacerbated by the war. The internal threats to the South African state remained three-fold. The first was the perception of a general rising of black Africans, which, although holding the greatest danger to the colonial state, was unlikely to occur soon. The second was a workers’ revolution and the third, an Afrikaner uprising and seizure of the state, both of which seemed possible, perhaps probable, during the period immediately after the Armistice. In April, Wyndham noted that Johannesburg had a ‘taste of Soviet government’, when the tramway men and power station men assumed control and turned out the town council.

Yet, perhaps even more disturbingly, Herzog seemed to draw the support of young Afrikaner men, both in the ‘backveld’ but increasingly also in the towns, many of whom were intoxicated by the vision of a restoration of the old republics. The defeat of Germany did not, as Wyndham had hoped, assuage these views. In fact the recent bye elections showed the contrary and he told Lady Leconfield that ‘so far the overwhelming victory
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of the Allies has had no effect in stemming' republicanism in South Africa. Having split with Botha and Smuts and violated the spirit of the Union constitution and the 'solemn agreement between the British & Dutch', the Nationalists pushed for secession from the empire and the resurrection of a Boer republic. Their ultra fringes, according to the 'British' section (Wyndham and Carter included), were again close to outright rebellion in 1919. Keeping the government in, the Nationalists out and labour down was becoming increasingly difficult.

Wyndham, hoping to influence opinion internationally, produced an article for the December 1918 issue of the Round Table, in which he gave an account of the restlessness in South Africa. People in Britain and elsewhere had 'had scrappy warnings' of South Africa's troubles, but these were not fully understood. Wyndham, who favoured greater governmental intervention, saw no alternative to strengthening the Union Defence Force in preparation for a possible showdown. Patrick Duncan, although taking a similar view, was less of an interventionist. Wanting to forge a South Africanism but avoid the excesses normally associated with 'the birth of the people', he, too, identified Bolshevism as the primary risk to South African security. The only way to avoid a reign of terror was to build on 'the good feeling' of the war years and bring about the political alignment of the loyalists, regardless of language, and the division of parties along constitutional lines.

Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Jan 1919, WSRO: PHA. See also K. Fedorowich, "'The Weak Link in the Imperial Chain': South Africa, the Round Table and World War One', in A. Bosco and A. May (eds), The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy (London 1997), pp 149-50.

William Carter to Algernon Lawley, 17 Jan 1919 and 7 Jun 1919; Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Letters. This view is carried in 'The Men who wanted to break up the Union; The Republican Deputation to Europe', anonymous pamphlet published by Wallach's Ltd, Pretoria, 1919, UNISA: United Party Archives, Central Head Office, Pamphlets. See also 'The Nationalists and the Peace Conference', The Round Table 9(34) Mar 1919, p 620.

Reginald Coupland to Hugh Wyndham, 22 Nov 1918, BLO: Ms Curtis 802, ff. 152-53. On The Round Table and its influence see C. Quigley, The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden (New York 1981) and, for the Round Table in South Africa, see K. Fedorowich, "'The Weak Link in the Imperial Chain': South Africa, the Round Table and World War One', in A. Bosco and A. May (eds), The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy, pp 137-58.
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The continued progress of Afrikaner nationalism was for the Wyndhams most disconcerting, challenging as it did not only the position of English-speakers in South Africa and the work Wyndham had associated himself with since his arrival in South Africa, but, most importantly, it contested the link with the empire and its institutions. Wyndham was at the time both chairman of the Victoria League of South Africa as well as the unofficial head of the Round Table movement in southern Africa, while Maud was president of the Women’s Unionist Association, a member of the executive of the Victoria League and on the executive of the National Council of Women. In many ways their actions were restricted by political sensitivity. Wyndham, for example, had been asked to facilitate a South African delegation to a proposed convention of Round Table Groups, but found this impossible. Not only were there no formal groups in South Africa and therefore no machinery for the election of delegates, but, as he told Coupland, anybody sent would ‘not represent any organized body of opinion in the Union.’ Moreover, Wyndham thought it very inopportune to work up any sort of public opinion on the question of imperial reorganization, which was ‘like a red flag to a bull to our brother Boer.’ And so, the best course for South Africa and the Round Table movement in southern Africa was ‘to sit tight & keep things as quiet as possible out here, until we sail into calmer waters.’

But the discomfort was not only emotive. It was also material, a point highlighted by two family developments in 1920. That May, Maud’s cousin, Dorothy Cavendish married Harold Macmillan, then but a publisher’s son and of whom little was known bar his having ‘moist hands.’ This closing of the class divide (Cavendishes, as Maud noted, did not marry publisher’s sons) signalled the final loss of power, both social and political, by the two hundred great governing families of England. In the next generation she supposed Cavendishes would be marrying shopkeepers and ‘standing behind the counter.’ Such was the rate of social change. Yet, she recognised that it would be ‘a better & more sensible world when it is all thoroughly mixed up – old & new – but the time of transition is v[ery] uncomf[ortable].’ The second incident was the death of the Marquess of Queensberry, one of Hugh’s Douglas cousins. The Queensberrys were severely

---

impoverished and he, having quarrelled with his wife, who was left in Britain to run a fish and poultry shop, travelled the world trying to make a fortune and recover a lost lifestyle. He arrived in South Africa in early 1920 and, falling into the company of two businessmen whom Wyndham described as ‘a couple of cheery blackguards’, died mysteriously in Johannesburg on 1 August 1920. The death of a British peer in hardened circumstances seemed to underline an apparent vulnerability in the aristocracy. The life of leisure had gone and it was easy for peers, many having to work for the first time and lacking business acumen, to fall in with the wrong crowd. Although Maud thought Queensberry ‘no loss’, the circumstances, ominous as they were, must have troubled. As Maud recognised, ‘the marvellous cheapness & comfort of pre war days’ had gone and with it the carefree, leisured life played out by migrant aristocrats somewhere on the imperial periphery.

The world had changed, politically, socially, economically. Country houses and town residences closed across the empire. In England, Maud’s cousin Johnny Chesham lost Latimer; while in South Africa Charles Leonard sold Gloria, and Richard Feetham and Patrick Duncan decided in 1920 to sell their farm as their manager was leaving them ‘for a more profitable job’ and in any case it required too much money if it were to be kept going properly while the returns were always very uncertain. Shortly afterwards Arcadia, the Phillips residence in Pretoria, was on the market and Bedford Farm, the Farrar country house, was sold for use as a girls’ school. Although the Wyndhams still travelled (increasingly for business, not solely for pleasure), appointed servants (see
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chapter 8) and occasionally bought paintings, they, too, scaled down. Wyndhams was leased from February 1919 and Kromdraai House, already in a poor state in 1915, was demolished in July 1920 and the materials were either sold or used for the erection of a ‘less pretentious dwelling.’ This was constructed along the kitchen garden and took the form of a series of linked rondavels. Three months later Kromdraai estate was placed on the market. The farming community had had a bad season in 1919 and agricultural returns, never good, had plummeted. Wyndham, who had not used the stables for several years, hoped to sell the farm to somebody who could better use them. Kromdraai was also too far for regular commuting from Johannesburg and he hoped to find a small holding, of about 200 acres and within fifty kilometres of Johannesburg, which could be visited more frequently and even treated as a weekend place. Wyndham, who once described himself as a ‘British, Landed Proprietor’ was now content simply to be ‘a farmer.’

2. A political wilderness

Woodrow Wilson in 1919, perhaps more than any single individual, signified the changed world with his principles and discourses on self-determination and individual freedoms. His call for the freedom of the seas was seized by Afrikaner nationalists, who claimed that British navalism was just as bad as German militarism. Like other members of the Milner Group, the Wyndhams treated Wilson with suspicion. Hugh, the broad-minded liberal of 1914, sensing that his way of life and perhaps even the future of the empire was at risk, suggested that Wilson ‘should be forcibly prevented from making speeches.’ Maud naturally agreed, ‘Europe [was] too full of him.’
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Sensing, in many ways already feeling, the floods of change, Wyndham assumed a more conservative position. Having been a major voice for the extension of the suffrage, he was now unwilling, despite a request from the Women’s Suffrage movement, to table his suffrage bill again in 1919. He argued that if one man introduced it each year it would lose its effect, the man would be thought a crank and the subject would become a hardy annual no one attends to. But, of course, he had other reasons too. There were greater issues on the table, matters of empire and the constitutional future of South Africa.

The Unionists expected a snap election in 1919. Alfred Hennessey, their chief party organiser, thought Botha would return from Paris with Rhodesia, German South West Africa and possibly a lease of Delagoa Bay ‘in his pocket’ and go to the country immediately without even whispering coalition. He wanted to reunify the Afrikaner people politically and of this the majority of Unionists had never had any illusions. They knew that Botha would take every advantage of their erstwhile, war-time cooperation. Yet, they were confident that they had ‘done the right thing’ in placing the interests of the Empire before any personal or party advantage. Botha hoped for a majority over all parties, but, if he did not get this, at least for increased strength and that the Unionists would be weakened by Labour, so that if Unionist support had to be obtained, on the numerical basis, it would not mean more than a couple of seats in the cabinet. As Jan Hofmeyr noted, the SAP were unwilling to amalgamate with the Unionists, while the latter remained home to what he described as jingo extremists.

Wyndham, whom Hofmeyr no doubt included in this category, was appalled by the proceedings of the 1919 parliamentary session, which opened with ‘a fierce debate … on the subject of the independence of South Africa from the British Empire.’ The Nationalists, fired with Wilsonianism, had now ‘gone the whole length, & have declared
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themselves as in favour of complete independence, & if necessary, of breaking up the Union in order to attain to it.' Wyndham nonetheless thought such aspirations vague. The Nationalists suggested no policy and would not touch on whether this would involve a civil war or 'how the independence they would gain would differ from the freedom they already enjoy[ed].' This, to his mind, signalled a return to the pre-Anglo Boer War position, with the one difference that there was 'a large & influential section of the Dutch population in favour of keeping things as they are.'\textsuperscript{41} The only hope for the Unionists and the maintenance of the imperial link lay with these men, Afrikaners loyal to the union constitution.

The Wyndhams travelled to Britain in mid-1919. Hugh attended the Round Table gathering in London, as the unofficial South African representative, as well as the conference of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. He was, however, disappointed with Milner's attitude on the future of empire in the post-Great War world. He expected Milner to be 'a little more imaginative on the subject' and the party, expecting to leave Milner 'full of ideas', 'drew a blank' on this occasion.\textsuperscript{42} Duncan, more in line with Milner's view, remained convinced that the only way to safeguard the imperial connection in South Africa was formation of a new political party on the basis of the maintenance of the union constitution. The British sector in South Africa could not and would not form another Ulster. A new party, with Botha as leader, was the only alternative to a civil war, in which the loyalists could not hope to prevail without imperial military intervention.\textsuperscript{43}

Feetham and Wyndham, the only other Kindergarteners still residing in South Africa, agreed with Duncan. They had to do all in their power to avoid a crisis.\textsuperscript{44} But Wyndham was disinclined to abandon possible intervention. While it would have 'the most appalling consequences', he argued that the consequences of non-intervention would be worse still. Unlike Duncan, he was unwilling to shape policy on the assumption that Britain would not fulfil her obligations in the event of a crisis and, in any case, South
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Africa remaining in the empire was not in the national interest of Britain alone. Australia, New Zealand and India were still all equally dependent upon South Africa for their sea, wireless and cable communications. 45

Botha died in August 1919, while Wyndham was still in Britain, and Smuts, for so long heir apparent, stepped forward and, addressing himself principally to the Afrikaners, appealed for unity. However, the Nationalists were softened neither by Botha’s death nor Smuts’ return from Paris. ‘The backvedlt Boer’, Archbishop Carter noted, was ‘not influenced much by argument.’ 46 Smuts attempted to follow Botha’s policy, but a great many Afrikaners, who may have followed Botha, refused to follow him. 47 Anxiety increased. In Britain, Lord Selborne pondered the consequences of a Hertzog victory in the next election. But, although pessimistic, he was somewhat reassured by the idea that Hertzog could not carry out his policy of separation without a civil war, as neither the British nor the blacks would ‘accept the re-establishment of Boer dominancy without fighting.’ 48

However, the Unionist Party, which would have to be a vehicle for that agitation, was undergoing a severe credibility crisis. They were officially the opposition, but, having been committed to Botha’s war policy, suffered from five years of self-repression. Their unselfish support endangered their own political survival, a sacrifice made at times reluctantly, but always with a view to imperial interests. Now in 1919, on the eve of a general election, they were in a situation that the party organiser acknowledged to be ‘really bad.’ 49 The years of ‘too much magnanimity towards the political foe, too much expediency, too much temporising, too little soul’, as one Unionist put it, had stifled the fighting spirit on which alone an opposition could survive, grow and attain efficiency. 50 The Unionists, as Wyndham admitted in April 1919, were now at their lowest ebb. 51
As a result, Smuts, unwilling to risk coalition with the Unionists before the poll, opposed them in all constituencies in the general election held on 10 March 1920. Wyndham therefore prepared for a three-way contest in Turffontein, which, he was sure, would result in a victory for Labour. However, when a Nationalist entered the lists—the outcome was more ambiguous, as he was expected to draw votes away from Labour. Wyndham appealed to the Turffontein electorate for their support, proclaiming that he stood for the maintenance of the constitution, national unity as opposed to the ‘narrow nationalism of the Nationalist Party’ and the ‘equally harmful Internationalism of the Labour Party’, a reduction in the cost of living and the equalisation of taxation. Maud, having returned from a year-long sojourn in Britain, thought Hugh’s meetings successful, although she could not help noting that the questions about which the electorate was most keen related to soldiers’ pensions and profiteering, the cost of living and increased taxation. These matters related to the war and both the government and the Unionists, war-time allies, were held to answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>No. of votes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.B. Steer</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.A. Wyndham</td>
<td>Unionist</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.W. Hunt</td>
<td>SAP</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H.L. Schumann</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour majority</td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Wyndham considered his chances in Turffontein reasonable, although he acknowledged that they were prejudiced by E.W. Hunt, the SAP candidate. The constituency comprised some 68 percent English-speakers; while a further 3.8 percent
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were Jewish.\textsuperscript{58} The racial make-up of the constituency pointed to success. However, on polling day the electorate did not vote along racial but class lines and Wyndham was defeated by G.B. Steer, who was then the Labour mayor of Johannesburg.\textsuperscript{59} (Table 9.1) Steer polled 831 votes; while Wyndham’s support had shrunk to only 432. Had the SAP not contested Turffontein, Wyndham might have secured 833 votes and so a third term. He told his mother that he might otherwise ‘have pulled it off – though it would have been a near thing in any case, as the pendulum is at the moment swinging in the direction of labour and the Nationalists.’\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{Figure 9.2:} Declining support for Hugh Wyndham in the Turffontein constituency, 1910-1920. (Source: B.M. Schoeman, \textit{Parlementêre verkieatings in Suid-Afrika}, pp 30, 63, 92.)

Electoral support for Wyndham in Turffontein had declined dramatically. Buoyed by the war, his voter support increased marginally in 1915: his majority increasing from 7.4 percent to 8.6 percent. On polling day in 1920 Labour enjoyed a majority of 19.5 percent in the constituency, reflecting a major change in voter pattern (Figure 9.2). Wyndham’s electoral support had declined from 54 percent of votes cast in 1915 to just 21.2 percent in 1920. Not only had a number of his past supporters defected to other parties, particularly...
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Labour, but a number of Unionists had also stayed away. Voter apathy had increased: the voter turnout in Turffontein fell from 77.1 percent in 1915 to 63.8 percent in 1920 (Table 9.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of votes cast</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyndham majority</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% voter turnout</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


His losses were, however, part of a broader pattern. Support for the Unionists had declined sharply across South Africa. They were returned in 1920 with fifteen fewer seats. In every province they received less support than they had enjoyed in the past. In the Transvaal, where the Unionists were the most popular party in 1910 (45.8 percent), their voter support was now only 9.9 percent (Table 9.4). Feetham was returned unopposed in Parktown, but otherwise, across the board, the Unionists suffered severe reverses. Even Patrick Duncan lost in Fordsburg, a defeat Maud was quick to attribute to the 'terrible crowd of low class Jews & Dutch' that lived there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of seats in Assembly</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% votes cast throughout Union</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% votes cast in the Cape</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% votes cast in Natal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% votes cast in the OFS</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% votes cast in the Transvaal</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4: Declining influence of the Unionist Party, 1910-1920.

* In the Orange Free State the Unionists stood in one constituency only, which they won unopposed.
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The Unionists had failed. Defective organisation contributed materially to the electoral disaster. Their party organization, never good, had collapsed: Hennessey, the party organiser, complained that few Unionists were ‘prepared to do any really useful work for the party’. Moreover, ‘the mistake’ always made in South Africa, a newspaper columnist later noted, was ‘to imagine that elections are won by a spasmodic blast of wind and thunder for some six or eight weeks before an election contest.’ This was simply not good enough as opinions were formed in the press, in the clubs and on street corners throughout every year. ‘No man’, the columnist warned, ‘however eminent, must expect that, with our shifting population and the constantly changing borders of constituencies, his personality is known to the electors of his division.’ The Wyndhams, believing that their social status would spur meaningful support, had not kept a tight enough hand on the constituency. They had not noticed the gradual shift within Turffontein from a middling to a working class suburb and, spending little time outside election campaigns in the constituency, the electorate, neglected by their representative in favour of more stimulating pursuits, found alternative political homes. The electoral results were catastrophic at the national level. The Nationalists were now the strongest party in the house and Smuts, with the support of the Unionists and independents, could obtain only a bare majority. ‘The worst prognostications’, Wyndham noted in a post-election letter to his mother, had ‘been fulfilled.’

However, the electoral result was not without its compensations. At a domestic level, the loss of Turffontein solved the problem of what to do with Wyndhams and the servants in Johannesburg. Maud did not particularly want to let the house again, but to enjoy the place and its garden and did not relish the disruption caused by the session in Cape Town. Secondly, at the national level, Smuts now had to come to terms with both the Nationalists and Labour, both of whom had made great gains. Smuts, who had not garnered the majority of the Afrikaner votes, drew substantial ‘British’ support without which he would have been beaten by the Nationalists. This Maud considered a good
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lesson as, in the build up to the election, he had ‘behaved with his usual slimness in several of the constituencies’ and, first and foremost, of course, in Turffontein, where Wyndham would have been returned had the SAP not opposed him. And now with the Unionists considerably weakened, Smuts would have to contend with Hertzog and Cresswell, and without the help of the Unionists ‘to pull his chestnuts out of the fire.’

Yet, with no party having an outright majority, and Labour and the Nationalists uncertain as to what to do, another election seemed certain. Smuts spent the Easter recess trying to form a coalition government. But Labour refused to lose their independence and the Nationalists were prepared to agree but on impossible terms. And, as a coalition with the Unionists alone would not give Smuts a working majority, the country braced itself for another election. Wyndham, like his Unionist colleagues and potential allies in the SAP, realised that there would have to be some combination in advance of an election to prevent the ‘constitutional parties’ from fighting each other and losing seats to the Nationalists and to Labour. But, as Smuts no doubt knew, this would not appeal to ‘the racial instincts’ of a large number of his followers.

If the war years were the summer of the Unionist Party, the party was now most certainly in the winter of its life. The leadership crisis was at its worst and Maud thought it now ‘in the position of the old Liberal Unionists, very sensible & worthy & sound in its views, but with no particular war cry to attract the people.’ During the war they had ‘stood for the flag & the Army & Navy & everything pleasant, & before that till the Hertzogites split off from S.A.P. we were the only ones for a British S.Africa - & now of course Smuts says his party is, so did Botha & as they both went to the war none can say them nay.’

A sense of powerlessness therefore pervaded the Unionists. The Afrikaners had been in power since Union and there seemed little alternative but to keep Smuts and the more progressive of their ranks there and to exercise ‘on them a stimulating &
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progressive influence.' Herein lay their only hope of ‘stemming the tide which has set in towards a reversion & crude racialism.’ But they could not approach Smuts with the offer of coalition. The choice of allies was in Smuts’ hands and so, Wyndham advised Duncan, the initiative had to be with Smuts also. Any pre-emption by the Unionists would probably lead to a rebuff and make their position even worse. But this standing by and playing the ‘waiting game’ was frustrating. They were, as Feetham noted, ‘practically sliding into the position of being the forward wing of the Govt Party – tho being outside their caucus we don’t get a chance of exercising inside influence.’

Yet Hugh was for the moment not entirely sorry ‘to be out of Parliament for a bit’ as it gave him an opportunity to focus on his business interests, chiefly coal, and allowed a visit to Rhodesia in June 1920, where they were the guests of the MalcGlms and Chaplins. They were most impressed with the territory, which had become a venue of choice for post-war migration, some of it aristocratic. Maud, who noted that two Bingham brothers were then farming, was impressed with the lifestyle, which she thought ‘most civilized – smart clothes & dinner parties & very pleasant people all around.’ Hugh travelled about extensively viewing the estates of the Chartered Company as well as some private development, all of which were well run. He realized that he had been shown ‘the best of the country, but considering the population & the time the country has been occupied, the progress made [he thought] remarkable.’ The country required an expanded railway network, ‘to open up fresh ground for closer settlement’, but, with the flood of new migrants and appreciating land values, the future seemed bright. Moreover, Wyndham could not help noting that Rhodesia was curiously remote from South Africa and that the Rhodesians seemed to have decided that, whatever their future held, they would not enter the Union.
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They returned to the news that Prince Arthur of Connaught had been appointed as the new governor general. Maud rather disliked the prospect of royalty in Government House, who holding themselves aloof would be boring; while Hugh would have preferred 'a real governing man.' The appointment, as he noted, drew the outrage of the nationalists and he doubted the qualifications of Connaught to deal with the crisis in South Africa. Smuts suffered severe reversals in the provincial council elections held in the Cape and Transvaal that September and went at some disadvantage to the Hereenigings conference, which as Wyndham noted only 'increased the bitterness between the two Dutch parties.'

Having lost his parliamentary salary and having more time on his hands, Wyndham took a greater interest in his business affairs, which now also had to pay. He paid regular visits to his coal interests in Middelburg and Vryheid and went to the Cape, Swaziland and Lourenço Marques on business. Kromdraai also needed attention. Cycles of incessant rain and drought damaged crops across the Transvaal. Many farmers had nothing to reap, others only very little. Wyndham, buttressed by a good dam and irrigation system, was normally in the last category. He was pleased to have had sold his horses and cows in August 1917 as in March 1918 he had 'nothing to feed them on.' A greater drought followed in 1919 and another in early 1920, the latter spoiling what promised to be a record crop. By April 1920 Wyndham acquired another farm, near Vereeniging, over which Hereford cattle roamed and at Kromdraai he started a herd of shorthorns. In May he went to Cradock, where he inspected some farming properties of a company of which he and Duncan were directors. However, tied to market prices and susceptible to price variations and poor climatic conditions, farming remained a constant battle.
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Wyndham faced a struggle at Kromdraai on another front too. A portion of the farm, two morgen in extent and within 300 yards of the station, was alienated to the government in 1914 and reserved for educational purposes. A school complex catering for 64 pupils together with teacher’s quarters was completed at the end of June 1916. Wyndham attended its opening in August 1916 and noted how the Scottish teacher only just appointed became the target of the local Nationalists who wanted him replaced by an Afrikaner. Although this was then ‘the regular process in the country districts’, as Wyndham lamented, it did not lead to educational efficiency. The Boers, whose ‘children are growing up practically uneducated’, would be the chief sufferers. The English-speakers, however, lost this battle too, and the Demestre children, offspring of Hugh’s farm manager, were sent into Standerton for their schooling.

The Wyndhams fell increasingly back on Johannesburg, politically, socially and culturally, where a new circle of family and friends had formed. The new Bishop of Pretoria was Neville Talbot, one of Maud’s cousins, whom Hugh thought ‘too much of the muscular Christian type’.

Yet, the bishop and his young family, together with the Wickhams, formed a welcome ‘phalanx of the family’ in South Africa. The arrival of the Talbots, together with Hugh’s election to the Johannesburg Town Council in 1921, maintained Wyndhams as a focus of family and political interest. The house was still a convenient place to entertain family and friends as well as the circle of local politicians and town councillors. Regular visitors included the Ponsonbys and the Villiers’s as well as the Government House throng. Prince Arthur, the governor general, had been at Eton with Maud’s brothers and sought her out on arriving in South Africa; while Miss
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91 Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 27 Sep 1920, HHA 2/4/11.
Braginton, Maud's former governess, was now secretary to the governor general's wife.\textsuperscript{92} If not visiting each other in residence they were rubbing shoulders at the races, at charity drives or social events.\textsuperscript{93}

By September, both Wyndham and Duncan were toying with the idea of standing for the Johannesburg Municipal Council, which to their minds had under Labour management become 'fearfully corrupt & dishonest.' Hugh's involvement in municipal politics would mean his having to deal directly with Labour, which, as Maud noted to Lady Leconfield, they had up until then managed to avoid. They would now 'be in the mud up to the neck.'\textsuperscript{94} It was, Hugh lamented, 'a hotbed of graft and corruption.'\textsuperscript{95} Yet it was important that 'decent men ... make a stand' and, perhaps a critical core of them, might reduce the influence of Mr Labour and 'his little venomous black rat of a wife.'\textsuperscript{96}

However, following the failure of the hereenigings conference and the subsequent rapprochement between Smuts and the Unionists, both Wyndham and Duncan, anticipating a general election, abandoned the idea of municipal councillorship and prepared for the parliamentary polls.\textsuperscript{97} The Unionists met in Bloemfontein on November 2, where they resolved to disband and join the SAP. The party, as Maud noted, 'was finished in a day.'\textsuperscript{98} When they were last in Bloemfontein, in 1910, they had joined Jameson, Farrar and Chaplin in founding the party. Now, ten years later, saddened, but with little choice, they decided to merge with Smuts. 'There it now lies in ashes & we can hardly think ourselves likely to rise as a Phoenix.'\textsuperscript{99} Amalgamation was not easy for the Unionists, who had 'to sink [their] identity and go into the fold of its old enemy.' But this

\textsuperscript{92} Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 4 Jan 1922, HHA 2/4/57.
\textsuperscript{94} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 7 Sep 1920, WSRO: PHA.
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\textsuperscript{96} Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Sep 1920, WSRO: PHA.
they did. With secession as the paramount political issue when Smuts went to the
country, they had little other choice.\textsuperscript{100}

The conference gave Wyndham a taste for politics again and he longed to return
to parliament.\textsuperscript{101} However, with urgent coal business to do in Birmingham, he and Maud
left hurriedly for England in November 1920.\textsuperscript{102} Wyndhams, leased to the Neville
Talbots, served for several months as Bishop’s Palace: Maud’s sitting room was
converted into a chapel and the drawing room and hall were converted into public sitting
rooms.\textsuperscript{103} Hugh spent part of November and December in Britain and, leaving Maud
there, returned to Johannesburg in January 1921 in time for the general election, but
‘found a complete deadlock over the question as to who was to fight the Turffontein
seat.’\textsuperscript{104} While seats were found for Duncan and others in the post-merge dealing, no
arrangement was made for Wyndham and there were now two nominations in Turffontein
for the South African Party ticket – Wyndham and Hunt, who had stood for the SAP
against Wyndham in 1920.\textsuperscript{105} Hunt was chosen by one vote and Hugh, not wanting to
split the vote and possibly let Labour in, stood down.\textsuperscript{106} While such things were liable to
occur when two parties merge, Wyndham was disappointed at not having a seat to fight.
However his absence in Britain seems to have undermined his chances of getting a seat
elsewhere.\textsuperscript{107} His being left in the political wilderness was, in Archbishop Carter’s
opinion, ‘a great pity … as he was a most useful member of Parliament.’\textsuperscript{108}

Wyndham nonetheless joined Duncan on the electoral road show, which found
him addressing political meetings in the Cape and Transvaal and appealing for support
for the South African Party, which he found curious, even though the issue before the country was the constitution. The SAP appealed to the South African voter to consider the consequences of his vote. A vote for the SAP, they claimed, as the only way to prevent South Africa from becoming another Ireland. The general election was held on February 8. It ended, according to Wyndham, ‘most satisfactorily for the Government party.’ Labour ‘suffered a smashing defeat everywhere, being reduced in number from 21 to 8.’ Turffontein was regained and, although he would have liked to recapture the seat, ‘the next best thing is that it should be won for the party by somebody else.’ Smuts now had a majority of twenty-four, won chiefly at the cost of Labour.

3. A shrinking lifestyle

Disappointed and ‘rather low about it’, Wyndham felt ‘rather at a loose end’ politically. He wanted ‘to have heaps on hand always.’ He did not enjoy games and sport gave no outlet, but Maud was sure that he would soon involve himself with farming associations and matters agricultural. However other, more pressing matters were on his mind, which gave him more than enough to do and he left immediately after the election for Vryheid and his Natal coaling interests at Hobane.

The devastation of European coalfields and the concomitant rising prices and the direction of ships around the Cape sea route, many of which took on coal at Durban, raised the prospects of the coalmines in which Hugh had invested in about 1910. The profit of the Hobane colliery increased progressively during the war and by 1917 had become the leading coal producer in Natal. Capital was ploughed back steadily in order to

---
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meet demand and in January 1918 the company, for the first time in its history, declared a dividend of five percent. However the good times were short-lived. Typhoid struck the compound in 1917, decimating the labour force, floods followed in early 1918 and, in that September, the influenza epidemic caused much illness and many deaths. Output dropped, profit decreased and no dividend was declared in 1919 (figure 9.5). Although a dividend of 5 percent was declared in January 1920, the price of stores and the rising cost of labour made mining unprofitable. What was more, under state contract, the company had to supply coal to the South African Railways (SAR) at below cost and, although a new contract was brokered in 1919, the company was forced in 1920 to sell the money-earning Hlobane railway line to the SAR.


Matters were bad. The revenue from sale of the Hlobane line was used to redeem the whole of the debenture stock and, with the onset of a worldwide economic depression, the demand for coal fell off drastically. Wyndham, again in a rush, left for Britain in March 1921. He seemingly hoped to sign lucrative contacts in Birmingham and

---

perhaps elsewhere. And so, he was off again on what Maud described as ‘this hateful coal business.’ She did not accompany him, but planned to join him in Britain if the work warranted a long stay. She had never liked Hugh’s coal dealings (‘...this horrible business ... I’ve always loathed it’) and described the pits at Vryheid as ‘the vomit.’ She wanted him well out of it so that he would be able to turn to other things. It was all ‘so unnecessary’ and ‘dubious of its success – but men do seem to have such a craze for these sorts of undertakings.’

New taxes were introduced in April 1921. Income tax increased to seven shillings in the pound. And Wyndham worried about money probably for the first time in his life. Kromdraai, now considered ‘a white elephant’, was to be sold and Solly Joel, who had expressed an interest in breeding horses in South Africa, was identified as a possible buyer. Maud liked Mrs Joel. She was pleasant in ‘spite of Solly & the marvellous opulence’ in which she lived. But the sequence of rondavels that formed the new residence at Kromdraai was a far cry from 2, Great Stanhope Street, where, as Maud noted enviously, the Joel dining room was ‘hung with Romneys, Sir Joshua & the rest & everything else to match.’ Joel inspected Kromdraai, but, perhaps not unsurprisingly, an offer was not forthcoming and so the Wyndhams leased the farm. Increased taxation and the news that Joel would not buy Kromdraai foreshadowed increasing frugality. Yet Maud remained optimistic that they would find a buyer and she hoped against hope that Hugh’s business prospects were not too bad and that they would ‘weather it all.’

But things did not improve. The coal business remained critical and Hlobane was forced to quote lower prices in order to maintain a share of the shrinking shipment
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Hugh, on the return voyage to South Africa in May 1921, notified Maud that they would depart again for Britain in June. This Maud thought ‘a mad proceeding’ and she wrote several ‘edgy’ letters to her mother and to Lady Leconfield. She was not privy to Hugh’s plans, which she described as being ‘as sudden these days as the German Emperor’s of happy memory’, and was uncertain what to do about shutting up the house and the dismissing of servants. Her letters to Lady Leconfield that May were, she later admitted, ‘rather cross.’ She had hated Hugh’s coal business from the moment she had heard of it many years previously. She had always felt that he ‘was throwing away his time & prospects on it.’ And now they had to endure ‘all this pillar to post life – up one minute down the next.’

Maud later wrote to Hugh’s mother apologising for her tone. She had returned from Britain that January and had only just settled when Hugh’s cable, notifying her of the changed plans, arrived: ‘it was a blow after feeling settled to find we’d got to upstick & turroosh off again so soon.’ She had not relished the impending dislocation of life, having to arrange and plan about the possible leasing of the house, nor had she relished the thought of ‘everybody yapping & asking questions & commenting w’ch is one of the blemishes of life out here.’ She was sure, however, that the news would soon be out, but she looked forward to Hugh’s arrival in Johannesburg and loved to think of the ‘haven in Great Stanhope St & Hagley.’ If her letters were edgy, it was because she felt ‘rather like living on a volcano.’ She loathed Hugh’s ‘horrid business’ and wished he had ‘never gone in for’ coal. Yet, she recognised, he was clearly interested in the coal business and she remained hopeful that it would yet ‘turn out a big thing.’

Wyndham in turn, hated feeling that he had been the cause of anxieties which could have been avoided, and was ‘anxious to get back to Maud.’ He arrived in Johannesburg on May 11 and was now determined to sell the farm. Maud was pleased.
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Kromdraai had recently been only a drain, giving no pleasure or profit. \(^{131}\) Life, as she noted, was now ‘regulated by considerations of cash & common sense.’ \(^{132}\) A new buyer appeared momentarily at the end of May, but the Wyndhams were eventually forced to lease the farm to a certain Mr Hadley. \(^{133}\)

Wyndham spent the following weeks moving between Johannesburg and the coal pits. This kept him ‘pretty busy’, but he managed to keep going despite ‘a bit of a struggle.’ He was now a little more buoyant and hoped that, not having as bad a time as he had expected, he would ‘perhaps get through after all.’ \(^{134}\) Maud thought Hugh, through it all, found the work rather thrilling. She certainly did not and hoped that he would finish with the coal business before long. \(^{135}\) Despite Hugh’s apparent enjoyment of the venture and their ability to weather several crises, she could not but sometimes feel that they ‘may [yet] be left in the last ditch.’ \(^{136}\)

Maud wanted to ‘cling’ to Wyndhams as long as they were in South Africa. The house was comfortable and ‘homey’ and easy to manage and yet still provided space for visitors ‘staying with all their flocks & herds without congestion ever.’ \(^{137}\) Hardened finances, however, caused her to scrutinise the household accounts more closely and it was not long before she found something was amiss and the cook, who had been ‘disposed to drink from the grocer’s bill’, was fired. \(^{138}\) This brought a saving in household wages, which was moreover, timely, as they would now not have to pay for a cook until their return from Britain.

They sailed on June 3 and Wyndhams was again leased to the Neville Talbots (for £20 per month – ‘v. little but just eno to swear by’ \(^{139}\)) and so the house became the Episcopal Palace once again. \(^{140}\) There was another strike when they arrived in London,
but, despite the inconveniences, Hugh took time out for the cricket, meeting Jack Lyttelton and other relatives at The Oval. Business took him into the city, while Maud was out on the town, visiting relatives or being entertained by friends. They then moved into the country, spending time at Hagley, Petworth, Forthampton, Hawarden and St Christophers, Hugh commuting at times for business in London and Birmingham. \(^{141}\)

4. **Johannesburg municipal councillor**

While still in Britain, Wyndham received news that he had been adopted as a candidate for Ward II in the Johannesburg municipal council. \(^{142}\) This necessitated an earlier return to South Africa. Deciding to leave Maud in London to work through Lyttelton letters, \(^{143}\) Wyndham worked in the city right up until he sailed on September 16. \(^{144}\) As was now customary, he spent his first day in Cape Town with the Carters before entraining for Johannesburg. \(^{145}\) The Archbishop, clearly impressed with Wyndham’s politics, thought he ‘ought to be in the Legislative Assembly’ and was convinced that he would ‘be again before long’. \(^{146}\)

However, while they were away, tragedy had struck at Wyndhams. Cecil Talbot, the bishop’s wife, had died there in childbirth and Hugh moved into the house, still under lease, and stayed with the widower and the young children. \(^{147}\) The general situation was also unpleasant. A financial depression had settled in. It was the first time since 1914 and the start of the war that ‘the country as a whole has been really pinched.’ \(^{148}\) A week later, Wyndham declared that he had never seen South Africa ‘in a greater condition of slump’:

\(^{141}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 29 Jun 1921, HHA 2/4/39; Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 20 Jul 1921, HHA 2/4/40; Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 2 Sep 1921, HHA 2/4/41; and Maud Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 10 Sep 1921, WSRO: PHA.
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\(^{143}\) Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 23 Oct 1921, HHA 2/4/49. This work was published by Hodder and Stoughton in 1924 as M. Wyndham, *Chronicles of the Eighteenth Century: Founded on the Correspondence of Sir Thomas Lyttelton and his Family. 2 vols* (London, 1924).
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'It is rather characteristic of the people here either to be up in the clouds or down in the depths, & they are very much in the latter position just at present. Probably a short time hence they will be exactly the opposite, & speculating as hard as usual.'

Although the government was suffering in popularity, politically things were very quiet. Wyndham opened his municipal campaign on October 18, 'with a speech to a small & select audience representing ratepayers associations.' His opponent was Fred Holland, a candidature which he did not take very seriously. This, and there being no time to canvas, Wyndham ran his campaign through the Post Office. He won Ward II 'with great ease' (the result was 1835 to 252) and proclaimed that he had 'never had an easier election, & [had] seldom done so little Electioneering.' Moreover, the election 'ended in a very satisfactory defeat of the labour party', who won only three out of twelve seats. The SAP, with a solid majority in the council, would now 'have a chance of putting things right, or trying to do so.'

Maud, having remained on in Britain to work through Lyttelton muniments, followed in November with Brown, her new ladiesmaid. The RMS Briton had 'the usual crowd of passengers – Jews in swarms, Belgians going to the Congo, pallid civil servants going back to their fever heat wilds & business men & commercial travellers, & a few on the spree only.' Maud did 'old letters in the saloon in the mornings.' She hoped to have her book ready for publication the following year. Hugh's book on South African horses was approaching completion and so was her brother Jack's. Neville Talbot had recently produced a religious work too and so Maud expected the shelves for family works at Hagley, Wyndhams and elsewhere would have to be enlarged.

---
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Wyndham represented Ward II in the Johannesburg Town Council. Wyndham, eager to fix the wrongs of what he considered to be two years of Labour mismanagement, enveloped himself in municipal affairs: Maud told Lady Cobham that he read up ‘all manner of books & papers on municipal things.’\textsuperscript{157} He attended his first council meeting on 4 November 1921, when he was elected to serve on the Finance and Water and Fire Brigade committees.\textsuperscript{158} He later served on the General Purposes Committee as well as the Works Committee and at one point chaired the Water and Fire Brigade Committee.\textsuperscript{159} His attendance of meetings was good (table 9.6). However, while the work was very interesting, he thought his fellow councillors to be ‘a very mixed lot’ who consumed enormous amounts of time ‘in perfectly irrelevant talk.’\textsuperscript{160} After ten years in the corridors of national politics, Wyndham found municipal affairs ‘really very dead.’\textsuperscript{161} The council meetings may have been lively at times, but ‘the level of debate and repartee’ he complained was ‘somewhere down in the neighbourhood of the nether regions.’\textsuperscript{162} His

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Meetings & Oct 1921-Oct 1922 & Oct 1922-Oct 1923 \\
\hline
Council & Max. 32 & 24 \\
& Actual 29 & 24 \\
Council in Committee & Max. 7 & 3 \\
& Actual 4 & 3 \\
Finance Committee & Max. 26 & 23 \\
& Actual 23 & 23 \\
General Purposes Committee & Max. 6 & - \\
& Actual 6 & - \\
Water and Fire Brigade Committee & Max. 14 & - \\
& Actual 14 & - \\
Works Committee & Max. - & 22 \\
& Actual - & 17 \\
\hline
Maximum Attendances Possible & 85 & 72 \\
Total Actual Attendances & 76 & 67 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Hugh Wyndham’s attendance of the Johannesburg Town Council and Committee Meetings, 26 Oct 1921 to 3 Oct 1923 (Source: NASAP: MJB 1/1/42, MJB 1/1/44.)}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{157} Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 18 Dec 1921, HHA 2/4/55.
\textsuperscript{158} Minutes of Special Meeting of Johannesburg Town Council, 4 Nov 1921, NASAP: MJB 1/1/40.
\textsuperscript{159} Minutes of Special Meeting of Johannesburg Town Council, 3 Nov 1922, NASAP: MJB 1/1/42.
\textsuperscript{160} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Nov 1921, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{161} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 14 Dec 1921, WSRO: PHA.
\textsuperscript{162} Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Nov 1921, WSRO: PHA.
patience at meetings seems to have waned as a result, something that Quip, the cartoonist for *The Star*, caught in a series of caricatures.  

However, if Wyndham’s patience was tested during council meetings, this may be attributed to the range of other matters on his mind. He attended the opening meeting of the SAP Congress on 29 November 1921. But his attention was drawn by other matters, too. He had still had coal on his mind and had to continue his visits to the pits, both in the Transvaal and in Natal. He departed for the latter immediately after the election. He liked Hlobane, which was the site of an Anglo-Zulu battlefield. It was ‘a most attractive spot’ and he was concerned that the coal mining operations were damaging the natural beauty of the place. The colliery nonetheless gave him some satisfaction, although the business side of things was progressing at a slower pace than he might have wished. And then, to aggravate matters still further, some eight inches of rain fell in just nine days in late November 1921, which ‘very much interfered with work there.’ Business remained critical and the colliery, having to operate in a climate of deepening recession, was forced to quote lower prices in order to maintain a share of the shrinking shipment trade. Interest in the Australian cricket XI, then touring South Africa, brought some relief, but more ominously, in November 1921, his attention was drawn by the threat of ‘considerable trouble on the gold mines.’

5. **Defence councillor (1918-1923) and the Rand Strike of 1922**

Wyndham, although losing parliamentary office in February 1920, retained an official interest in defence. He had been appointed to the Defence Council in December 1918 and remained there until his resignation in 1923. The Council, a statutory body established in terms of the *South Africa Defence Act*, comprised four members, two English-
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speakers and two Afrikaners, all military specialists and representing the four provinces. They were appointed by the Governor General on the advice of the Minister of Defence who was *ex officio* President of the Council. The Secretary for Defence, then still Sir Roland Bourne, served as Secretary of the Council.

The Council was to advise on every proposal involving the exercise by the Governor General of the powers vested in him under the provisions of the *South Africa Defence Act*. The Governor General could also consult the Council in relation to the general or special defence requirements of the Union, whether arising from normal or abnormal conditions affecting the peace and security of the Union. They had also to advise the Minister of Defence with regard to the establishment, composition and development of the UDF and specifically the integration process and sectarian interests. Other specialists could also be summoned to join the Defence Council in deliberation and give advice, although this seemingly was seldom done. The Council for Defence was a safety mechanism and was to function for five years from the commencement of the *Defence Act*. However, with advisory powers only, the Council was little more than a watchdog without teeth and from 1912 through to July 1918, the period of integration, the rebellion and the Great War, it was convened on only thirteen occasions. The councillors felt superfluous and objected to being 'merely ... a registering machine for actions by the Department.' Crewe resigned, possibly in protest, and his seat was filled by Wyndham, who was determined to increase the Council's influence and was a major voice during its meetings.

Wyndham, like colonial officials and commercial expatriates elsewhere, sought three things in the colonial state: a strong economy, good security, and respect for British institutions and conceptions of individual freedom. And for these men there was no necessary trade-off between the three. A balance could be maintained, but this required strong government. A breakdown in law and order, never tolerated, would result in martial law and the call-out of the troops, and only once law and order had been re-

---

169 The first defence councillors were Col Sir Charles Crewe (Cape), Brig Gen Sir Duncan McKenzie (Natal), Gen C.R. de Wet (Orange Free State) and Gen S.W. Burger (Transvaal). See Defence Council Agenda of 1st and 2nd meetings, MAP: DC, Box 109, files 2270 and 2271. Minutes of 13th Meeting, 20 Jun 1918, MAP: DC, Box 348, file 35930. 14th Meeting of Defence Council.

170 Minutes of 13th Meeting, 20 Jun 1918, MAP: DC, Box 348, file 35930. 14th Meeting of Defence Council.

171 De Wet to Buxton, 19 Dec 1918, NASAP: URU 383, f.2863; and Ministers' Minute No 2863 of 20 Dec 1918, NASAP: GG 29, 1/1149.
established would civil liberties be restored. A government had to govern, to show it meant business. At the same time, the old Kindergarten believed that England had established successful plantings in North America due to their superior institutions and considered the extension of freedom and self-government throughout the empire as a necessary but gradual path to follow. Yet, at the same time, it was equally important, before any grant of self-government, that the subject peoples understand British institutions and the principles of commonwealth. As Curtis warned, any ‘premature extension of representative institutions throughout the Empire would be the shortest road to anarchy.’ According to their combined wisdom, this was the only way to govern a country and take its peoples to eventual self-government. Wyndham, whose attention was drawn continually to the threat of industrial trouble and other internal conflict, pointing to a lack of appreciation for British institutions by Afrikaner diehards, naturally agreed.

At the time of the Rand Strike he and Maud were in Johannesburg, a place that Archbishop Carter described as ‘never quite normal – partly in consequence of the altitude & partly because of the kind of life which exists in a great mining centre.’ Early in 1922 this centre was convulsed by the gravest industrial action, to strike the Rand. The rising cost of living, post-war unemployment and the attraction of Marxist ideology, all exacerbated by the prospect of wage reductions brought on strike action, first on the coalfields and then by 10 January enveloping all the goldmines, the Rand power stations and city engineers. The strikers, influenced by international syndicalism, were armed and organised along military lines. Police stations were attacked and parts of the Rand came under the control of the strikers’ commandos. Martial law was declared.

---

172 Members of what Quigley has defined as ‘the Milner Group’ (see his The Anglo-American Establishment, chapter 5) took the same view. Willingdon could not bear the ‘habit of parleying with revolutionary leaders’ whether in India or Ireland, and considered law and order to be the ‘first principle of increased liberty.’ Lord Willingdon to Drummond Chaplin, 15 Sep 1921, UCT: BC831 Drummond Chaplin Collection, B1. Willingdon, who was also Robert Brand’s cousin, was then Governor of Madras. Selborne was disinclined to parley at all. ‘I am not at all sanguine about Ireland. The people we have to negotiate with are not strictly speaking rational beings. And as for those who are not only rebels, but assassins, I think nothing would have induced me to have negotiated with them at all.’ Lord Selborne to Howard Pim, 31 Aug 1921, Wits: A881 Pim Papers, BL.1.


and citizen forces were called out, as the violence, including brutal murders, peaked. The government regained control on March 14, when Fordsburg, the last stronghold of the strikers, was bombed.\textsuperscript{176}

Mail letters carried the news of the strike to Britain. On January 9 Maud had warned her mother of impending industrial action and enclosed cuttings from the \textit{Sunday Times}, which gave 'rather an amusing acct of day by day things on the Rand.'\textsuperscript{177} The Lytteltons, however, were rather less than amused. Alarm descended upon Hagley.\textsuperscript{178} Sensing their anxiety, the Wyndhams sent off cables of reassurance to Hagley and elsewhere. This was a great comfort. Lord Cobham, now aged and very ill, had been most worried. As Lady Cobham explained, he 'really took the revolution all in, more than anyone.' He had been 'so very anxious', fearing 'a native rising, & masses of uncontrolled scum.'\textsuperscript{179} Maud was his favourite child and he had visions of Wyndhams, relatively isolated on Parktown ridge, being looted by 'raiders & Bolsheviks.'\textsuperscript{180} As they anxiously watched the progress of the strike the Cobhams were concerned that Hugh and Maud, surely 'on the list of "prominent citizens" to be shot', would also be kidnapped.\textsuperscript{181}

Maud later wrote a long 'strike letter', detailing their experience in Johannesburg during the trouble, which was circulated through the family and later received wider currency.\textsuperscript{182} It told of the anxiety of the residents of Parktown and Johannesburg's other suburbs and the 'thrill' in experiencing the sequence of events. Hugh, then a municipal councillor was called away at times, sometimes at night, leaving Maud in their mansion on the ridge. But the Wyndhams, typical of their class, were not overcome with paralysis.

\textsuperscript{176} D. Jacobsson, \textit{Fifty Golden Years of the Rand} (London 1936), pp 89 et seq. See also A.G. Oberholster, \textit{Die Mynwerkersstaking, Witwatersrand, 1922} (Pretoria 1982) and 'The Red Revolution on the Rand; Holding Down the Lid of Hell', \textit{The Nongqai} May 1922. The latter is an extensive, contemporary article in a government publication, attuned to Wyndham's opinions.

\textsuperscript{177} Maud Wyndham to Lady Cobham, 9 Jan 1922, HHA 2/4/58.

\textsuperscript{178} Maud's brother, Richard, noted how Rand strikes always seemed 'to be rather big things' (Richard Lyttelton to Maud Wyndham, 9 Feb [1922], HHA 2/37/6/8), Johannesburg being a 'warm shop' (ditto, 8 Mar 1922, HHA 2/31/76).

\textsuperscript{179} Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 11 Apr 1922, HHA 5/6/13.

\textsuperscript{180} Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 15 Mar 1922, HHA 5/6/9.

\textsuperscript{181} Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 22 Mar 1922, HHA 5/6/10.

\textsuperscript{182} The letter was circulated within the Lyttelton family (Lady Cobham to Maud Wyndham, 11 Apr 1922, HHA 5/6/13). Archbishop Carter acquired a copy, which struck him as very interesting, and he had it duplicated. Carter sent a copy to Rev Algernon Lawley (Lord Wenlock) in late March 1922, with the request that he keep it private as he did not have Maud Wyndham's permission to do so. William Carter to Lord Wenlock, 30 Mar 1922, Wits: AB186 Archbishop Carter Letters.
of fear. They took in refugees, assisted the Girls' Diocesan Association and other charities in relief work and distributed whiskey to the drivers. The middling classes feared the working classes (those 'masses of uncontrolled scum'); the upper classes despised them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Security forces</th>
<th>Revolutionaries</th>
<th>Suspected revolutionaries</th>
<th>Innocent civilians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Killed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounded or injured</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.7: The human cost of the 1922 Rand Strike
Note: The categories are taken from the official report.
(Source: D. Jacobsson, Fifty Golden Years of the Rand, p 92.)

The casualty bill was heavy (table 9.7) and recriminations followed in the House of Assembly, increasing the bitterness between Smuts and the Hertzogites. The Defence Council met in Pretoria on March 23, 1922, to discuss the position of affairs as revealed by the Rand revolution. 'One great fact that emerged,' Wyndham noted to Duncan, now in Smuts' cabinet, 'was the hopeless inadequacy of the permanent force.'

The SAMR had been disbanded in 1920 and Andries Brink, the Chief of the General Staff, had recommended the formation of a mobile striking force, which, for reasons of economy, had not been formed. With the outbreak of what Wyndham termed the Rand 'revolution', the small force available at Roberts Heights was sent to the Reef, leaving Roberts Heights ungarrisoned and the magazines and airstrips there unguarded. At the meeting Wyndham tabled a strongly-worded motion urging the government to form a properly-constituted permanent force immediately. However, as Hendrik Mentz, the Minister of Defence, replied, no budgetary provision had been made. Wyndham was horrified. The last of the imperial garrison had been withdrawn in December 1921 and Wyndham, cataloguing the unrest in 1907, 1913-14, 1918 and 1922, reaffirmed his
warnings published in 1909. Armed conflict occurred regularly in South Africa and the feelings of fresh bitterness and increasing unemployment pointed to further unrest. South Africa ran a risk in not funding an operationally-competent force. A mobile force of two-thousand-five-hundred men at Roberts Heights, he argued, would have made all the difference and he trusted that they would ‘never again have to run the risks which we took on March 10th and 11th’.

Unsurprisingly, Wyndham was keen on airpower. He had taken his first flight in July 1919, when he travelled to France to visit the battlefields of the Western Front and was most impressed by the developments in aircraft and intrigued by the possibilities of airpower. In the same year he had pondered the application of ‘a squadron of aeroplanes’ as ‘a healthy preventative against a too crackbrained application of the self-determination principle’ in South Africa. His fascination with the air arm, which seemingly held great advantages, continued. It was both economic and efficient, one or two pilots could achieve the same result as 2500 infantrymen, but, at the same time, it elicited fear and in southern Africa was almost immune to ground attack at the time. Both the Rand Strike and the Bondelswarts rising later in 1922 highlighted the importance of airpower; in the latter case two aircraft ended a campaign fuddled by an artillery detachment and 100 mounted troops operating in unfamiliar, broken terrain. Wyndham was still a defence councillor when a South African Air Force was established early in 1922, and then primarily for colonial policing.

---

186 H.A. Wyndham, ‘Some aspects of South African defence’, The State: A South African National Magazine, 2(6) June 1909 and 2(7) July 1909. He might have added the Bambata Uprising of 1906 as well as the Israelite unrest at Bulhoek in May 1921. See DC, Box 451, file 52002 Recalcitrant ‘Israelite’ Natives. The latter crisis peaked at a time when Wyndham was in the midst of a financial crisis and for this reason was perhaps left unnoted.

187 Hugh Wyndham to Patrick Duncan, 24 Mar 1922, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.44.3; and Minutes of 20th meeting, 23 Mar 1922, MAP: DC, Box 461, file 3/52032 21st Meeting of Defence Council.

188 Hugh Wyndham to Patrick Duncan, 5 Aug 1919, UCT: BC294 Duncan Papers, D1.44.1; and Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 9 Aug 1919, WSRO: PHA.

189 Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 16 Jan 1919, WSRO: PHA.

190 Minutes of 22nd meeting, 24 Oct 1923, MAP: DC, Box 461, file 3/52032 21st Meeting of Defence Council. For the Bondelswarts see the correspondence and Van Ryneveld’s report on the ‘Air Operations Bondelzwart Revolt’ in MAP: CGS Gp 1, Box 12, file 23 S.W.Africa Native Disturbance at Kalkfontein May 1922 Bondelzwarts rebellion.
Despite his self-perceptions (he described himself as a 'colonial' in 1903 and 'as a true Afrikaner' in 1921), Wyndham remained a Briton at heart and, like other Britons in South Africa, he felt increasingly alienated in a South Africa that had become progressively Afrikanerised after the war. At times he raised the question of linguistic accommodation at the defence council, but eventually, he seems to have resigned himself to the inability of the council to ensure an equitable balance between the linguistic groups in the UDF. Major C.R. Burgess, who had once served as staff officer and confidant to Beyers, now hoped 'for a host of 1920 settlers to balance things up a bit.' Even he noted that 'justice [was] not to be found in the Defence Dept for the Britisher.' Crewe agreed. Large-scale British immigration was the only sure obstacle on the road to an Afrikaner republic. Without this the British-South African would lose hope and would be either gradually absorbed or have to leave South Africa.

6. 'Going home'

A sequence of events commencing with the general election in March 1920 seemed cumulatively to point to the end of an era. Wyndham's defeat in Turffontein, which he had represented for ten years, by a Labour man marked a change in the political landscape. He had hoped that the formation of a 'constitutional party', embracing loyalists of both languages, would 'tide us over the next few years.' It bought just three years. The rise and then confluence of Labour and a resurgent Afrikaner nationalism, representing in Wyndham's mind the combination of backveld Dutch and working-class English, his two archenemies, brought the downfall of Smuts in 1924. This alliance, unholy and in the context of the recent past almost unnatural, seemed to usher in a dark age. Politically,
South Africa could no longer be saved for the empire and, as an erstwhile Unionist colleague noted, with 'no great national British question at stake' South African politics had become 'dull and degrading.' His dreams of transplanting a British world into South Africa had failed.

The loss of political influence in 1920 was only partially compensated for by a seat on the Johannesburg municipal council. But this coincided with the primary adoption by most British South Africans of a South African identity as well as the erosion of his social power, always tenuous on the more egalitarian periphery. Wyndham, as an MLA, had had official precedence in South Africa, but this he lost in 1920 when he was defeated in Turffontein. He now had no official standing, although a son of a peer and entitled to privilege in Britain. Moreover, as a result of the economic impacts of the Great War, the settling in of a worldwide economic depression and the effect of years of careless financial management, Wyndham, once a very wealthy man, experienced serious financial troubles after 1918. Extensive travelling within South Africa and abroad, the maintenance of a genteel lifestyle and two houses, both equipped for entertaining, and careless financial management came at a price, although Wyndham only felt this from 1914 when his supply of money from Britain was disrupted and then reduced. He closed his stud in 1917 and so lost his racing income and this was followed in 1920 by the loss of his parliamentary salary.

Furthermore, his speculative activities never paid off. He lost an early investment in the Transvaal newspaper industry when the Eastern Transvaal Printing and Publishing Company Limited was liquidated in June 1906; while farming losses, associated with climate and pestilence, caused further losses between 1904 and 1920 and, for much of the same period, the Kromdraai stud probably drew at least as much money as it generated. These losses were exacerbated by neglect of the potentially rich agricultural lands at

197 Charles Crewe to Lewis Michell, 11 Dec 1925, NASAC: Sir Lewis Michell Collection, vol 1.
199 Hough to Horsfall, 18 Jan 1917, and Secretary to Governor General to Senatus Cape Town, 29 Jan 1917, NASAP: GG 1271, 34/577 Honours Precedence Question of precedence of the Hon Jean de Villiers, the Hon Hugh Wyndham, Commander the Hon S. Hay and Lady de Villiers.
200 Ex parte application H.A. Wyndham, Order ex parte Wyndham, 8 Jun 1906, NASAP: ZTPD 8/798, 527/1906.
Kromdraai, his farm on the highveld, which, never really produced a profit, was eventually alienated.

However, his greatest losses seem to have been associated with the coal business. His coal mining interests in the Middelburg and Vryheid districts never came to much, despite the great expectations that they once generated. For many Victorians there was a fine line, albeit mostly a blurred one, between ‘investing’ and ‘speculating’, with the last related closely to ‘gambling.’ While well-heeled Victorians and Edwardians invested, sometimes heavily, in foreign ventures, failure always produced talk. It was the gossip, the labelling of Hugh as a ‘speculator’ or even worse a ‘gambler’, that worried Maud. Although the exact nature of his losses cannot be ascertained, they must have been considerable. Staying at Bishopscourt in January 1923, Wyndham shared his disappointments with the Anglican prelate, who, breaking the confidence, noted to a correspondent in Britain that Wyndham had suffered what he called ‘serious financial losses.’

He could no longer survive in the new South African environment. It was hostile financially, socially and politically to a man of his background, his opinions of the world, and his choice of pursuits. Milner had confided to Geoffrey Robinson in September 1907 that those Britons remaining in South Africa would ‘have one or two very bad years to live through.’ Hugh saw through a further sixteen years. Yet, ultimately, as Milner had feared, the constitution of some Britons would ‘be too feeble to stand’ the pressures over the years. Having battled through sixteen years of Het Volk and SA Party rule, he recognised the inevitable. The Nationalists, in alliance with Labour, would sweep the elections scheduled for 1924 and eventually, unable to do so militarily, they would take

---


203 On the difficulty in writing about finances in this period see Poovey, M., ‘Writing about Finance in Victorian England: Disclosure and Secrecy in the Culture of Investment’, *Victorian Studies* 45(1) 2002, pp 17-41. In Hugh Wyndham’s case, his letters at Petworth are only accessible to 1921.

South Africa along a constitutional path to independence and the restoration of a republic but over the whole of the country. The embracing white South Africanism of Botha was in full retreat.

Disillusioned, politically and financially, he resigned from both the defence council and the Johannesburg municipal council and left South Africa at the end of 1923. Giving up the fight of more than two decades, he returned permanently to Britain, where, again using network links, he created a new career with the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

---


206
EPILOGUE
Britain 1924-1963

Britain's colonial retreat brought on a series of crises for Wyndham. The politics of empire had troubled his family for some time. As a governing aristocracy under threat, imperial concerns formed their staple debate.¹ The Empire had stood for many things: a tacit proof that Britain was 'Great', an inspiration for poets, a provider of jobs for colonial administrators and officials. As Martin Kitchen has noted, the English aristocracy 'needed the Empire not simply because they were trained from earliest childhood to administer distant lands, but also because the Empire confirmed their sense of superiority, their authority, their mission, their purpose in life, their dearest and deepest values.'² Colonial retreat in South Africa and the resurgence of Afrikaner nationalism undermined Wyndham's sense of surety, both as an aristocrat and as a Greater Briton.

Therefore, when he returned to Britain at the end of 1923, he joined other former kindergarteners at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) in the study of problems pertaining to the empire.³ They, as part of what Quigley has called the Milner Group, influenced Commonwealth affairs by publicity work of great quantity and often of reasonable quality: This they did through various periodicals, including The Round Table, The Times and International Affairs as well as the variegated series of books published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs and by public meetings and private moots.⁴

¹ See, for example, Hannah, Countess of Rosebery to Constance, Baroness Leconfield, 3 Jul 1886, WSRO: PHA 9680.
³ Wyndham later served on the council that governed the Royal Institute of International Affairs. On the history of both the Institute and the Round Table movement see S. King-Hall, Chatham House: A brief account of the origins, purposes and methods of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (London 1937), pp 10-11; and C. Quigley, The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden (New York 1981), chapters 7 and 10. King-Hall is sympathetic. Quigley is conspiratorial. For weighty, thorough treatments see A. Bosco, and A. May (eds), The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy (London 1997) and, most particularly, A. May, 'The Round Table, 1910-66' (unpub DPhil thesis, Oxford 1995).
⁴ These were 'sponsored by the Round Table Group throughout the Commonwealth, by the Institute of International Affairs everywhere, by the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), by the Council on
Wyndham wrote many articles and book reviews for the Institute’s mouthpiece - the *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* – as well as for *The Round Table*.\(^5\) His study on the South African horse was published in 1924\(^6\) and thereafter his attention turned to the empire and the so-called ‘idea of colour’, at a time when ideas within the empire on the relations between black and white subjects of the crown remained inchoate. He published an article in 1925\(^7\) and during the following year he co-convened a workshop of the British Institute of Philosophical Studies on ‘The Problem of Colour in Relation to the Idea of Equality.’ In the same year, he co-edited a collection of papers emanating from the workshop\(^8\) and this was followed in 1929 with a paper he read at Chatham House on the ‘Liquor Traffic in West Africa’.\(^9\)

During this prolific period of his life Wyndham produced a chapter for volume eight of the Cambridge History of the British Empire\(^10\) in addition to his directing a RIIA study group on Comparative Colonial Administration and produced three volumes for the Institute’s series on the *Problems of Imperial Trusteeship*.\(^11\) His Native education in Ceylon, Java, Formosa, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Malaya was

---

\(^5\) Foreign Relations, by the Williamstown Institute of Politics, by the Rhodes Scholarship group; and through the three unofficial conferences on British Commonwealth relations held by the Group since 1933.' See C. Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*, p 161.

\(^6\) The *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* was at first only available to members of the Institute. The first issues, much like *The Round Table*, were anonymous. When it went on public sale in 1927, the name changed to *International Affairs*. Publication was suspended at the end of 1939.


\(^9\) The proceedings of the workshop were published as Lord Lugard, M. Ginsberg and H.A. Wyndham, ‘The problem of colour in relation to the idea of equality’, Supplement to *Journal of Philosophical Studies* 1(2) 1926.


published in September 1933. This was followed in May 1935 by *The Atlantic and slavery* and a companion volume, *The Atlantic and emancipation* two years later.\(^{12}\)

The study group reports assumed many forms, although all were to 'conform to the requirement that they shall be respected by the expert and acceptable to the general reader.'\(^{13}\) Here, Wyndham seemingly fell short. Jim Stratford, a friend from South Africa who had at least two of Wyndham's books on his shelves, admitted to not having read them. Stratford wondered why Hugh did 'not write on subjects which make more popular appeal.'\(^{14}\)

Wyndham also visited European countries during this time. He and Maud were in Spain in 1936 and in Italy in 1937. However his analysis of the situation in Spain and forecasts concerning the war later proved wrong and John Guest, one of Maud's nephews, hoped his 'predictions' about Italy would 'work out better.'\(^{15}\) However, Wyndham was gradually moving to the fore in the RIIA. He attended the unofficial Commonwealth conference that met in Sydney in 1938 as part of the British delegation that included men like Lord Lothian, Lionel Curtis and W.K. Hancock.\(^{16}\) And from 1939 Wyndham presided at the general meetings of the RIIA, which, during the winter of 1939-40, were held in Rhodes House, Oxford.\(^{17}\) During the war, between his ARP duties, Wyndham produced a *Friends of Free Italy* manifesto\(^{18}\) as well as his *Britain and the World*.\(^{19}\) And, in 1944, when the publication of the Institute's *Journal* resumed, Wyndham was appointed chair of the editorial board.\(^{20}\)

However, after the war, Wyndham withdrew from the public stage and devoted himself increasingly to the history of his family and their ancestral lands. He went to the conservation department of the Public Record Office in London, to learn how to repair

---

\(^{12}\) *Native education in Ceylon, Java, Formosa, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Malaya* (London 1933); *The Atlantic and slavery* (London 1935); and *The Atlantic and emancipation* (London 1937) all in the *Problems of Imperial Trusteeship* series of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

\(^{13}\) S. King-Hall, *Chatham House*, p 60.

\(^{14}\) Jim Stratford to Maud Wyndham, 25 Mar 1943, HHA 2/37/5/2.

\(^{15}\) John Guest to Maud Wyndham, 24 May 1937, HHA 2/37/6/6.


his own family archives. And, having done much research in the archives and, having produced books on the history of the family and the estate, with these he was au fait. The two volumes of his *Family History* appeared in 1939 and 1950.  

Yet equally demanding of his attention was the future, which seemed portentous and in particular so in view of the extent to which the family estates were exposed to the mercy of Inland Revenue. From 1949 the maximum rate of personal death duty, since its introduction in 1894, had reached a crushing 80 percent. Moreover, the inability of both Charles (the third Lord Leconfield) and Hugh (his heir and the future fourth lord) to produce their own direct male heir meant that the Leconfield title and estates would have to move sideways through a succession of three elderly brothers, Charles, Hugh and Edward. All were then in their seventies. So even if the Leconfield estate survived the duty it would have to pay upon Charles’ death, it was sure to be caught within a relatively short time by two further assessments in swift succession. Repeated three times, even with the benefit of rapid succession relief, the compound levy would exhaust the Wyndham asset base and, within one generation, strip one of Britain’s ‘great governing families’ of their inherited wealth and privilege.

By family agreement the bulk of the estates, territorial and otherwise, would pass on Charles’ death directly to John Wyndham, the 32 year old son of Edward, the fifth of the Wyndham brothers. And so only one set of death duties would be payable.  

---

21 These are *A Family History*, vol. 1: the Wyndhams of Norfolk and Somerset, 1410-1688 (London 1939) and *A Family History*, vol. 2: The Wyndhams of Somerset, Sussex and Wiltshire, 1688-1837 (London 1950).

22 On the impact of death duty, but with special reference to the Grosvenor family see R. Lacey, *Aristocrats* (Aylesbury 1984), pp 183-92. The Wyndhams were nonetheless forced to hand over family pictures and priceless works of art to the treasury and at ridiculous values. Petworth House itself was handed over to the National Trust. See R. Lacey, *Aristocrats*, p 190. In this regard, the following pieces, still closed to the public, could not be consulted at the Public Record Office:

- **T227/670** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1952-55.
- **T227/671** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1955.
- **T227/672** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1955.
- **T227/673** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1955-56.
- **T227/674** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1956.
- **T227/675** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex, 1956.
- **T227/676** Acceptance of works of art at Petworth House, Sussex: inventory of chattels and valuers report, 1953-54.
- **TS56/223** Petworth House: paintings by Turner accepted as payment of estate duty under section 30 of the Finance Act 1953, lent to the National Trust, and subsequently
Leconfield title, however, would pass in sequence to Hugh (the fourth Lord), then on his death to his brother Edward (the fifth Lord), and then to Edward’s son, John (the sixth Lord), who, having served Harold Macmillan as private secretary, had been ennobled as Lord Egremont.  

Hugh, who had been heir presumptive since Reginald’s death in Flanders in 1914, duly succeeded as the fourth Lord Leconfield when Charles died in 1952. Maud died during the following year and increasingly Hugh surrendered himself to the past. He oversaw the posthumous publication of Maud’s manuscript on the *Three Howard Sisters*, which appeared in 1955, 25 and he himself produced two volumes of local history. 26 Wyndham’s concern for the past and the desire to preserve that past for the future can give the aristocrat an indifference to the present. It is this lack of aristocratic responsiveness to the present, according to Robert Lacey, that leads to the accusations of disdainfulness and even downright eccentricity, charges that beleaguered Wyndham for the twenty-two years he spent in South Africa. 27

He died in 1963.

24 The sixth Lord Leconfield (and 1st Lord Egremont) disposed of the last of the family lands in Yorkshire, Lancashire and Dumfries, and 20,000 in Cumbria (including the manor of Egremont) and some 7,000 acres in Sussex. Petworth House was handed over to the National Trust – the Wyndhams are now tenants. Cockermouth Castle was retained and modernised and now serves as the dower residence. The second Lord Leconfield had some 109,900 acres in 1876, the present and seventh Lord was left with only 13,000 acres in 1976. See Lord Egremont, *Wyndham and Children First* (London 1968), p 95; letter Lord Egremont to R. van der Waag, 19 Jun 1981; and Appendix H: Patterns of Estate Ownership, 1876-1976 in D. Cannandine, *The Decline and Fall of the British Aristocracy*, pp 710-11.

25 Maud had in fact first ventured into family history publication. Before her marriage she had published several articles in *The National Review*. This was followed by an edited collection of her great-grandmother’s letters, which appeared as *The Correspondence of Sarah Spencer* (New York 1912), which her uncle, General Neville Lyttelton, thought to be ‘very good reading’ (N. Lyttelton, *Eighty Years: Soldiering, Politics, Games* (London 1917), p 13. Her two-volume *Chronicles of the Eighteenth Century: Founded on the Correspondence of Sir Thomas Lyttelton and his Family* appeared in 1924 and this was followed posthumously by her *Three Howard Sisters: Selections from the Writings of Lady Caroline Lascelles, Lady Dover and Countess Gower 1825-1833* in 1955. Lady Caroline Lascelles was Maud’s great-grandmother.

26 These, relating to Wyndham manors and ancestral estates, are *Petworth Manor in the Seventeenth Century* (Weldon 1954) and *Sutton and Duncton Manors* (Weldon 1956).

CONCLUSION

Wyndham and his world

Lord Rosebery, Queen Victoria’s penultimate prime minister and Hugh’s uncle and godfather, remarked once on the apparent superfluous number of biographies then in circulation. He suggested that only the very great ought to qualify. Mary Drew, one of Maud’s Gladstone cousins, countered Rosebery on the occasion, contending that ‘it was not so much a question of greatness as of unusualness, distinctiveness.’

The life of Hugh Wyndham, although a second (perhaps rather third) tier figure in the history of the period and overshadowed by more powerful personalities, is in many ways both unusual and distinctive. A near contemporary of Winston Churchill (1874-1965), Wyndham’s life marks almost exactly the period of the second British Empire. He was born in 1877, on the eve of the so-called ‘Scramble for Africa’, and died in 1963, the year Kenya was granted independence. He lived to see the dissolution of empire, the loss of the mass of Her Britannic Majesty’s colonies and territories overseas, and, in 1961, the exit of South Africa from the Commonwealth.

His eighty-six years break into four, almost equal periods. The first of these, as outlined in chapter one, covers the 22 years from his birth to his posting to South Africa on Milner’s staff. This was a time for imperial expansion and the empire, requiring numerous government and colonial officials, was viewed as a national enterprise and the opportunities it offered for the creation of power, prestige and possible wealth, were seized by ambitious young men. The twenty-two years Wyndham spent in South Africa, attempting to do just this, form, more or less, the second period of his life. His return to Britain at the end of 1923 and the victory of the Nationalists, both in Ireland (1922) and South Africa (1924), and the ‘betrayal’ of traditional elites in both places, marks the start of the third phase, which is characterised by Wyndham’s attempts with the others in the Round Table organisation and the Royal Institute of International Affairs to translate the empire into a commonwealth of
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1 Diary of Mary Drew, 1 Mar 1916, in Lucy Masterman (ed), Mary Gladstone (Mrs Drew): Her Diaries and Letters (New York 1930), p 484.
nations. This period terminates with the end of the Second World War. The final period, coinciding with the dissolution of empire and ending with Wyndham’s death in 1963, is marked by his withdrawal from the public stage and his increasing interest in the history of his family and their ancestral lands and his succession in 1952 as the fourth Lord Leconfield. This study focuses on the second of these periods, the time Wyndham spent chiefly in South Africa, where he arrived just as the last of the Boer republics were drawn into the British fold.

His correspondence and that of Maud, his wife from 1908, is also in many ways unique and covers twenty of the most tormented years in South African history: the period during which the Boers forces were defeated in the field and forced to the conference table to sign a document that stripped them of their independence; a political settlement in which the African people, the vast majority of the population, already incorporated into the colonial states, were sacrificed on the altar of English-Afrikaner relations, a settlement leading eventually to the consolidation of a white state. Six years after the signing of the peace at Vereeniging, the Boers gained political power, although under the Union Jack. At the same time there was a massive concentration of government at the centre, leading to the incorporation of the four British colonies in South Africa under Afrikaner hegemony, leaving the British settlers and English-speakers and African populations on the periphery or, in the latter case, well outside the political system. The passing years witnessed the rising of Bambata and his adherents in 1906, and continuous industrial trouble on the Witwatersrand, with strikes evolving into outright conflict in 1907, 1913, 1914 and 1922. The Afrikaner nationalists split with Botha and Smuts, who remained true to the Union constitution and the ‘solemn agreement between the British & Dutch’; while their ultra fringes went into rebellion in 1914 and almost again in 1916 and 1919. It was a fearful period, one of brutal suppression, the killing of rebels, and of arbitrary justice. A squadron of Wyndham’s regiment – the Southern Mounted Rifles – took the field against Bambata; yet, as a vocal Unionist MLA after 1910, Hugh took up the cause of the ‘British’ South African together with several civil liberty issues.
Wyndham was, of course, an amateur in the true sense of the word and on occasion in the house, much to the amusement of fellow parliamentarians, described himself as such. He in fact, as a nephew has noted, came 'from a long line of distinguished amateurs.' Some 'so distinguished and so amateurish that they either got their heads cut off or languished as prisoners in the Tower of London year after year.' The difference, Lord Egremont continued, 'between the amateur and the professional – if the amateur is a proper amateur – is that the amateur dabbles.'

Hugh Wyndham was a 'proper amateur.' But what assessment can be made of his twenty-two years in South Africa? In terms of what he himself set out to accomplish the short answer must be that he failed, and dismally so. A private imperial entrepreneur, he hoped to transplant a British world into an essentially hostile South Africa. His plans, often elaborate, but mostly superficial and lacking in real substance, embraced the introduction of British settlers, their settlement on the South African platteland and the gradual leavening of South African society through the instilling of British values and ideas and the planting of British institutions. However, like the grand scheme of Milner, his prophet and mentor, these all miscarried under the weight of resurgent Afrikaner nationalism. The British settlers were never introduced in sufficiently large numbers to the veld, which remained an Afrikaner bastion, defiant and safe places from which to launch well-aimed, telling counteroffensives against the Milner administration and its supporters in London, and, after 1907, against the few remaining Greater Britons in South Africa who hoped vainly to 'cover the retreat of the Home government.'

The settlement dominions were established essentially for white migration, where the layered, ordered, hierarchical society of home, could be replicated. The open space and emphasis on agriculture presented disaffected nobles and gentlemen-at-leisure, in fact men like Hugh Wyndham, with the opportunity to recreate on the imperial periphery a lifestyle that was vanishing at home. In Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa, spellbound by precedence and social distinction, they became justices of the peace, founded British-style clubs and societies, and were much concerned with horses, the military, genealogy and family history, local politics and patronage, and similar
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2 See, for example, Debates of the House of Assembly, 23 April 1913, col 1815-1817 ('... us amateur legislators ...') as well as Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 28 Feb 1916, WSRO: PHA.

genteel pursuits: Wyndham patronised the Transvaal Philosophical Society and the St George’s Society and served as a justice of the peace and as a member of the Standerton Liquor Licensing Court. They provided the social leadership in the towns and burgeoning cities. They controlled the local horse races – Wyndham was steward of the South African Jockey Club – gave lavish garden parties and weekend ‘at homes’, and sat as lay members of the provincial synod. These migrant gentlemen established residences in town and country, the latter assuming the nature of country houses, set in parks, and as with the Wyndhams, often with real English lords and ladies in residence. Their estates gave scope for lavish entertaining, fishing, polo, and big game shooting – which Jack Lyttelton, Hugh’s brother-in-law, described as being ‘of course own brother to hunting.’ And, as explained in chapter 8, here on the periphery too, a variety of servants supported this lifestyle.

Yet, unlike British East Africa, Canada and the antipodes, South Africa was in many ways unfavourable to aristocratic settlement. While climate and terrain were good, the natives, black and white, were ‘unfriendly’. And with a large European population, South Africa also held the danger of incompatibility in an egalitarian environment and so the maintenance of geographical and social distance would be difficult. The Boers of the former republics, in particular, were mesmerised less easily by British grandiloquence and the workers on the mines were unwilling to accept an imposition of the rigid, layered society of Britain. Wyndham’s lifestyle and the associated expenses never brought him the expected political and business returns. The high cost seemingly near bankrupted him.

Moreover, Wyndham’s attempts to cover colonial retreat in South Africa were feeble. His Transvaal Settlers’ Union and the Settlers’ Cooperative Union, which he later formed with the help of Duncan and Feetham, both died asphyxiating deaths. Eventually acknowledging defeat in ‘the numbers game’ he and his fellow travellers nonetheless hoped, as the parliamentary official opposition after 1910, to influence the policies and actions of the South African government. Yet even the Unionist Party of South Africa, which they established in May 1910 as a vehicle through which to exert just such a leavening influence in the Union parliament, died of inanition. With the failure of
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5 Jack Lyttelton to Maud Lyttelton, 24 July 1905, HHA 2/21/27.
Unionism and settler dominionism, the road toward dominion nationalism or, even worse, Afrikaner domination, was viewed in trepidation. Thick-headedness on the part of both the Unionists and Afrikaner nationalists and the reticence of both to vacate zones of exclusivity and embrace the notion of a new South Africanism undermined the formation of an embracing identity for all (white) South Africans. Wyndham lived to see South Africa's exit from the Commonwealth as well as the country's retreat down the path to garrison statehood and then total strategy, and the replacement of the 'problem of labour' by race.

Nonetheless, there were minor victories, not so much for the Unionist Party, but rather for clusters of its parliamentarians. Although the project to influence the South African government after 1910, by cultivating a respect for British institutions and values came to nought, Wyndham, often in conjunction with Patrick Duncan and Richard Feetham, made significant stands, taking up several civil liberties and other progressive issues. Wyndham, for example, tabled a private bill in 1914 to provide for the women's franchise and he and Duncan tabled another in 1917 to regulate the wages of women and young persons. And both he and Duncan, drawing the ire of the government, the majority of the press and the balance of their party, protested vigorously against the deportation of the 1914 strike leaders, an action that threatened to split the Unionists. The stand they made in 1914 for habeas corpus and the rule of law is monumental in the legal and civil-rights history of South Africa. The Unionist Party and its chequered decade of active politics requires a new, modern historian. Van der Schyff is very two-dimensional and accusatorial and moreover much primary material has since become available.

Wyndham's contribution to military thought is small by the standards of his European and American contemporaries but, in the South African context, this seems substantial albeit due largely to the insignificant offerings of other senior officers in the Union Defence Forces (UDF). Here, of course, Collyer is the exception. Nonetheless, through his series of articles on South African defence and his membership of both the parliamentary committee on defence (1912) and the defence council (1918-1923) Wyndham contributed to the shaping of early South African defence policy and the
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7 P.F. van der Schyff, 'Die Unioniste Party in die Suid-Afrikaanse politiek, 1910-1921' (Unpub M.A. thesis, P.U. for C.H.E., 1964). The Fitzpatrick Papers was the only primary collection used for this study.
formation in 1912 of the UDF, a new force based purportedly upon both British and Boer military traditions. Several explanations have, of course, already been provided for the allegedly heavy British imprint that is based, some argue, on the length of Britain’s presence in southern Africa and her pre-eminence position after 1902. Others blame Smuts and Botha for abandoning volk and embracing empire. While all of these explanations have merit, they remain, even collectively, inadequate. What Afrikaner nationalist historians have ignored is an assessment of the individuals behind the establishment of the UDF, the nature of that force, and the purpose for which it was designed. Using Wyndham as a lens through which to observe this process, an argument is made in chapter six that the UDF was the product of a combination of the British and Boer systems and, due to men like Wyndham, this was a thoughtful combination, one of ‘proper conception.’

However, defence forces are microcosms of society and the stresses and strains in South African society after 1912 were manifested, perhaps most visibly, within the UDF. Military factions were created in the struggle for power as colonial gentleman and Boer notable, many suspicious of links with Britain, filled posts in the new structures with personal supporters and protégés. Wyndham lost his command of the Southern Mounted Rifles, which was absorbed into the new Citizen Force of Christiaan Beyers. Such action worked toward permanent alienation rather than reconciliation and affected the unity of the UDF materially.

This manifested itself clearly at the start of the First World War, a conflict which divided Afrikaners irrevocably and welded together, temporarily at least, the majority of English-speakers. The war momentarily saved the Unionists, who had been divided on the question of the deportations and their relationship with the government and on the verge of partition in 1914. For the Labour Party it was a disaster. For friends, like Farrar, and Hugh’s brother, Reginald, and several cousins, it was death. For others it brought danger and excitement and psychological scarring. But Wyndham, like the Unionist Party, had a good if unexciting war. He was appointed to the General Staff at Defence Headquarters as head of the Intelligence Department, where he served for the duration of the German South West campaign as the agent for wartime press censorship. He was
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commissioned in 1916 to write the official history of that campaign, but, in view of his frankness, this was never published. Throughout the war his influence was felt in the South African parliament as well as from late 1918 in the Defence Council. He used both venues to call for greater South African commitment to imperial defence and vocalised ideas on land, naval and air power.

What is striking is the extent to which private enterprise in the hands of men like Wyndham created the empire. They were at the cutting edge of progressive farming and often at the forefront of organised agriculture. They officered, often commanded, the volunteer regiments that gave some substance to imperial security, which was all-too-often hollow. They filled the breach between indigenous competitors and the government houses, between the colonial nationalists and the removed colonial officialdom. They competed agriculturally and otherwise with the Boers and Quebecois and Feinians and struggled for political dominance in their districts. Collectively, they gave substance to the empire. There is a need for further studies on private entrepreneurs, often transplanted gentlemen, and their attempts to instil Britishness in new-world, often-hostile environments.\(^9\)

Wyndham, moreover, is a medium that allows an investigation that cuts across both the imperial hub as well as a portion of the periphery. Although the focus of British imperial studies has shifted recently from Britain to the periphery, from the colonial and dominions offices to those at ‘the receiving end of empire’ and in such disparate locations as Kalgoorlie and Karachi, too many studies focus solely on that particular part of the periphery and to the exclusion of happenings in Britain or elsewhere in the empire.\(^10\) Hugh and Maud Wyndham, through their incredible literary legacy, allow a (re)integration of Britain with their part of the empire. They lived in South Africa. He was heir titularly and (for a time) territorially to inherited acres – some 110,000 acres – in England, Scotland and Ireland. His father-in-law had agricultural and industrial interests in North America, Australasia, East Africa and South Africa. Ancestors had created the first British Empire; relatives served with the colours and in government houses throughout the second empire. Nationalist urges, similar to those that threatened the Wyndham acres in Limerick,


\(^10\) See D. Cannadine, Ornamentalism, pp xvii, 195.
threatened Hugh's position in South Africa; while the ideology of international syndicalism
induced massed strikes, seemingly workers' uprisings, in Birmingham, on the London
docks, at the coal face in Wales and Natal, and on the goldmines of the Witwatersrand. The
massacre at Amritsar coincided with shootings at Bulhoek and the aerial bombardment of
the Bondelswarts in the Fish River Canyon, all manifestations of thinking on imperial
policing, a debate to which Wyndham contributed in South Africa and later in Britain. He is
therefore a useful lens through which to study various processes in South Africa and the
wider British Empire, processes that sometimes originated locally, sometimes emanated
from Britain and washed out to the periphery. For the Wyndhams, public and domestic
affairs, imperial and South African, were for the most part closely intertwined.

The Hugh Wyndhams were connected to the empire in a variegated way. They and
their families were bound to the Whig interpretation of history and the grand march of
English constitutionalism and the superiority of English institutions and constitutional
values. They shared much 'cultural glue' – those sentiments, shared institutional values and
the plethora of social and business networks – that held their families and friends together
within a greater British world. In Hugh and Maud was the blood combined of Pitt,
Chatham and Marlborough, Tudor and Plantagenet, and a host of colonial governors,
including Henry Grenville (Barbados), Charles Lyttelton (a seventeenth century governor of
Jamaica) and William Lyttelton (who governed South Carolina and then Jamaica in the
eighteenth century). Lord Mayo, a governor general of India, numbered among Hugh's
uncles; while Lord Frederick Cavendish, the murdered Irish secretary was married to one of
Maud's aunts. Their families' financial interests and associations furthermore stretched
across the Anglophone world from North America to New Zealand. One of Maud's
nephews was the last aristocratic proconsul of the last territory, being governor general in
Wellington from 1957 to 1962.

This was truly a vast, interconnected world, one that was longitudinal as well as
contemporaneous, and one that embraced a multiplicity of metropoles and peripheries. But,
if the Wyndhams were bound to the empire and to notions of the superiority of English
institutions and constitutional values, they also believed inherently in the superiority of their

See C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich, 'Mapping the British World' in C. Bridge and K. Fedorowich
(eds), The British World: Diaspora, Culture and Identity, p 6.
class. Born with the design that they were to govern the empire in the fashion of their ancestors, they were exposed to the democratic revolution of the twentieth century and the inner struggle of these years as ideas on class were redefined. They are, therefore, also a wonderful lens through which to view class relations in turn-of-the-century Transvaal as well as the notions of migrant nobles and their ideas concerning aristocratic settlement.

Bernard Burke and then Ronald Robinson explored indigenous elites (both settler and non-European) and the nature of collaboration with imperial structures out on the periphery. Although there are incidences of linkages between migrant aristocrats, Cape and Natal gentlefolk, and (even) Boer notables, and occasionally between the last and non-European traditional leaders, no new South African gentry was formed by their confluence. In fact, as the Wyndhams show, migrant aristocrats, belonging to a transplanted elite, felt increasingly isolated, even violated, after 1907 and, typical of the English aristocracy, they looked down on the colonial born and rejected equally the society of the enormously wealthy business tycoons. Gradually they developed into a caste, both distancing itself from, and being at a distance from, the new plutocrats, who, although in South Africa's case not of gentry origins, retained nonetheless to some degree at least, a respect for British institutions and a taste for social prejudices.

Several years ago, David Cannadine opened a discussion of the ornamental empire, a construct of British society in which 'hierarchy was made visible, immanent and actual.' This edifice crumbled as it 'fell victim to satire and scepticism and scorn.' Instead of with respect and deference, the Wyndhams were treated with increasing disdain. Their household, increasingly a piece of Britain displaced to the periphery, was atypical in South Africa and the activities, both of the Wyndhams and their guests, were largely unique. Moreover, Wyndham's social status became more and more of a political
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14 D. Cannadine, Ornamentalism, p 122.

15 D. Cannadine, Ornamentalism, p 172.
hindrance. The Volksstem had played with the word ‘Honourable’, Hugh’s prefix as the younger son of a baron, during their ‘exposure’ of the ‘Wyndham Scandal’ in 1907. Steer, Wyndham’s labour opponent in Turffontein in 1915, had proclaimed that the Turffontein electorate were such snobs that they ‘would follow a doll if it had the word “Honourable” attached to its name.’ However, although Steer was forced to retract, Wyndham knew that such aristocratic labels were largely empty, at the very least always tenuous, on the more egalitarian periphery. The aristocrat, in order to survive, had to convince the world ‘to accept him not for what he does, but for what he is; his ancestors did the doing.’ And in this attempted persuading of the South African electorate Hugh failed too, although not entirely of his own doing. By 1920, the gentry, once revered in some quarters, were cast as a selfish, monopolistic clique, wanting to postpone the end of an outdated way of life.

South African society at the start of the twentieth century had been layered. Society cascaded down from Government House and the migrant nobles in orbit around the proconsul, through the local gentry and gentlemen farmers, many of whom were represented in parliament and the provincial and municipal councils, to the white electorate and the officials of Native Affairs Department, the magistrates, chiefs and headmen. But, if this layering was essentially hierarchical at first, it was done increasingly and solely according to race, as in the fate of the Wyndhams’ band of servants.

Wyndham’s life is a window through which to view the British world of the early twentieth century. It opens a range of issues, from the difficulties in transplanting aristocratic sprigs and British ideas and institutions through to the processes (nationalism, labour and syndicalism, egalitarianism) that threatened the concord and constancy of this world. The historian can zoom into such processes as private entrepreneurship, class, gender and race relations, and the nature of South African society, fractured along fault lines that were at once political, economic, social, ecclesiastical, cultural and, of course, racial.
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16 ‘More Class Distinctions’, news cutting (possibly from The Star), WSRO: PHA 9579. See also Hugh Wyndham to Lady Leconfield, 30 Sep 1915, WSRO: PHA.
17 Robert Lacey, Aristocrats, p 21.
Genealogy 1: The Wyndhams of Petworth, showing Percy and O’Brien successions

Percey
Earls of Northumberland

Lady Elizabeth Percy (1667-1722) m(1)
Charles Seymour 6th Duke of Somerset (1652-1748)

- Algernon Seymour (1684-1750)
  7th Duke of Somerset
  1st Earl of Northumberland
  1st Earl of Egremont

- Lady Elizabeth
  m
  O’Brien
  last Earl of Thomond

- Lady Catherine (d 1731)
  m
  Sir William Wyndham
  3rd Bt of Orchard Wyndham

- Charles Wyndham (1710-63)
  2nd Earl of Egremont
  m
  Alicia dau of Lord Carpenter

- Percy Wyndham (later O’Brien)
  Earl of Thomond (1756)
  (d unm 1774)
  & two daughters

Dukes of Northumberland

George (1751-1837)
3rd Earl of Egremont
m
Elizabeth Ayliffe

- George Wyndham (1787-1869)
  1st Lord Leconfield, colonel
  m
  Mary Blunt

- General Sir Henry Wyndham (1792-1860)
  m
  Elizabeth dau of Lord Charles Somerset

- Colonel
  Charles Wyndham

- Sir Henry Wyndham
  Under Secretary for War in 1859

Henry Wyndham (1830-1901)
2nd Lord Leconfield
m
Lady Constance Primrose

Percy Scawen Wyndham MP of Clouds
four daughters

Hugh Wyndham (1877-1963)
eventually
4th Lord Leconfield

Rt Hon George Wyndham
Genealogy 2: The relationship of the Hugh Wyndhams to British prime ministers

[Diagram showing genealogy with names and relationships]
Genealogy 3: Closest relationship between Hugh and Maud Wyndham: 4th cousins once removed

Sir William Wyndham, 3rd Bt (1688-1740) m. Lady Catherine Seymour

Charles Wyndham (1710-63) 2nd Earl of Egremont m. Hon. Alicia Maria Carpenter

George Wyndham (1751-1837) 3rd Earl of Egremont m. 1801 Elizabeth Ayliffe

George Wyndham (1787-1869) 1st Lord Leconfield m. Mary Blunt

Henry Wyndham (1830-1901) 2nd Lord Leconfield m. Lady Constance Primrose

Hon. Hugh Wyndham (1877-1963) m. Hon Maud Lyttelton

Lady Elizabeth Wyndham m. Rt Hon George Grenville Prime Minister

Lady Catherine Wyndham (d. 1796) m. Richard Neville 2nd Lord Braybrooke

Lady Catherine Grenville (d. 1796) m. Richard Neville 2nd Lord Braybrooke

Hon. Mary Neville (d. 1857) m. Sir Stephen Glynne Bt, of Hawarden

Mary Glynne m. George (d. 1876) 4th Lord Lyttelton

Charles (d. 1922) 5th Lord Lyttelton m. Hon. Mary Cavendish

Hon. Maud Lyttelton (1880-1953) m. Hon. Hugh Wyndham
Genealogy 4: Hugh Wyndham and the ‘Imperial’ connection in South Africa
Genealogy 5: The Cavendish and Spencer connections

William 1720-64
4th Duke of Devonshire
m. Lady Charlotte Boyle

George 1754-1834
1st Earl of Burlington
m. Lady Elizabeth Compton

William 1745-1811
5th Duke of Devonshire
m. Lady Georgina Spencer

William 1790-1858
6th Duke of Devonshire
m. Lady Georgina Cavendish

Lady Caroline Howard
m. Rt. Hon. William Sebright Lascelles

Lady Blanche Howard
m. William 7th Duke of Devonshire

Lady Georgina Cavendish
m. George Howard 8th Earl of Carlisle

Lady Blanche Howard
m. William 7th Duke of Devonshire

William 1808-91
2nd Earl of Burlington
7th Duke of Devonshire
m. Lady Blanche Howard

Lord George Cavendish
m. Louisa sister of Wm Sebright Lascelles

Lord Edward Cavendish 1838-91
m. Emma Lascelles (opposite)

Lord Frederick Cavendish (k.1882)
m. Hon. Lucy Lyttelton

Spencer 1833-1908
8th Duke of Devonshire

Victor 1868-1938
9th Duke of Devonshire

Susan Cavendish
m. Viscount Hampden

Robert H. BRAND

Henry Cavendish (1709-1873)

Francis William
Henry Cavendish (1820-73)

Hon. Maud Lyttelton
m. Hon. Hugh WYNHAM
Genealogy 6: The Wyndhams of Petworth: war deaths, 1914-18, 1939-45

George Wyndham (1787- )
1st Lord Leconfield
Colonel

Henry Wyndham
2nd Lord Leconfield

Percy Scawen Wyndham
(1835-1911)
Capt Coldstream Guards

Fanny Charlotte
m Alfred
Montgomery

Blanche Julia
m 6th Earl of Mayo
vicerey of India

Reginald
killed in France
1914

Hugh
4th Lord
Leconfield
(1877-1963)

Edward
5th Lord
Leconfield

Maude Evelyn
m 1899
Vincent W.
Yorke

Rt Hon George
Wyndham

Guy Percy
Wyndham

Mary
m 11th Earl of
Wemyss and March

Pamela
m Edward
Lord Glenconner

Madeleine
m Charles
Adeane

Sibell Adeane
m Rev Hon Charles
Lytton

Anzio
24 Feb 1944

Henry Wyndham
killed Alamein
1942

Philip Yorke
killed in France
28 Jul 1917

Percy Wyndham
killed France

George Wyndham
killed France

Ivo Charteris
killed France

Hugo Charteris
'Big Ben'
killed France

Edward Tennant
'Bimbo'
killed France

Rt Hon George Guy
Percy
Mary
Percy
George
Edward
Charles
Ivo
Hugo
Edward
Sibell
Charles
Rev Hon Charles
Anzio
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Map 3: Wyndham’s interests in Natal and the Transvaal.
Map 2: The ground floor plan of Wyndhams, Parktown.
Map 1: Rural and agrarian competition: Kromdraai and the alternative nodes of power in the District of Standerton
I PUBLISHED WORKS BY HUGH WYNDHAM
(Listed Chronologically)

'South Africa', The Round Table 5(17) Dec 1914.
'South Africa: The Rebellion — Some Consequences', The Round Table 5(18) Mar 1915.
The early history of the Thoroughbred Horse in South Africa (Oxford, 1924).
'The colour problem in Africa', Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs vol 4, 1925.
(With Lord Lugard and M. Ginsberg, M), The problem of colour in relation to the idea of equality. Supplement to Journal of Philosophical Studies 1(2) 1926.
'The Liquor Traffic in West Africa', read at Chatham House, 1929.
Native education in Ceylon, Java, Formosa, the Philippines, French Indo-China, and British Malaya (London 1933) in the series Problems of Imperial Trusteeship (Royal Institute of International Affairs).
The Atlantic and slavery (London 1935) in the series Problems of Imperial Trusteeship (Royal Institute of International Affairs).
The Atlantic and emancipation (London 1937) in the series Problems of Imperial Trusteeship (Royal Institute of International Affairs).
Petworth Manor in the Seventeenth Century (Weldon 1954).
Sutton and Duncton Manors (Weldon 1956).

II UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

1 PRIVATE PAPERS

University of Birmingham Library (UBL)
The Masterman Papers (ref. CFGM)
CFG/M/1/17/7/1-4 Letters from Lavinia Talbot to Maud Wyndham 1 Dec 1899 - c.1933
CFG/M/1/17/11/1-11 Letters from Mary, Viscountess Cobham, to Maud Wyndham 29 Nov 1918 - c.1934
Letter from Mary, Viscountess Cobham, to Hugh Wyndham 21 Dec 1918

Letters from Maud Wyndham to Lucy Blanche Masterman 23 Jan 1901 - 28 Apr 1907

Letter from Maud Wyndham to Mary, Viscountess Cobham 16 Oct 1907

Letter from AK Gibbs to Maud Wyndham 26 Dec 1918

Letters from John, 9th Viscount Cobham, to Lucy Blanche Masterman 11 Aug - 25 Dec 1907

Letter from John, 9th Viscount Cobham, to Charles Masterman 11 Oct 1914

Letter from John, 9th Viscount Cobham, to Mary Wyndham 4 May 1937

Letter from Margaret Becker, daughter of Arthur Lyttelton, to Maud Wyndham 18 Sep 1921

**Bodleian Library, Oxford (BLO)**

*Papers of Lionel Curtis and the Round Table (Mss Curtis)*
1-3 General Correspondence and papers
802 Correspondence
816 Correspondence
824 Correspondence
834 Correspondence
838 Correspondence
839 Correspondence
840 Correspondence
864 Correspondence

*Geoffrey Dawson Papers (Mss Dawson)*
7-16 Diaries, 1901-1910.
60 Correspondence: D.O. Malcom.
61 Correspondence: Lord Milner, 1904-1923.
62 Correspondence and Papers.
80 Correspondence and Papers, 1938-1939

*Milner Papers (Mss Milner dep.)*
71-78 Diary 1901 - 1907
36-39 Correspondence
185-190 General Correspondence 1901 - 1905
184 Correspondence
205 Correspondence
207 Correspondence
209-212 Correspondence
218 Correspondence

*Milner Adds.*
687 Correspondence, 1900-1901.
688 Correspondence, 1902-1912.
Violet Milner Papers
VM8 F2/1 Diary of a journey to Mafeking and Zeerust, compiled from letters, 1900-02 [compiled 1957]. 1900-1902
VM11 F2/2 Extracts from diaries and letters, 1903-4. 1903-1904
VM14 F56 Material relating to death of George Cecil. 1914-1919
VM15 C Letters to Lady Caroline Fitzhardinge Maxse
VM16 C24 Letters to Leo Maxse From Violet Cecil. 1900
VM17 C51 Letters to Olive Maxse From Beatrice Leconfield. 1939
VM19 C62 Letters to Violet Cecil From her brother General Sir Ivor Maxse. 1899-1900
VM37 C210 From Sir Drummond Chaplin. 1925-1929
VM38 C243 From Brig Gen Sir C.P. Crewe. 1925-1932
VM55 682/31 From DD Lyttelton, wife of Edward Lyttelton. 1900

Centre for Kentish Studies (CKS)

Stanhope of Chevening Manuscripts (ref. U1590)
U1590/C511/1-3 MS. History of the Stanhope Family by the Duchess of Cleveland.
U1590/T160/13 Copy of will of Catherine, Duchess of Cleveland. 1891-1895.
U1590/T160/14 List of bequests of Duchess of Cleveland. 1891.

Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge University

Churchill Papers
CHAR 2/30/78
CHAR 2/35/14F
CHAR 2/72/25
CHAR 28/27/71

Hagley Hall Archives, Hagley Hall, West Midlands (HHA)

The Papers of Hon Mrs Hugh Wyndham
2/2 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, the 8th Viscount Cobham, 1918.
2/4 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, the 8th Viscount Cobham, 1921.
2/5 Rachel Lyttelton's letters, 1910-16.
2/6 Letters to Maud Lyttelton: from Jack Lyttelton, ORC, 1901-02.
2/9 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1917.
2/10 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1909.
2/12 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1914.
2/14 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1912.
2/16 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1921.
2/17 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1919.
2/18 Letters between Hugh and Maud Wyndham and her parents, Lord and Lady Cobham, 1919-29.
2/21 Letters between Maud Wyndham and her father, Lord Cobham, 1905.
2/23 Letters to Maud Lyttelton, 1907.
2/24 Letters between various members of the Lyttelton family, 1906-07.
2/30 Correspondence between Maud Wyndham and various members of her family, 1917.
2/31 Letters mainly to Maud Wyndham, 1922.
2/34 Letters to Maud Wyndham, 1910-12.
2/36 Correspondence between Maud Wyndham and various members of the Lyttelton family, 1913-15.
2/37 Letters between various members of the Lyttelton family, 1922-43.
4/25 Correspondence between Maud Wyndham and various members of her family, 1913.
5/2 Letters between various members of the Lyttelton family, 1901.
5/5 Miscellaneous letters, 1863-1937.
5/6 Letters to Maud Wyndham from her mother, Lady Cobham, at Hagley, 1922.
5/9 Letters mainly to Maud Wyndham, 1903-04.
5/12 Letters to Maud Wyndham, mostly from her father and mother, 1914.

Scrapbooks
Scrapbook of Mary, Viscountess Cobham, 1880-1908.
Scrapbook of Maud Mary Lyttelton, 1899-1908.

Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

Wyndham mss.
Letters from Colonel Charles Wyndham to his father, the Earl of Egremont. 1813-1841

National Archives of South Africa Cape Town (NASAC)

Fremantle Collection (ref. A.608)

| 1-4 | Diary kept by H.E.S. Fremantle | 1891 | 1894-1917 |
| 5-6a | Diary of Public Events | 1902-1924 |
| 14 | Correspondence | 1922-1925 |

F.S. Malan Collection (ref. A583)

| 1-6 | Inkomende Briewe: Verskeie Persone: Kennisse. | 1891-1931 |
| 11 | Inkomende Briewe: Diverse Sake. | 1916-1940 |
| 13 | Uitgaande Briewe: Algemeen. | 1893-1940 |
| 16-23 | Dagboeke. | 1893-1940 |
Manuskrip: Cambridge History of the British Empire, deel 8.
43 Inkomende Briefe: Partypolitiek. 1904-1936
44 Inkomende Briefe: Algemene Verkiesing. 1915-1916
45 Inkomende Briefe: Monumente Vrouemonument. 1907-1913
50 Inkomende Briefe: Staatkundige Aangeleenthede. 1909-1910
51 Inkomende Briefe: Staatkundige Aangeleenthede. 1915
52 Inkomende Briefe: Diverse Aangeleenthede. 1910-1940
56 Memorandum: Politieke Situasie na Algemene Verkiesing van 1920.
64 Inkomende Briefe: Nasionale Konv ensie en Unifikasie. 1907-1910
66 Inkomende Briefe: Landbou. 1908-1920
69 Inkomende Briefe: Mynwese en Nywerheid. 1908-1934
70 Inkomende Briefe: Rykskonferensies. 1911, 1912
90 C.P. Schultz Correspondence. 1900-1914

Sir Lewis Michell Collection (ref. A540)
1 Letters Received No. 1-173. 1885-1928
2-14 Dairies. 1902-1928
29 Final typed copy of Reminiscences "Fifty Years in and out of South Africa."
31 Memorandum on Lord Milner's plan for helping British Education in South Africa, by Lady Milner.
Memorandum on the settlement in South Africa with accompanying letter by Author.
33 Printed Papers re Lord Milner.
40 Letters addressed to Rhodes, Dr Jameson and J.G. McDonald.

J.M. Orpen Papers (ref. A302)
1 Letters and telegrams received. 1874-1919
2 Letters and telegrams despatched. 1874-1921

Dr T.N.G. te Water Papers (ref. A467)
58 Letters Received: General. 1898-1916
59 Letters Received: General. 1882-1906
60 Letters Received: Political Matters. 1877-1918

National Archives of South Africa, Pretoria (NASAP)

General C.F. Beyers Collection (ref. A414)
1 Inkomende Stukke, amptelik en semi-amptelik. 1904-1914
1 Uitgaande Stukke, amptelik en semi-amptelik. 1907-1914
1 Diverse korrespondesie. 1896-1919
2 Dokumente oor militêre aangeleenthede. 1909-1910
2 Memories aan die Volksraad teen die konsep-Verdedigingswet. 1910-1914

T. Boydell Collection (ref. A75)
1 First Parliamentary Election – album. 1910
8 Political career: correspondence incoming. 1910-12
79 Political career: correspondence Bailey, Lady Selborne.
99 Papers in connection with Boydell pedigree. 1930-37
100 Propaganda issued by Mr Boydell on behalf of the South African labour Party. 1915

Colonel Mike du Toit Collection (ref. W77)
W77/1 Briewe van Generals Beyers, de Wet en President Steyn. 1912-1925

Dr F.V. Engelenburg (ref. A140)
1 Lid van Onderwysraad, Transvaal, en korrespondensie oor Onderwysaangeleenthede. 1907-1918
6 Korrespondensie met Genl Louis Botha en sy sekretaris, Dr Bok. 1909-1918
7 Oprigting “Het Volk”, Program van Beginsels, Hertzog Krisis, Genl J.C. Smuts. 1906-1928
8 Politieke Sake, Algemeen. 1905-1930
8 Korrespondensie met John X. Merriman. 1906-1918
19 Korrespondensie, drukwerk, resensies re “Genl Louis Botha” deur Dr Engelenburg. 1925-1927

J.P. Jooste Collection (ref. W201)
Pamphlets and newspaper clippings. 1906-1918

Charles Leonard Collection, 1892-1921 (ref. M725)
1-2 Correspondence. 1892-1904

H. Orban Collection (ref. W18)
W18/1 Brieweboek van die Volkstem. 1893-1911
W18/6 Register herkiezing President Kruger. 1892

Dr G.S. Preller Collection, c. 1838-1943 (A.787)
1-3 Anglo-Boereoorlog: Genl Louis Botha. 1899-1900
89-93 Persoonlike Stukke ens. Van Genl Louis Botha 1896-1916

J.C. Smuts Collection (ref. A1)
104 Transvaal. 1907
105 Portuguese East Africa. 1908
109 Transvaal. 1909
110 Union of South Africa. 1909-1910
111 Union of South Africa. 1910-1914
112 South West African Campaign. 1914-1915
113 East African Campaign. 1916
114 East African Campaign. 1916
115 Union of South Africa. 1918-1922

National Library of Scotland (NLS)

Rosebery Papers (ref. 10001-10216)
MSS 10089-10196 Correspondence between Lord Rosebery and the Marquess of Crewe and Constance, Lady Leconfield, 1891-1931.
Queen's University Archives, Kingston, Ontario

John Buchan Papers
2110 General correspondence series.

Rhodes House Library, Oxford

Sir George Farrar Papers (ref. Mss. Afr. S. 2175)
1-4 Farrar family mining activities in South Africa.
5-7/1 George Farrar's arrest after the Jameson Raid.
7/3-9 Farrar's political career.
10-11 Farrar family social activities.
12-17 World War I (GSWA campaign) and Farrar's death.
18-20 Family photographs.
21 Other material.

Richard Feetham Papers (ref. Mss. Afr. S. 1793)
2-5 Letters from Feetham to his parents, 1898-1920.

Lord Lugard Papers
Lug 8/1 Correspondence: Lord Trenchard.
Lug 60/3 Correspondence: Hugh Wyndham.

University of Cape Town Libraries, Cape Town

Drummond Chaplin Collection (ref. BC 831)
A Diaries
Lady Marguerite Chaplin, 1895, 1902-09, 1912.
B Correspondence
B1 Sir Drummond Chaplin, 1915-1929.
B2 Lady Chaplin, 1897-1935.
B3 Lord Milner to Lady Chaplin, 1905-1910.
B4 J.C. Smuts to Sir Drummond Chaplin & Lady Chaplin, 1923-31.
B5 Noordhoek House affairs.
C Cash books and record books.
D Articles.
E Photographs.
F Clippings.

Patrick Duncan Papers (ref. BC 294)
A Administrative and Political Papers.
B Speeches and Articles.
C Private Papers.
D Sir Patrick Duncan Correspondence.
E Duncan Family Material.
F Photographs and News Clippings.
H Countess of Selborne, 1909.
J Correspondence Duncan to Lady Selborne, 1909-1940.
University of South Africa Library, Archives and Special Collections

Senator J.M. Conradie Collection
Political correspondence, 1915-74.

A.J. Dieperink Collection
Correspondence, 1903, 1913-15.

A. Mardon Collection
Correspondence, 1912.

University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library

Jan H. Hofmeyr Papers (ref. A1)
Aa General correspondence, 1913-48.

Nourse Family Records (ref. A743)
Bb1-7 Farming and horse breeding.
Da1 Notes on horsebreeding.

Howard Pim Papers (ref. A881)
Bl.1 Political correspondence, 1903-34.
Bl.4 Joint Council of Europeans and Natives, 1922-34.
Ce Letterbooks, 1907-36.

West Sussex County Record Office, Chichester

Maxse Papers
50 Letters from Hugh Wyndham to his sister, Lady Mary Maxse. 1902-1905
315 Letters from Maud Wyndham and Gladys Wyndham to their sister-in-law, Lady Mary Maxse. 1940-1941
455 Letters from Hugh, Edward, Humphrey and Margaret Wyndham to their sister, Lady Mary Maxse. 1914-1915

Petworth House Archives (ref. PHA)
uncat Letters from Hugh Wyndham to his mother Constance, Dowager Lady Leconfield. 1904-07
uncat Letters from Hugh and Maud Wyndham to his mother. 1909, 1912-21
uncat Scrapbook probably compiled by Maud Wyndham, which includes photographs of the Wyndham estate - in South Africa and the horses, and electoral addresses and press cuttings. 1904-07
1131 Photographs of H.A.Wyndham. 20th century
1700 Eton School report for 1895.
1701 Eton School report for 1895.
9579 Family photograph album: Edward and Hugh Wyndham and their regiments and other wartime memorabilia. 1914-c.1920
9680 Letters to Lord and Lady Leconfield from their children. 1881
Worcestershire Record Office, Worcester

Lyttelton Family, Viscounts Cobham, Hagley Hall
Ref. 705.658, parcel 18 Family and Estate Papers: Notes made by Lord Cobham for the guidance of his executors.
Ref. 970.5:104 Family Correspondence: Microfilms of correspondence sent to the Lyttelton family, selected letters from vol. 6, 1763-1949.

2. ORGANISATIONAL PAPERS

Cape Archives, National Archives of South Africa

The Secretary, Victoria League in South Africa, Cape Province (ref. A2203)
Guild of Loyal Women of South Africa.
1/1 Minutes: Executive Council. 1903-1906
Victoria League in South Africa, Cape Province Executive Committee.
2/1/1/1-2/1/1/11 Minutes, Executive Committee. 1947-1995
2/3/1/1 Annual Reports. 1929-1994
Cape Town/Sea Point Branch
3/1/1/1-3/1/1/12 Minutes, General and Committee Meetings. 1924-1998

University of South Africa Library, Archives and Special Collections

United Party Archives: Central Head Office
2. Congress (national)
   2.1 first annual congress 1911 minutes, circulars and photographs
   2.2 second annual congress 1912 minutes
   2.3 third annual congress 1913 minutes
   2.4 special congress 1915 speeches delivered by General L. Botha and minutes
   2.5 congress 1919 speech by General Smuts
   2.6 special combined National and South African Party congress ('Herenigingskongres') report 1920
   2.7 seventh Union congress 1923 minutes
3. Elections accounts for general election material 1915
   5. Pamphlets
   5.2 'The Republican Deputation to Europe', c.1919.
   5.3 'Rijk, republiek en ras', c.1920.
   5.4 'Waarom saam gaan met de Engelsen', c.1920.
5.5 'Beware the Election Law is strict', 1920.
5.6 'Over onze koalitie', c.1921.
5.7 'Gaan Suidafrika 'n tweede Ierland word?', c.1921.
5.8 'General Smuts begins the battle', 1921.
5.9 'Beknop historiese oorsig van die werkstaking in die goud- en steenkoolmijne van Transvaal', 1922.
5.10 'Genl. Smuts's great speech', SA Party manifesto, 1924.
5.11 'Here it is! A brief outline of party politics in SA during the past quarter of a century', 1924.
5.18 'The unholy alliance' (Labour and National), 1929.
9. Coalition and fusion
   Correspondence, notes and pamphlets, 1933-38.
11. Wallach's Printing and Publishing Co.Ltd.
   11.1 minutes and extracts from minutes, 1903, 1929-30.
   11.2 correspondence, memoranda and agreements, 1920-60.
   11.3 election material accounts, 1915.
   11.7 photographs of staff, 1913-36.
   11.8 publications, 1924-60.

*United Party Archives: Transvaal*

*Het Volk*
   2. Constitution and programme, 1907.

*South African Party*
   1. Congresses
      1.1 first provincial congress 1911 minutes
      1.2 fifth provincial congress 1919 minutes and speeches delivered by Gen. Smuts and Col. H. Mentz
      1.3 sixth provincial congress 1921 agenda
      1.4 seventh provincial congress 1923 agenda
   3. Scrap-books
      3.4 scrap-book no.4, 1921-22.
      3.5 scrap-book no.5, 1922-23.
   8. Delimitation Commissions

*United Party Archives: Division of Information and Research*

40. Cartoons, c.1900-66.

*University of the Witwatersrand, William Cullen Library*

*Church of the Province of South Africa*

AB186 Archbishop William Carter’s Papers, 1891-1930.
3. OFFICIAL PAPERS

National Archives of South Africa, Cape Town (NASAC)

Master of the Supreme Court (ref. MOOC)

Military Archives Depot, South African National Defence Force, Pretoria

Adjutant General (AG 1914-1921)
27 G.23/9199 vol 1 Grant of Commissioned Rank in UDF during Hostilities.

Chief of the General Staff, Group 1 (ref. CGS)
12 23 S.W.Africa Native Disturbance at Kalkfontein May 1922 Bondelzwarts rebellion.

Diverse
1 2493 Intelligence Reports SWA.
1 2493 Intelligence Reports.

Personnel Files
file 196 Lt Col Hon. H.A. Wyndham.
file Maj J.G.W. Leipoldt, D.S.O.

South African Citizen Force (ref. SACF)
4 61 SA Mounted Rifles.
67 2508/1 Purchases of Horses.

South African Mounted Rifles (ref. SAMR)
1044 516/89 War History of G.S.W. Campaign being written by Col the Hon H. Wyndham.

Secretary for Defence (ref. DC)
1 12 Members who took part in debate in Parliament.
47 1063 SA Defence Bill.
109 2270 and 2271 Defence Council Agenda of 1st and 2nd meetings.
189 11122 Correspondence with various people re History of the German South West African Campaign.
348 35930 14th Meeting of Defence Council.
564 57624 Naval Matters.
573 D.9199 European Crisis General, vol 7.
2338/9199 Official History of G.S.W.A. Campaign.
4/58X South African Naval History.
DCDB 2394/7 Suggested recall of Brigadier General Cavendish G.O.C. South African Military Command and appointment of General Martyn.

National Archives of South Africa, Pretoria (NASAP)

Chief Entomologist (ref. CEN)
14 EE778 J. de Mestre. 1905-06
51 EE3114 R. Ruxton, Kromdraai Station. 1909
63 EE3987 H.A. Wyndham, Standerton. 1905

Colonial Office Records, 1900-1903 (FK Vols. 299-1063)

Colonial Secretary (ref. CS)
447 2415/04 First Annual Congress of Transvaal Farmers' Association. 1904

Colonial Treasurer (ref. CT)
286 CONF Letter to Hon. H.A. Wyndham. 1902
JL429/02 Appointment of Mr John Buchan. 1901-1903
288 CONF Colonial Treasurer, Wyndham, High Commissioner's Office, Johannesburg, advice by telegram of departure with Lt. Governor to Potchefstroom returning on 14th to Johannesburg and asking for meeting at Park Station. 1903
JL55/03
288A JL101/03

Commandant General, SAR (ref. KG)
193 CR 6353/96 Coloniale Secretaris Kaapstad Verzoekt dat permit verleend worde aan zekeren Heer Wyndham om zijne revolvers binnen dezen staat mede te bregen. 1896

Executive Council, Transvaal (ref. URU)
17 1267 Extension of the term of office of Lt Col the Hon. H.A. Wyndham as commanding officer of the Southern Mounted Rifles for a period of one year. 1910
61 2392 Extension for one year, of term of office of Lt Col the Hon. H.A. Wyndham. 1911
75 99 Cancellation of the commissions as justices of the peace granted to A.J. Malherbe, C. Power and the Hon. H.A. Wyndham. 1912
124 146 Issue of a freehold title to a portion of the farm "Kromdraai" No 76, District Standerton, to the Hon. H.A. Wyndham. 1913
383 2863 Appointment of Colonel the Hon. Hugh Wyndham as a member of the Defence Council. 1918
Appointment of Acting Sub-Inspector A.E. Wyndham to act as Inspector of the South African Police from 3rd May 1922.

Complaint of Mr Wyndham, Orange Grove, against Resident Justice of the Peace. Re non-conviction of native sergeant Charlie Manexini.


Application for employment Chas Wyndham.

Justice of the Peace, H.A. Wyndham vice Kelby.

Liquor Licences. Standerton Bottle Store.

Liquor Licence. Standerton.

Liquor Licensing Court Standerton.

Application for special meeting of Liquor Licensing Court for district of Standerton.

Special liquor licence sale of Standerton cantonments.

Liquor Licensing Court Standerton.

Proposed allotment of the farm 'Ludlow' No. 2355, District Wakkerstroom, to Mr J. de Mestre.

Proposed purchase by Hon. Hugh Wyndham of the Farm "Kromdraai" No 76 Standerton.

Questions and Returns, for Union Parliament 1914 Session. Wyndham - return of allotted farms Transvaal.

Minutes of Council.

Minutes of Council.

Louisa Ruxton

Robert Ruxton

Question in House of Assembly Mr Wyndham regarding (1) underground dust sampling, (2) annual holidays for underground workers, (3) dust conditions underground in Randfontein group of mines.
Mining Commissioner, Klerksdorp (ref. MCK)
1/56 MCC67 Propecting on Droogspuit 404, G. Wyndham. 1912
6/12

Prime Minister (ref. PM)
1/1/30 4/93-4/95 Series 4: European War. 1914-1917
1/1/31 4/95 1914-1917
1/1/32 4/95
1/1/271 147/1 Series 147: Military. 1910
147/1-12 1912
147/1 1914
1/1/303 156/1-4 Series 156: Naval. 1910
156/1 1911
156/1-7 1912
156/1-6 1913
1/1/532 Secretary to the Prime Minister: Confidential Prints. 1921
Air Defence and suggested lines of development for
Dominion Air Forces.

Public Works Department (ref. PWD)
272 6718/04 Lands. Mr Ruxton, Standerton, instructions re width of
roads. 1904
3571 11672 Kromdraai (76) School. Standerton. Erection. 1914

Registrar of the Supreme Court of South Africa, Witwatersrand Local Division (ref. WLD)
1891/1923 Illiquid case money due and payment Walter Foster versus
Pattison D.B. (Chairman), H.A. Wyndham, E.S. Jaffe, W. Easton,
C. Lee, W.M. Adams, D. Drummond, J. Blaker. (In their capacity
as the members of the Pension and Provident Fund of the
Municipal Council of Johannesburg. 1923

Secretary to Governor of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies (ref. GOV)
80 PS8/19/06 Miscellaneous D.G.V. Dalgety Campbell Importation
of Sheep. 1906
200 GEN949/06 Correspondence on the subject of land settlement 17th
September, letter from the Hon. Hugh A. Wyndham
21st September, letter from the Hon. H.A. Wyndham. 1906
1025 PS73/14/06 Stock Importation of Sheep Hon. Hugh Wyndham. 1906

Secretary to the Transvaal Administration (ref. CS)
35 4786/01 Assistant Private Secretary to Lord Milner Requesting
that Hon. Hugh Wyndham be gazetted as above. 1901
48 6460/01 Assistance to returning British refugees. Enclosing
copy of a memorandum by Mr John Buchan assistant
private secretary to the H.C. re organising a refugee aid
fund for above. 1901
**Supreme Court of the SAR and the Supreme Court of the Transvaal Colony (ref. ZTPD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/798</td>
<td>527/1906</td>
<td>Ex parte application H.A. Wyndham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Town Clerk, Standerton (ref. MST)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal Committee and Town Council Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Council Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Council Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Town Council Meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Purposes Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Works Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/5/2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Works Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transvaal Agriculture Department (ref. TAD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>G1062/04</td>
<td>H.E. de Mestre. Staff file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>G1248</td>
<td>Hugh Wyndham. Re: Cattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>G1545</td>
<td>J. de Mestre, Government Experimental Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>574</td>
<td>G1517/06</td>
<td>The Hon. Hugh A. Wyndham application for Africander cattle and miscellaneous correspondence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>1454/04</td>
<td>J.E. de Mestre. Agricultural Publications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transvaal Volunteers (ref. TVO)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50B</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enrollment Book of the Southern Mounted Rifles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Record Office, London**

**Cabinet (ref. CAB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38/14/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa: Defence scheme (Internal), revised to April 1907, 1908.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>War Cabinet: War Priorities Committee: Minutes and Memoranda, 1917-19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Home Office (ref. HO)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194/26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer of West Sussex Civil Defence fire prevention responsibility to Lord Leconfield, 1941-42.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Record Office (ref. PRO)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/768</td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers of Lord Egremont, Secretary of State, Southern Division, dated c.1758-1763: proposed gift by the Hon. Hugh Wyndham, 1946.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/778</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collection of Lord Leconfield's papers on Charles 2nd Earl of Egremont, 1946-47.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**War Office (ref. WO)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95/4632</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Battalion Cape Corps, 1918-19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL ARTICLES**

'Death of the Duchess of Cleveland', *The Times* (?).

'Het Volk Congress', *Rand Daily Mail*, 5 Dec 1906.


'Het Volk in Congress', *Rand Daily Mail*, 7 Dec 1906.

'The Wyndham Scandal', *De Volksstem*, 6 Feb 1907.


'Wedding of Hon. J.C. Lyttelton and Miss Violet Leonard: Brilliant ceremony at St Peter's Eaton Square', *The Times*, 30 June 1908.


'A Great Day for the Unionists', *The Transvaal Leader*, 16 Sep 1910.

'FitzPatrick's magnificent Victory', *The Transvaal Leader*, 16 Sep 1910.


'Strike leaders taken from Fort; Sent off by special train; Destination Unknown', *Rand Daily Mail*, 27 Jan 1914.


'Beyers' Letter; Strange Idea's of Duty and Honour; Stinging Reply from Smuts; No Lip-Loyalty in the Union', *Rand Daily Mail*, 21 Sep 1914.

'General Smuts and Mr Beyers', *Rand Daily Mail*, 22 Sep 1914.

'Generaal Botha's Reputatie wederrechtelik aangestast; maar Kragtig verdedigd', *De Volksstem*, 2 Nov 1915.


'Gallant Officers', *The Times*, 2 Dec 1914.


'Was General Botha in 1900 'n verrader?', *De Spectator*, 8 Apr 1916.


'Death of Sir Howard Gorges', *The Star*, 19 Nov 1924.

'Sir Howard Gorges Dead', *Rand Daily Mail*, 19 Nov 1924.


'Democracy and Party Strife; Sir Patrick Duncan’s Warning', *The Times*, London, 7 Jul 1939.

'Dougal Orme Malcolm', *The Round Table*, Dec 1955.

III SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books


Beinart, W., P. Delius and S. Trapido (eds.), *Putting a Plough to the Ground: Accumulation and Dispossession in Rural South Africa, 1830-1930* (Johannesburg 1986).


Bonner, P., J. Hofmeyr, D. Jones and T. Lodge (eds.), *Holding Their Ground: Class, Locality and Culture in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century South Africa* (Johannesburg 1989).

Bosco, A. and A. May (eds), *The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London 1997).


Boyden, P.B., A.J. Guy and M. Harding (eds), *'Ashes and Blood': The British Army in South Africa 1795-1914* (Coventry 1999).


Calpin, G.H., *There are no South Africans* (London 1946).


Crawford, J. and I. McGibbon (eds.), *'One Flag, One Queen, One Tongue': New Zealand, the British Empire and the South African War* (Auckland 2003).
'An Editor and His Times: Geoffrey Dawson and the National Government', *The Round Table*, Jun 1956.

2. PUBLISHES DIARIES, MEMOIRS, SPEECHES AND LETTERS AND AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Anon. (By a Colonial Officer), *Twenty-Five Years' Soldiering in South Africa: A Personal Narrative* (London 1909).
Barlow, A.G., *That We May Tread Safely* (Cape Town 1960).
Buchan, J., *Memory hold the door* (London 1941).
Cleveland, Duchess of, *Life and Letters of Lady Hester Stanhope* (London 1914).
Fraser, M. and A. Jeeves (eds.), *All that Glittered: Selected Correspondence of Lionel Phillips, 1890-1924* (Cape Town 1977).
Kemp, J.C.G., *Die pad van die veroweraar* (Cape Town 1946).
Russell, A.F. and E.R. Roper (reporters), *Decisions of the Supreme Court of South Africa (Appellate Division) during the year 1914* (Cape Town and Johannesburg, 1930).
Solomon, V. (ed.), *Selections from the correspondence of Percy Alport Molteno, 1892-1914* (Cape Town 1982).
Wright, H.M. (ed.), *Sir James Rose Innes: Selected Correspondence, 1884-1902* (Cape Town 1972).
Wyndham, Maud (ed.), *Correspondence of Sarah Spencer Lady Lyttelton 1787-1870* (London 1912).

3. CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE

Amery, L.S., *The Times History of the War*, vol V
Dickens, C., *Dombey and Son* (Harmondsworth 1982).
Lukin, H.T., *Savage Warfare: Hints on Tactics to be adopted and Precautions to be taken* (Cape Town 1906).

4. **GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS**

(i) **Hansard**


(ii) **Acts of Parliament**

*Defence Act Amendment Act* (22 of 1922)
*Defence Endowment Property and Account Act* (33 of 1922)
South Africa Defence Act (13 of 1912)
Women's Enfranchisement Act (18 of 1930)

(iii) Proclamations
Transvaal Colony, 1901-1902

(iv) Parliamentary Papers

British (Imperial blue book printed by command of the King)

Cd. 1163 1902 Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa.
Cd. 1463 1903 Further Correspondence relating to Affairs in South Africa.
Cd. 2104 1904 Correspondence Relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.
Cd. 3528 1907 Further Correspondence Relating to Affairs in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, 1906-7.
Cd. 4948 1909 Imperial Conference. Correspondence and Papers relating to a Conference with Representatives of the Self-Governing Dominions on the Naval and Military Defence of the Empire, 1909.
Cd. 6941 1913 Correspondence Relating to Recent Disorders on the Witwatersrand and the Employment of Regular Troops.

South African

Select Committees

Papers printed by order of the Union Government

Miscellaneous
Index to the Manuscript Annexures and Printed papers of the House of Assembly including Select Committee Reports and Bills and also to Principal Motions and Resolutions and Commission Reports, 1910-1930 (Cape Town, 1931).

Transvaal Legislative Council

Transvaal Official List of the Civil Service (Pretoria, 1903).
Hyam, R., Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914 (Basingstoke 1993).
Jackson-Stops, G., Petworth House; West Sussex (London 1978).
Jones, S., Raising the Red Flag; The International Socialist League and the Communist Party of South Africa, 1914-1932 (Bellville 1995).
Keegan, T., Rural Transformations in Industrialising South Africa: The Southern Highveld to 1914 (Johannesburg 1986).
Kendall, W., The Revolutionary Movement in Britain, 1900-21 (London 1969).
Kendle, J., The Round Table Movement and Imperial Union (Toronto 1975).
Lacey, R., Aristocrats (London 1984).
Long, B.K., Drummond Chaplin: His life and times in Africa (London 1941).
Lyttelton, E., Alfred Lyttelton; An account of his life (London 1917).
Mandy, N., A City Divided: Johannesburg and Soweto (Johannesburg 1984).
Marks, S., and A. Atmore (eds), Economy and Society in pre-industrial South Africa (London and New York 1987).
McClintock, A., Imperial ether: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest (London and New York 1995).
Powell, M., Servant's Hall (London 1979).
Pretorius, F., Life on Commando during the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902 (Cape Town 1999).
Reader, W.J. “At duty’s call”: A study in obsolete imperialism (Manchester 1988).
Rennie, J., Every Other Sunday (New York 1955).
Roebuck, P., Yorkshire Baronets, 1640-1760; Families, Estates, and Fortunes (Hull 1980).
Scholtz, G.D., Generaal Christiaan Frederick Beyers 1869-1914 (Johannesburg 1941).
Scholtz, G.D., Hertzog en Smuts en die Britse Ryk (Kaapstad 1975).
Scholtz, P.G.M., Standerton: Gister en Vandag (Bloemfontein n.d.).
Smith, H.L., Behind the Press in South Africa (Cape Town 1944).
Thom, H.B., Die geskiedenis van die skaapboerdery in Suid-Afrika (Amsterdam 1936).
Thompson, A.S., Imperial Britain: The Empire in British Politics, c.1880-1932 (Harlow 2000).


2. **Journal Articles**


Bottomley, J., "'Almost bled to death': The effects of the second Anglo-Boer War on societal transformation in the Orange River Colony", *Historia* 44(1) May 1999.


Kriel, L., ‘n Verkenning van beskouings oor die sogenaamde “egodokument” as bron vir historiese navorsing’, Historia 43(1) May 1998.


Marks, S., ‘History, the Nation and Empire: Sniping from the Periphery’, History Workshop, 29, 1990.


Parsons, N., 'Imperial history in the Ukay', *South African Historical Journal* 34, 1996.


Riedi, E., 'Women, Gender, and the Promotion of Empire: The Victorian League, 1901-1914', *The Historical Journal* 45(3) 2002.

Robinson, R.E., 'Imperial Theory and the Question of Imperialism after Empire', *Journal for Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 12, 1984.


3. Theses and Dissertations


Cilliers, J.H., Die administrasie en benutting van Transvaalse Kroongrond, 1900-1906 (D Litt et Phil, Unisa, 1979).
Esterhuizen, S.J., Die ekonomie en maatskaplike toestande van die gewese republikeinse burgers in die Transvaal-kolonie, 1900-1910 (D Phil, UP, 1966).
Jooste, L., FC Erasmus as Minister van Verdediging, 1948-1959 (MA, Unisa; 1995).
Marais, A.H., Die politieke uitwerking van die verhouding van die Afrikaanssprekendes tot die Engelssprekendes, 1910-1915 (D Litt, UOVS, 1972).
Spoelstra, B., 'Die Bewindsaanvaarding van die Botha-regering oor Transvaal as selfregerende Britse Kolonie in 1907' (Archives Year Book for South African History 1953 II).
Van Rensburg, A.P.J., Die ekonomiese herstel van die Afrikaner in die Oranjerivier-Kolonie, 1902-1907 (Archives Year Book for South African History 1957 II).
Vermooten, F., 'Transvaal en die totstandkoming van die Unie van Suid-Afrika' (Archives Year Book for South African History 1957 II).

4. Personal Information
Mrs Alison McCann, West Sussex County Record Office, Chichester, 1995,2001.
Mr Miles Costello, Petworth, Jan 2001.
Mrs Penny Hatfield, College Archivist, Eton College, December 2003.
Mrs Joyce Purnell, PA to Lord Cobham, Hagley Hall, September 2003.

5. Electronic (Internet) Sources