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The Last Trek
FOREWORD

Only half a century ago, the Boers were the heroes of Europe and America—the gallant little nation that went down before a mighty empire. Today, the greater part of the outside world regards the vocal majority of their descendants, the Nationalist Afrikaners, as the epitome of violence, race prejudice and Herrenvolkism.

In this study I have tried, as objectively as may be, to trace the development of Boer into Afrikaner, of oppressed nationhood into oppressive nationalism, and to see the reality behind the conventional stereotypes. Out of the medley of emotions, sympathy, exasperation, admiration and despair, that any contemplation of this historical development must evoke, came this book. If it gives non-Afrikaners sufficient material for a revision of their ideas, and provokes sufficient irritation amongst Nationalist Afrikaners to induce them to write more about themselves for outside consumption, it will have served its purpose.

It would be quite impossible to list here the scores of people who have given so generously of their time and knowledge during the two years that it took to write this book. I have thanked each one of them separately and here repeat my most sincere appreciation. I do however owe a particular debt of gratitude to Mr. Adrian Roberts, lately Union High Commissioner in Canada, for his invaluable bibliography, and to Professor Arthur Keppel-Jones, of the University of Natal, Dr. C. H. V. Sutherland, of Christ Church, Oxford, and Mr. Frans Deelman, for their valuable criticisms and factual corrections of various sections of the draft manuscript. Nobody but myself is however to be held responsible for any opinions or conclusions contained in this study.

I should also like to express my appreciation of the efficiency and courtesy with which the Union Bureau of Census and Statistics, the Provincial Administrations and the main Afrikaans-speaking voluntary associations have responded to re-
quests for information, and to thank Mrs. Rene Nielsen for typing the great bulk of the first and second drafts of the manuscript. Finally, I am indebted to the Proprietors, Investors' Intelligence, Ltd., Johannesburg, for permission to make use of the material contained in their monthly news-digest, African X-Ray Report.

Johannesburg and London
September, 1956

SHEILA PATTERSON
CHAPTER ONE

GENESIS, EXODUS AND CHRONICLES

'Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate, thus saith the Lord'

(2 Corinthians, 6: v. 17)

'The importance of an historical event lies, not so much in the extent of its influence upon contemporary thought and action, as upon its propaganda value for a later generation'

(Professor Vincent Harlow)

THE birth-year of the Boer or Afrikaner nation was in 1657. In this year the Dutch East India Company, interested, as always, in penny-pinching, decided that a more economical method must be found of provisioning its Indies-bound ships at the Cape entrepôt, which had been set up five years earlier. The local Hottentots were not an agricultural people, and had proved demanding and capricious when pressed for a regular supply of cattle.

Accordingly, nine free burgers, all of Dutch or German origin, were settled in the Lãsbeek valley. The terms of settlement were sufficiently onerous to lay the foundations of subsequent strife between officialdom and the colonists.

The Company had no intention of creating a colony. The settlers, however, forced its hand by overflowing the Company's wild almond hedge and all the other boundaries subsequently set up, and moving steadily towards the interior. By 1660 the original nine settlers had become sixty, and by 1678 they had spread over the Cape Flats as far as the Hottentots Hollands Mountains. Thereafter followed three decades of assisted white
immigration and close European settlement, under a wise and far-seeing Governor, Simon van der Stel. It was a process that might, if continued, have altered radically the history of Southern Africa.

It was in this era that most of the ancestors of the Afrikaners of today arrived in South Africa. The original settlers had been easy-going and unfanatical ex-soldiers or Company servants, usually poorly educated Netherlanders or North Germans. The year 1688, however, saw the arrival of about 200 Huguenots, or roughly one-sixth of the free burger population. These newcomers were characterized by their knowledge of viticulture, by their industriousness and high capacity for organization, by a stern Calvinist fanaticism, and by a rejection of Europe and all her ways. The two latter traits at least were to become part of the Boer ethos. The Huguenots also brought with them the French language. This however was ruthlessly stamped out in the second generation by the authorities, who said firmly that they 'wanted no Quebec in the Cape'. Today, the French language remains only in the lovely, nostalgic names of the Western Cape wine farms, such as Bien Donné, Lorraine, and La Champagne. The Afrikaans-speaking descendants of these du Toits, Malans, Marais and du Plessis, were, however, to resist a century of anglicization with much greater success.

The contemporary Governor, Simon van der Stel, was determined to ensure homogeneity in all spheres. He therefore distributed his Huguenot settlers amongst Dutch and German farmers. Although they tended to group together later in the wine-growing districts of French Hock, Stellenbosch and Drakenstein, the Huguenots were soon integrated into settler society by intermarriage, though their darker colouring and stronger features often dominate the blonder northern strain to the present day. Another integrating factor was the growing community of interests and grievances which all settlers felt in opposition to the officials.

These grievances came to a head, and a settlers' front was achieved by the first decade of the eighteenth century. There had long been friction between officials and colonists. The rigorous conditions of the original settlement had been resented,
and the Company’s arbitrary fixing of grain prices and its ban
on cattle-bartering were a continual irritation.

The climax came, and Afrikanerdom’s first hero was created,
when Simon van der Stel’s able but ambitious son William
Adriaan succeeded in acquiring for himself and other officials
one-third of the colony’s farm lands, and in cornering the
colony’s meat and wine contracts. This was not only strictly
contrary to the Company’s regulations, but had a throttling
effect on the little colony’s never too flourishing economy.

A wine farmer called Adam Tas, whose name is perpetuated
today in the punning and provocative name of his wine farm
‘Libertas’, succeeded, despite imprisonment, in smuggling out a
petition to the Company. The petition acquainted the Com-
pany with the Governor’s actions and asked in uncomfortable
and forthright terms for his recall. It was signed by sixty-three of
the 550-odd adult male free burgers (the total adult population
in 1707 was 803). It is worthy of note that half the signatures be-
longed to the smaller but more politically-conscious Huguenot

The colonists won this round and the younger van der Stel
was recalled. Their victory was, however, an illusory one, for it
confirmed the Company in its view that white colonists were
troublesome. As a result, assisted immigration was stopped, and
the Afrikaners have from then until the present day had to rely
on natural increase and individual immigration for the aug-
menting of their numbers. A further even, more momentous
consequence of the Tas episode was the D.E.I.C.’s official de-
cision in 1717 to import more docile slave labour in preference
to the unruly European immigrants.

Commissioner Verburg had reported in 1672: ‘The Dutch
colonists in the Cape of Good Hope bear the name of free men
but they are so trammelled and confined in all things that the
absence of any freedom is but too manifest.’ Freedom was how-
ever a state for which the colonists hankered more and more. If
it was not to be had near Capetown, it seemed to beckon them
beyond the flats and mountains to the north and east. Uncertain
markets, low prices, the labour shortage, were other factors
which impelled the colonists on to the dry, sunbaked lands
beyond. These lands were well suited to the cattle-farming that fulfilled the Cape market's only steady demand. They also offered a chance of evading officialdom and irksome restrictions.

Quite early in the eighteenth century, Cape society was divided into three sections; the townsmen, the plaas-boers and the vee-boers. First came the officials and company servants in Capetown (three of them to every eight burgers by 1740), and the townsmen who kept boarding-houses and canteens, and traded illegally but avidly. Near by, but separated by the bad roads and their distrust of official rapacity and urban sophistication, were the second group, the settled wine, corn and fruit farmers of the fertile Boland. Each farm was, as Eric Walker described it, 'a state in miniature, producing little more than was needed for the maintenance of its inhabitants, but self-sufficing in everything save luxuries, articles of manufacture, and a few raw materials. But their vineyards, plough-lands and beloved oxen were for them a universe which was bounded by the flats and the mountains of Africa.'

The Boland farmer was no absentee landlord, although he might sometimes oversee his modest quota of slaves from the shade of his stoep. Solidity, moderation and piety were his recognized virtues, and the only hint of luxury was provided by the wedding-cake ornamentation of the gables with which the Boland farmers decorated their solid farms after 1781-3, when the unofficial French occupation brought temporary prosperity to the settlement. Despite their early separation from the town, these plaas-boers were nevertheless part of the pattern of organized society. And in the next century they and the townsmen were to evolve a mature and tolerant plural society which was doomed to extinction once the Cape entered Union.

Neither the townsmen nor the plaas-boers were to determine the form of the South African society to be. This was left to the far-wandering vee-boer or cattle farmer, whose evolution will be described elsewhere. Here it must be stressed that this evolution owed much to the initial conflict with unsympathetic

---

6 The term 'Boer' means farmer, but in the South African context it has rather the significance of 'land-owner'.
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officialdom, and the fact that the vee-boers and trek-boers remained intolerant of authority and ready to remove themselves from it the moment it became irksome. The vee-boers came to regard the distant Government as an institution that should not tax but protect. This protection involved sanctioning the farmer's claim to unlimited land, ensuring an adequate supply of non-white labour and high prices for farm produce, and providing arms, ammunition, and if necessary troops to protect the farmer from Bushmen depredations and Kaffir raids. These views on government were later reflected in the Trekker Republics, which de Kiewiet describes as 'land-owning states which had fewer obligations higher than the encouragement and protection of their burgers and their right to land ... From the beginning too, the power of government was limited by the refusal of burgers to accept any but the lightest restrictions or burdens upon their property.'

Meanwhile, the eighteenth-century gap between officials and colonists continued to widen. There was a petty and abortive rebellion in the north-west, when a landdrost summoned some burgers to court for looting Hottentot cattle while they were out on a forbidden cattle-bartering expedition. The rebel leader was a deserting ex-sergeant who accused the colonial authorities of tyranny and corruption and of favouring Hottentots above white men. More serious was the petition sent to Amsterdam in 1779 by 400 Cape Patriots, protesting forcefully against official venality and legal confusion, and demanding burger representation in government. These Cape Patriots were drawn entirely from the West. All of them lived within a day's ride from Capetown, and their action was not one of withdrawal but, like that of the American colonists, a demand for greater representation of their viewpoint in government.

In the next twenty years the Dutch East India Company drifted into bankruptcy, and the Boers in the eastern districts of Swellendam and Graaff-Reinet rose against its rule. Of the ideas of the French Revolution which had percolated along the long ox-wagon trails, liberty was stressed at the expense of equality and fraternity. The main issue, however, was that of the growing tension between Boer and Bantu on the frontier, exacerbated
by the attempts of an energetic landdrost to enforce the rule of law and the rights of both black and white on that frontier. The rebels were quelled by a show of military force when the British occupied the Cape for the first time, in the terms of their treaty with the refugee Prince of Orange. The same Boers rose again abortively in 1799. Between 1803 and 1806 the Cape came under the rule of the Batavian Republic,1 and the ideas of a new, enlightened Europe entered the local scene.

Officialdom and its excesses or deficiencies were not the only factors to influence the evolution of the Boers. Even more important were the constant contacts, in peace or war, with the non-white peoples. In the white man peaceful contact produced a sense of superiority and the familiarity that breeds contempt, while contact in war bred insecurity, fear, and frequently hatred. These two sets of attitudes survive in uneasy combination in the Afrikaner of today, fixed and hallowed by the habits of generations.

The introduction of slaves into the Cape in 1658 was the first major turning-point in South African history. From then on there was no question of the Cape becoming a white man's country, as its climate and relative emptiness might have entitled it to do. Non-white labour became firmly integrated in the economic sphere and set the pattern for all future economic development in South Africa. Manual, and, for a time, even artisan labour, became the province of the slave, the Hottentot, the mixed-blood and later the Kaffir. Remuneration was nonexistent or low, and work done for a master acquired a stigma which few Boers would incur. This occupational gulf was sanctified by custom and persisted long after slavery had vanished. When later the Boers grew too many for the land, the old division of labour stood in the way of their entry into modern indus-

1Under the terms of the Treaty of Amiens. The Batavian Republic was a mildly revolutionary 'client republic' of Napoleon's France—it entrusted the ruling of the former Dutch East India Company's territories to a Council for the Asiatic Possessions, one of whose members was the liberal De Mist. The liberal interlude was short-lived. In 1806 the British took over the Cape again for good, to safeguard their Indies route. The Cape was formally ceded to Britain under the general peace settlement of 1814.
trial life. This was the genesis of Poor Whiteism. A Poor White problem can only exist where poverty is by custom reserved for non-whites.

Reinforcing the economic colour-bar from the start was a religious sanction. Initially, the line had been drawn between Christian and pagan, and the few non-whites, mainly freed Asiatic slaves, who became Christians, were acceptable in white society. Perhaps the early shortage of white women contributed to this acceptability. The low cultural level of the Hottentots and the low status of the slaves soon, however, caused the three criteria of whiteness, Christianity, and superior social and cultural status to converge. By the end of the eighteenth century ‘white man’ and ‘Christian’ were synonymous terms; slave owners had ceased to favour conversion amongst their slaves; and farmers were objecting to the efforts by missionaries to convert and educate the Hottentots.

In succeeding years, Christianity spread to hundreds of thousands of non-whites, and the Christian-heathen and white-black dichotomies could no longer be made to coincide. The Christian-heathen dichotomy thereafter began to lose its force and Christian society acquired a hierarchy of pigmentation. This was reflected in the constitution of the Transvaal Republic, with its harsh stipulation that there should be no equality between whites and people of colour in Church or State. More recently, the Dutch Reformed Church theologians have evolved a concession to conscience, with their doctrine of vertical apartheid and separate churches for the different racial groups.

In the settled slave-owning areas the division between black and white and even between slave and free was never so rigid as it became on the frontier. After slavery was abolished in 1834, there evolved a complex socio-economic classification, based on European cultural determinants. In this the lower classes were coloured and the upper classes were largely white. This society drew no harsh lines. It was divided by an ill-guarded frontier area through which able, light-coloured individuals could pass upward, and ill-equipped whites could sink.

Slavery initiated the basic socio-economic division in South African society, but it was the frontier that made it sharp and
irrevocable. There were various reasons for this. The frontier
Boers were no longer meeting decadent and semi-Europeanized
Hottentots and mixed-bloods, or the more cultivated slaves of
the Cape. For a century they were exposed to the incessant
depredations of the Bushmen, resentful at the loss of their in-
memorial springs and hunting-grounds. Of this period, the travel-
ler Barrow writes: 'An inhabitant of the Sneeuberg not only
lives under constant apprehension of losing his property, but is
perpetually exposed to the danger of being put to death. If he
has occasion to go to the distance of five hundred yards from his
house, he is under the necessity of carrying a musket. He can
neither plough, nor sow, nor reap without being under arms . . . To endure such a life of constant dread and anxiety, a man
must be accustomed to it from his infancy and unacquainted
with one that is better.'

In the middle of the eighteenth century the Boers came up
against the vanguard of an even more formidable foe. The ener-
getic and robust Bantu peoples were moving southwards in
quest of the same unlimited land that the Boer cattle farmers
sought. During the next three-quarters of a century there were
no fewer than eight Kaffir wars. These wars were in fact only
the high spots of incessant contact and friction between the two
peoples, whose way of life and economic aims were all too similar.

There is no object in examining here the rights and wrongs
of the frontier struggle. What is important is the historical myth
that the Boers built around the events of this period. This myth
found its earliest expression in the writings of the 'Trekkers'
historian' Theal. Like most myths it was not entirely divorced
from reality, but had all the simplicity of an early American
motion picture of cowboys and Indians in the Wild West. The
heroes were the simple, peace-loving frontiersmen, anxious to
defend their families and farms against the villainous Kaffirs,
who were continually pouring over the border to raid, burn and
murder. The auxiliary villains were the authorities, who would
not defend the frontier adequately but thwarted the frontiers-
men's efforts to defend themselves, and the missionaries, who
maligned the frontiersmen to the authorities, and treated
Hottentots and Kaffirs on an equality with Christian men.
The attitudes which the frontier Boers developed during this period of turbulence have persisted almost unchanged to the present day. Perhaps the most important and potentially dangerous of these attitudes is that which sees the African as an enemy on the other side of a frontier, and not as a member of society at all. It is this attitude that enables the most kindly and humane people to feel satisfied with a system which imposes taxation without representation, moves whole townships arbitrarily from one place to another, restricts the movements of labour-seekers, and in general treats the majority of the population as unwelcome aliens, despite the fact that inseparable economic links have been forged between black and white.

Mention has already been made of the friction between Boers and missionaries; firstly over the latter's attempts to educate and Christianize the Hottentots in the more settled west, secondly because they championed the 'noble Kaffir' on the frontier.

The missionaries were indeed the bearers of a new and explosive set of ideas which were to change the structure of the Cape Colony in a few short decades. The impact of these ideas was also to evoke an equally violent counter-reaction amongst a large section of Boer colonial society. This resentment outlived the missionaries and has since provoked measures designed to nullify their work.

The libertarian Christianity of the missionaries would in any case have percolated into the stagnant pool of the eighteenth-century colony. The effect would, however, have been gradual and possibly more effective in the long run. As it was, the ideas of these meddling missionaries and political parsons had the full backing of the British Colonial Government and of the affluent middle-class public in Britain. To the missionaries or to their allies in Britain could be directly ascribed the formal establishment of political and legal equality for the Hottentots and other free persons of colour, the promulgation of master-and-servant regulations that interfered with the farmers' traditional rights to deal with their servants as they thought best, the abolition of slavery and the emancipation of the slaves.

The effects of these radical and disruptive measures were
enhanced by the day-to-day activities and attitudes of the missionaries. The Boers considered that the missionary institutions interfered with their labour supply by providing a sanctuary where Hottentots could grow idle and insolent. They resented the missionaries' partiality for the heathen, and their much-publicized criticisms of established Boer customs. They were also shocked at the missionaries' impatient disregard of the accepted social barrier between white and non-white.

On the black list of Nationalist Afrikanerdom, the 'meddling missionaries' hold the same high place as the anglicizing pro-consuls. The members of the London Missionary Society occupy the most prominent place and in their forefront stands the Kirkcaldy weaver's son, Dr. John Philip. According to Eric Walker he was 'stiff in opinions, given to hyperbole, and fully endowed with (a) love of disputation'. It was Philip who enlisted the support of Wilberforce and the English philanthropists for the Hottentots; the latter were technically free, but legally and economically in a worse plight than many slaves. Within nine years of Philip's arrival in the Cape his representations in London had secured the promulgation of the famous Ordinance 50 of 1828. This gave all free persons of colour a legal status and economic freedom equivalent to that already possessed by the white population.

Boer distrust of the missionaries was reinforced by a series of later incidents and clashes in which the missionaries almost invariably figured as highly vocal protagonists of the non-white people against the Boers.

For instance, there was Campbell of the London Missionary Society, who organized a miniature Griqua State on the Vaal River. This resisted the infiltration of land-hungry Boers for some years and, to the outrage of frontier opinion, even at—

---

1Dr. van der Kemp, the first representative of the London Missionary Society, married a freed slave girl many years his junior, while his successor Dr. James Read took a Hottentot to wife.

2Some American missionaries, and such observers as Mrs. Andrew Murray, Junior, felt indeed that the Boers were just as much in need of spiritual ministrations as were the 'heathen', and that the existing societies should devote some time and money to their plight.
tempted to exercise authority over those Boers who came within its territorial jurisdiction.

In 1840, a Wesleyan missionary living in the kraal of Faku, the Pondo chief, advised the latter to appeal to the British colonial authorities for protection, after the Natal Trekkers had sent a commando on a retaliatory raid on his neighbour's kraal. This incident, although it was not a root cause, influenced the British decision to extend Colonial protection to the tribes beyond the border, and led finally to the British occupation of Natal and to the end of the Natal Voortrekker Republic.

In the 1860's, John Mackenzie of the London Missionary Society incurred further odium for his Society by championing the Bamangwato and the Imperial connexion against repeated attempts by the Transvaal to extend its authority into Bechuanaland. David Livingstone, another member of the London Missionary Society, was suspected of having supplied powder and even guns to the Bakwena tribe, and was accused of having 'taught the tribes to kill Boers'. He himself, with his colleagues Edwards and Inglis, accused the Boers of being slavers, contrary to their own laws. This charge Eric Walker finds substantially justified, and it was one of the factors which led to the British intervention north of the Orange River. In the 1860's, the Free State Volksraad expelled the Paris Evangelical missionaries from Basutoland for politicizing. This action provoked widespread protest in London, and thereby strengthened the case for the British annexation of Basutoland.

Legislation in the Trekker Republics reflected their attitudes to the missionaries. The Nine Articles of 1837 forbade any contact with 'allen den Sendelings Genootscap van Engeland'. The Grondwet of the Transvaal excluded Roman Catholics altogether and discouraged all Churches not linked by the Heidelberg Catechism. Eric Walker gives evidence that the Boers' bark was worse than their bite, except where the London Missionary Society men were concerned. He does, however, mention that even the first Dutch Reformed Church missionaries in the northern Transvaal were very unpopular amongst the Boers there.

Whatever the contemporary Boer attitude, the missionary
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from overseas has been built into almost a stage villain by the compilers of nationally-orientated Afrikaner annals. The mythical figure has been rounded out by the recent anti-apartheid activities of various Anglican clerics. The Reverend Michael Scott and Father Trevor Huddleston in particular have succeeded in attracting a world-wide audience for views which have greatly wounded Afrikaner amour-propre.

The liberal humanitarianism of the missionaries might, as has been said, have been less disruptive had it not influenced the British administration so directly. Taken by itself, the British administration represented a new and all-embracing system of government which would have proved sufficiently unpalatable to the colonists, and particularly to the frontiersmen, whose idea of government was based on the easy-going slothfulness of the dying Dutch East India Company. But, as Professor H. T. Strauss, Professor of Political Science at the University of the Orange Free State, said in October, 1953, 'the greatest calamity suffered by our nation was the appearance of humanitarianism on the soil of the fatherland.' Aided by the coming of the nineteenth-century British with their liberal traditions and nascent, revolutionary and democratic political ideas, humanitarianism had left a 'legacy of religious disaffection which even today causes nothing but trouble and sorrow'.

In addition to the measures designed to protect and improve the lot of the non-white inhabitants, the new rulers within twenty-five years reformed the currency (a step which always involves hardship for some individuals); initiated a vigorous programme of anglicization in Church and schools; planted 5,000 British settlers amongst the frontier Boers; attempted to stabilize the land-system and root the wandering frontier Boers by introducing optional quit-rent tenure in place of the loan-place system which had encouraged poor farming and wandering habits; established Circuit Courts which brought the law and its agents right up to the frontier; set up an independent judiciary and drastically reformed the local judiciary, abolishing the old unpaid local representatives and thereby incidentally doing away with the only representative body through which the Boers might have expressed their grievances.
The measures of the new rulers, however admirable and essential, were often modified and even distorted in their effects by such factors as the inconstancy of London colonial policy and the lack of officials and funds to carry out such measures in an undeveloped, impoverished and far-flung colony.

Two episodes occurred in this period of change which have in recent decades become keystones of Afrikaner mythology, exemplifying the most outrageous aspects of the new system. These were the Black Circuit of 1812, and the Slagters Nek Rebellion of 1815. The Black Circuit was the name given to the proceedings of the newly-created court that sat in Uitenhage and George in 1812. Here for the first time whites were hauled into court to answer for misbehaviour towards their Hottentot servants. This in itself was difficult enough to swallow, but the proceedings were embittered further by the large number of baseless or exaggerated charges brought by the zealous London Missionary Society representative, Dr. James Read, on behalf of his charges. He spoke irresponsibly of ‘upwards of 100 cases of recent murders in Uitenhage’, but, in fact, only twenty-two cases of all kinds were brought before the court. Many of these cases referred to events long past, and less than half were substantiated by a court which consisted of Cape Dutchmen. The shock to conservative frontier opinion, was, however, unbounded. A part of their resentment was directed against the authorities for putting them on a legal equality with their servants and against the missionaries for what was regarded as slanderous partiality.

In the Slagters Nek episode which followed soon afterwards, the missionary factor was lacking, but the essential elements were otherwise the same. The frontier Boer, Frederick Bezuidenhout, had for two years refused to answer a court summons on a charge of cruelty to a Hottentot servant. When a white officer and twelve Hottentot troops were sent to arrest him, he fired on them and was killed in the affray that followed. To many frontiersmen, this was yet another instance of the tyrannical excess of the new rulers. It was aggravated by the fact that the charge laid against the dead man had been made by a Hottentot and that Hottentot soldiers had been sent to bring him in.
Bezuidenhout's brother, Johannes, the influential Hendrik Prinsloo and a group of malcontents thereupon planned a rebellion. In this enterprise they were somewhat illogically prepared to make an ally of Gaika the Xosa Chief, although he was their erstwhile enemy and a Kaffir in addition.

Many Boers in the east did not support the plan, and the rebels finally rode out less than 200 strong. At the actual encounter at Slagters Nek, not a shot was fired. Most of the insurgents rode away and surrendered later. Johannes Bezuidenhout shot it out on his farm and died of wounds. Forty-seven prisoners were finally brought to trial under the old harsh unreformed Roman-Dutch Law. Thirty-two were banished from the frontier districts and six were sentenced to be hanged by the Cape Dutch judges who composed the special commission. One rebel was pardoned, but the rest were hanged on the spot where the rebel oath had been taken. The circumstances of the hanging were described by an eye-witness as 'horrid and distressing'. They supplied an additional goad to contemporary and later outrage. The rope broke, so that four of the five condemned men fell to the ground and had to be hanged all over again, despite their pleas for mercy.

This minor and half-hearted rebellion has, particularly in the last few decades, become one of the rallying-cries of Nationalist Afrikanerdome. Alleged relics of the gallows are still peddled and the non-participation of the majority of frontier Boers is forgotten. The Cape Dutch officials who defeated, tried and sentenced the rebels are regarded as traitors. At their head stands the Veld-Kommandant Nel, who, according to Cory, is thought to have induced the Boers to surrender by swearing that they would suffer no harm. The undocumented story ran that he watched the execution with a reprieve in his pocket, and that pangs of conscience drove him to suicide three months later.

Over the next twenty years, unrest and resentment grew amongst the frontier Boers. These Boers had by the last half of the eighteenth century become a very singular group, living a very singular and unchanging way of life. They had, in effect, become white Africans, or Afrikaners, as they sometimes called themselves. They had adapted themselves to the slow African
rhythm of movement and to the semi-nomadic pastoralism and subsistence economy dictated by the African climate and soil. They did not dominate their environment, but like the Bantu made a successful adjustment to it. Only when the Boer and the Bantu clashed, and the supply of free grazing lands beyond the horizon dried up for both groups, did it become clear that the land could not support two such independent communities side by side.

Ecologically then, the frontier Boer lived the simplest of self-sufficient lives. Natural dangers were few, the climate moderate, and food and water were easily obtained. The frontier Boer's home was a thatched hut built of earth or reeds, or even a trek-wagon. His staple diet was meat, supplemented by the more settled and energetic with fruit and a little wheat. His clothes and shoes he usually made himself, and all he ever needed to buy was gunpowder, some cloth, coffee, brandy and various implements. These he paid for by the occasional sale of cattle, butter and soap to the roving butchers' agents. Regular markets were distant or non-existent and the frontiersmen had in any case been discouraged by the early monopolistic restrictions of the Company. Little of the land beyond the settled western Cape was suitable for intensive arable farming. The loan-place system, with its relative insecurity of tenure, led to over-grazing and improvident farming. It also stimulated rapid dispersal and the restlessness which lay behind the 'trekkees' of later days. The frontier Boer was not deeply attached to any particular farm or building, but to his cattle, his way of life, and the land as a whole.

Wealth on the frontier was reckoned not in cash but in cattle and sons. Sons there were in plenty, but the constant Kaffir raids discouraged the accumulation of enormous herds. In a society where any men could acquire land for the asking, a

---

1The loan-places were great cattle-runs of 3,000 morgen or more, held on loan from the Company for a year at a time. In practice the grants were rarely resumed. The holder's heirs were entitled by law only to the value of the house and other improvements. The government made no charge at all until 1714, after which it levied an annual rent of £2. 10s. Many farmers held more than one such loan-place.
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society which had come to regard 6,000 acres as every Boer’s birthright, there were no hereditary class distinctions. All men were potentially equal, and few white men worked for a master.

Such a life could not fail to stimulate a spirit of self-reliance and independence. This made men intolerant of the distant demands of officialdom. Each patriarch administered his own law amongst his family, his Hottentot servants and his slaves (though relatively few families in the East were slave owners).

In time of war, the frontier Boers would assemble, not always enthusiastically, in the military unit evolved by them for frontier needs, the commando. This was under the command of a local official who was a farmer like themselves. When the danger was over, the Boers fell away again into their isolation.

In one aspect of life only did the frontier Boers dominate their environment. A law unto themselves they might be, but the great majority were not lawless. This was due to their profound attachment to their Calvinist faith. In the all too familiar phrase, the Boer went into the wilderness with a gun in one hand and his Bible in the other. This was usually the only book in a frontier household, but its influence was paramount. Predikants and churches were few and far between, but the Old Testament from which their initial Calvinism had been drawn now provided a manual of behaviour entirely suited to the frontier Boers.

As the historian Theal wrote so vividly, the frontier Boer lived ‘under such skies as those under which Abraham lived. His occupation was the same, he understood the imagery of the Hebrew writers more perfectly than anyone in Europe would understand it, for it spoke to him of his daily life. He had heard the continuous roll of thunder which was as the voice of the Lord upon many waters, and had seen the affrighted antelope drop their young as they fled before the storm, when the great trees came down with a crash and the lightning divided like flames of fire. He knew too of skies like brass and of earth like iron, of little clouds seemingly no larger than a man’s hand presaging a deluge of rain, and of swarms of locusts before whose
track was the Garden of the Lord, while behind was a naked desert.'

In general then, the frontier Boers were independent, self-reliant, unimaginative, tenacious, enduring, roughly courteous, hospitable, devout, restless in their movements, but narrowly conservative in their thinking. Contemporary views of them ranged from the earlier judgement of the Batavian de Mist in about 1800 that these 'half-wild Europeans' were rebellious and unreasonable, and suffered from a 'complete corruption of their moral sense', to the eulogies of Theal, and Sir Benjamin d'Urban's approving tribute to 'a brave, patient, orderly and religious people.'

On these frontier Boers, untouched by a century of European thought, and undiluted by any appreciable later addition to their numbers, there descended, from the second decade of the nineteenth century, the full impact of the new ideas and the new rulers. Liberalism and philanthropic negrophilism were buttressed by a centralizing authority. The rule of law was enforced, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to turn the roving subsistence farmers into intensive and settled agriculturalists. Rather than suffer these changes, most Boers were prepared to trek. A handful had already turned north beyond the Colonial border and moved over the Orange River.

Over and above these man-made inflictions, the frontier Boers were for the next decade subjected to a series of natural scourges. Drought, floods and Kaffirs plagued the eastern border, and the Government failed in Boer eyes to deal satisfactorily with the latter or to allow anyone else to do so in its place. In 1836, a particularly severe drought and the British Government's economy-minded decision to restore the newly-annexed territory of Queen Adelaide Land to the Kaffir tribes

1 This judgement was later modified. General Dundas was, however, even blunter. He called them a 'troublesome and disaffected race', 'the strongest compound of cowardice and cruelty, of treachery and cunning, and of most the bad qualities with few, very few, good ones of mind', (Cory, p. 196). In general, the opinions of those hostile to the Boers tended to survive, and their continued immoderate tone may help to explain the deep resentment of criticism and sense of being misunderstood which the Boers developed and have maintained to this day.
touched off the mass movement of population which was to be
called the Great Trek. Despite the later myth and grievances
that grew around it, the Great Trek was, as de Kiewiet writes:
‘In one sense but an acceleration on a large scale of the move-
ment of expansion that had been going on for centuries. Since
the end of the eighteenth century an important section of the
population had been checked in its freedom of movement by the
opposing native tribes . . . Tactically, the Great Trek repre-
sented a decision to give up the frontal attack and undertake an
outflanking movement. When fully carried out, it was a man-
œuvre that carried the colonists beyond the range of British in-
fluence and enabled them to strike at the vital resources of the
natives at numerous points.’

The leaders of the Trek left their own versions of the griev-
ances that drove them to seek a new land without boundaries or
irksome officialdom. Piet Retief published a Manifesto in the
Grahamstown Journal in 1837. His first three points concerned the
prevalence of coloured vagrancy (following the granting of
equivalent legal status to Hottentots and other ‘free persons of
colour’ in 1828); losses caused by emancipation (Retief was one
of the few Voortrekkers who had been a slave-owner and the
regulations affecting compensation were extremely irksome and
petty); and losses caused by the ‘continual system of plunder
endured from Caffres and other coloured classes.’ ‘We are re-
solved’ he wrote, ‘wherever we go that we will uphold the just
principles of liberty; but whilst we will take care that no one
shall be held in a state of slavery, it is our determination to
maintain such regulations as may suppress crime and preserve
proper relations between master and servant.’

The grievances over vagrancy, plundering by Kaffirs and
emancipation were stressed by most Trekkers who recorded
their motives. Apart from the economic losses involved, there
was widespread resentment at the sort of legislation which
placed slaves on an equal footing with Christians and enabled
Hottentots to run wild and to bring exaggerated charges against
their ex-masters. Ordinance 50 of 1828 and Emancipation con-
stituted a social revolution which struck at the whole Boer way
of life.
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Land hunger, economic and human losses, insecurity and restlessness, the vexatious interference of officialdom and outrage at the attack on their established social system; all these were inflated and enhanced by a general feeling of personal outrage at the 'unjustifiable odium cast on us by interested and dishonest persons under the cloak of religion, to the exclusion of all evidence in our favour'.

By 1834, the idea was being whispered about the Boer farms of a mass trek to a land of their own where they might be 'left to themselves', to live in quiet, free and exempt from taxation'. Scouting parties were already out in 1835. These parties found Natal, land of milk and honey, and the inland plains, seemingly empty of tribes. The emptiness, though they could not know it, was a temporary phenomenon due to the devastations of Shaka and Dingaan. Later in the same year the two first important treks crossed the Orange River. They were followed during the next three years by some 10,000 to 12,000 Boers. The unit was the small trek party, under a patriarch or local official; each small party usually owed allegiance to one of the principal leaders. These pioneers alone are entitled to be honoured as Voortrekkers, although the Cape Boers continued to trek to the Republics for many years to come.

During that short period, as de Kiewiet points out, a thin layer of Boer settlement spread over the most desirable part of the interior, already settled by a virile Bantu population. This made the territorial segregation of the two races forever impossible, and linked the whole future of South Africa with the Boer race. In the interior, the Trekkers gained two more generations for their own way of life, beyond the reach of the Colonial authorities or the new ideas.

1Seven thousand of His Majesty's subjects were in one week driven to utter destitution; 100 Europeans and Hottentots had been killed, 455 farms had been burnt, and many thousands of horses, cattle and sheep carried off, and, of the cattle taken or retaken, most had been eaten by the troops and commandos during nine months of war, and now many burghers were too impoverished to buy the remnant at auction, even with two months’ credit. The total colonial losses amounted to perhaps £300,000.' (Eric Walker, History of South Africa, p. 194.)
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The events of the Trek itself have passed into legend. This process was greatly facilitated by the paucity of written Trekker documents. The Trek came to be seen as the birth of a nation, as an Exodus with Retief as the Boers’ Moses, and Natal as the Promised Land. In vain did the Dutch Reformed Church condemn the Trek as an Exodus without a Moses or the certainty of a Canaan, and refuse to send ministers to accompany the Boers in their flight from Pharaoh.

The frieze inside the Voortrekker Monument near Pretoria shows the main events of the Trek as they are remembered by the present generation of Afrikaners. Among its highlights are the Battles of Vegkop in 1836 and of Kapain in 1837, the second of which drove the Matabele north of the Limpopo and cleared the Transvaal for Boer settlement; the trek of Retief’s and Maritz’s parties over the Drakensberg to Natal; Retief’s negotiations with, and subsequent treacherous murder by, the Zulu King, Dingaan; Dingaan’s slaughter of the Boers at the place which came to be called Weenen, the Place of Weeping; further disastrous encounters with the Zulus; the Vow taken by the Trekkers under their new leader Pretorius, at the battle which overthrew Dingaan at Blood River in 1838; the building of the Church of the Vow at Pietermaritzburg; Trekker women doing their men’s work while the men were in the field; the murder of the fugitive Dingaan by the Swazis; the British occupation of Natal and the return trek over the Drakensberg to escape from British rule; and finally the Sand River Convention of 1852 which officially terminated the Trek, when the British acknowledged the independence of the 15,000 Boers beyond the Vaal.

In essentials, the modern legend of the Trek perpetuates the hostility, treacherousness and savagery of the African, the unwarranted interference and dog-in-the-manger attitude of the British authorities, and, as is only reasonable, the simplicity, piety, courage and endurance of Trekker men, women and children.

1Trekker myths do not usually stress the fact that the Trekkers, not then so delicate about arming black men as their descendants are today, allied themselves with the Barolong against the Matabele.
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Courage and endurance there were in plenty, but the Trek was not perhaps so difficult nor so unique as it has been pictured, at least in comparison with the opening up of the far greater expanses of the North American West. The Drakensberg was the only considerable natural obstacle, and the formidable Zulu and Matabele empires were apparently broken within a few years. This does not of course mean that the Voortrekkers did not pay highly in losses of men and livestock, in insecurity, in discomfort and nostalgia.

The Trek has been divided into two stages. The first stage began in 1835; it took the Voortrekkers out of the Colony, Retief and Pretorius to Natal, Potgieter to Potchefstroom and Louis Trichardt on a via dolorosa as far as Delagoa Bay. The second trek began in 1843, the year of the British occupation of Natal. This occupation, followed by the annexation of Transorangia in 1848, drove all the most determined and irreconcilable elements over the Drakensberg and the Vaal into what was soon to become the South African Republic.

This second trek helped to differentiate the subsequent histories of the Orange Free State and the South African Republic. The former had already a substantial settlement of pre-Trek Boers, who had no quarrel with the Colonial Government and dissociated themselves very strongly from Trekker politics. These pre-Trek Boers were soon reinforced by the most stable and the least adventurous Trekkers, for whom one trek was enough, and by land-hungry newcomers from the Cape. Northward over the Vaal went the remainder of the Voortrekkers, a group of independent, unquiet, opinionated and factious individuals who were still far from being a nation. They were united mainly by their bitter resentment over the insidious British policy of following them up and reaping the benefits of Boer pioneering and endurance.

By the Sand River Convention of 1852 Britain recognized Boer independence north of the Vaal. In 1854, motives of false economy drove her to do the same in the territories north of the Orange River, despite the protests of a substantial section of its Boer inhabitants. This short-sighted move made it possible for Transvaal attitudes and policies to dominate a far larger area of
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Southern Africa and thereby radically influenced future history. Nevertheless, the Orange Free State, with its ‘quiet pastoral people’ and its proximity to the Cape, developed gradually but surely into a homogeneous little republic, where Boer, Briton and Jew lived in tolerance and harmony. As its motto it adopted the virtues: ‘Patience and Courage’.

Across the Vaal the warring leaders continued to bicker, and the rank-and-file spread inexorably over the land, until this gave out in the 1870’s. Each farm had a minimum area of 6,000 acres. Speculation was none the less rife. Some farms swelled to a quarter of a million acres, and a number of them were held by absentee owners. Much of this land was already owned by African tribes who had been driven off it temporarily during the ‘Mfecane’ (crushing) caused by Shaka the Zulu. Returning to find their land rights usurped, these Africans remained on it as squatters and labourers, an integrated part of the whole economy. Today Afrikaners are apt to defend themselves against outside criticism of their race attitudes by pointing out that their Voortrekker ancestors did not, like some other colonizing powers, follow the policy of extermination of the aborigines, and indeed saved these from further extermination by their own people.

The Transvaal Boers required little of their government but protection of their land rights; it was to be, and indeed by virtue of the population’s composition had to be, a government of Boers, for Boers and by Boers. In 1856 the factions came together sufficiently to draw up a rambling and highly flexible constitution; this could be and frequently was amended by a simple majority in the Volksraad. Anarchical conditions and centrifugal bickering between factions persisted however for the next quarter of a century. Political anarchy was accompanied by administrative inexperience and ineptitude, and conditions of economic chaos, verging on near ruin. An attempt by Martthinus Wessels Pretorius immediately after the ratifying of this constitution to unite the Boers south and north of the Vaal failed ignominiously.

1A land-owner acquired citizen rights easily, a landless man less easily.
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The feeling of loose Boer community, south as well as north of the Vaal, developed into nationhood largely as a result of the alternation of fumbling vacillation and imperialistic leap-frog which characterized British colonial policy for the rest of the century. The penny-wise withdrawal from the Free State in 1854 was followed by London's rejection of Sir George Grey's bold federation plan to link the Free State, Natal and the Cape. In 1868, however, came the swing of the pendulum and the Free State was deprived of what it regarded as the fruits of victory by Wodehouse's annexation of Basutoland.

In 1870 the discovery of diamonds at what is now Kimberley gave added significance to the claim of Nicholas Waterboer, a half-breed Griqua chief, to the territory involved. The southern territory was claimed by the Free State on the grounds of occupation and prescription; by Waterboer, advised by an imperialist law agent called Arnot, on the basis of treaties with the Colonial authorities. North of the Vaal, the disputed territories were claimed on a reversed basis, the Transvaal depending on treaties, the Bantu tribes on occupation. Apart from its diamondiferous possibilities, the disputed territory was on the road to the north, the so-called Missionaries' Road. In Boer hands it could be used to check any British advance into the interior.

On arbitration the case went against the Transvaal in the north. In the south the Griqua chief appealed for British protection and Sir Henry Barkly, new High Commissioner, annexed the whole of Griqualand West to the British Crown. This latter action, coming as it did just after the discovery of diamonds in the area, deeply embittered the Free Staters and turned them back on the Transvaal. Some decades later, the historian Theal, who had lived through this event, thought the annexation had done more to alienate Briton and Boer than any other happening.

Federation, or confederation, nevertheless remained in the air, for reasons of order, economy and defence against the African. It found such supporters as the moderate President of the Free State, J. H. Brand, and J. H. Hofmeyr of the Cape. The possibility of federation was, however, effectively dispelled by
the premature annexation of the Transvaal, stage-managed between President Burgers and Shepstone. This action brought strong protests from Kruger and the mass of burgers, from the Free State, and even from Hofmeyr and other Cape leaders who had formerly supported federation. The annexation, indeed, helped to consolidate the Cape Dutch as a self-conscious political group.

After their early tame submission, the national feeling of the Transvaal Boers crystallized under the energetic leadership of Kruger, when the British failed to honour Shepstone's pledge to give the Transvaal self-government. The final British destruction of the Zulu military power which had menaced the Transvaal borders, and the new authorities' firm method of extracting taxes, gave the Boers an added incentive to rid themselves of their unwanted overlords. In December, 1880, over 5,000 Transvaal burgers came together at Paardekraal, decreed the restoration of the Republic and started the First War of Independence. The British were routed at Majuba, and the Transvaal's independence was recognized by the Pretoria Convention. The British Government, however, reserved its suzerainty over the Republic's external and frontier affairs, a step that was later to prove a considerable bone of contention. The Convention also defined the boundaries of the Transvaal on all sides, thereby for the first time setting a final horizon for the endless trek to new lands.

Majuba and the withdrawal from the Transvaal brought humiliation to the British, and imbued the Boers with a perhaps excessive self-confidence and a growing consciousness of nationhood. This consciousness now reached well beyond the Transvaal borders, and was summed up in the war-cry of the Free State Express: 'Africa for the Afrikanders'. Jan Hofmeyr wrote: 'The annexation of the Transvaal has taught the people of South Africa that blood is thicker than water. It has filled the (Cape) Africanders, otherwise grovelling in the mud of materialism, with a national glow of sympathy for the brothers across the Vaal, which we look upon as one of the most hopeful signs for the future'.

Meanwhile the Boer Republics were ceasing to be Britain's
personal problem. Germany, in particular, was moving into Southern Africa from the western seaboard. The danger was that she might join up with the Transvaal, and by occupying Bechuanaland cut the Missionaries' Road to the north. There was even a chance that Germany might claim the open Pondos coast south of Durban, or the north coast up to Delagoa Bay. These dangers were averted by the British annexation of the whole Natal coast and of Bechuanaland. German pressure eased for a while after the Berlin Conference of 1884–5. Within ten years, however, came Kruger's pro-German speech on the Kaiser's birthday, the appearance of German officers in the Transvaal and of German warships in Delagoa Bay, and, after the failure of the Jameson Raid, the Kaiser's over-exuberant telegram of congratulation to Kruger.

Apart from the ever-present danger that she might become a pawn in European power politics, the Transvaal's hopes of being left in peace after the Pretoria Convention were destroyed for ever by the discovery of gold on the Witwatersrand in 1886. Within a few years the gold rush had created an Uitlander population on the Rand which outnumbered the original Boers by two to one. The nearly bankrupt Transvaal soon grew wealthy on the taxes imposed on the mines and the Uitlander population.

Politically and socially, however, the Republic was totally unequipped to adjust itself to the new conditions and to the new inhabitants. The adjustment from an ox-wagon to a machine economy would have been difficult enough in a homogeneous society. Here the new economy and the new ideas were brought by aggressive and impatient outsiders, most of them speaking the language of the old oppressors. These differences were accentuated by Kruger's Dutch and German advisers, who had their own reasons for wishing to build an independent Boer national state across the path of British expansion in Africa.

The Uitlanders were a mixed bag of cosmopolitan adventurers, tough miners from England, and steady Dutch and English colonists from the Cape. To the stern Dopper President Kruger, sitting on his stoep in quiet Pretoria some thirty miles over the veld, Johannesburg might look like Babylon or Gomorr-rah. As mining towns went, however, it was not over-disorderly
and was rapidly acquiring a stable population of skilled artisans and trained employees.

These Uitlanders had a number of grievances against the Transvaal administration. Most of them were genuine enough, but they were exaggerated by imperialists and politicians. The most bitterly felt grievances were the harsh naturalization and franchise regulations introduced after 1882, which made it virtually impossible for any immigrant to become a burger. Kruger, on the other hand, quite reasonably considered that if the franchise were granted to these alien newcomers, who outnumbered the original inhabitants seven to three by 1895, the Republic and the way of life for which the Boers had fought and suffered for so long must inevitably disappear.

Other Uitlander grievances concerned the lack of State support for English-speaking schools, the refusal of the right of public meeting, and the rough hostility with which the President often greeted deputations seeking peaceable redress. To one he said: ‘Go back and tell your people I shall never give them anything; I shall never change my policy, and now let the storm burst’.

These were the grievances of the settled rank-and-file, most of whom were men of South African birth. To these grievances were added the irritation of the magnates, who were barely concerned with the franchise, at the inefficiency and corruption of the Republican Government and the irksome and discriminatory mining tariffs, monopolies and concessions, through whose agency Kruger milked the mining industry of its excess profits. However wise the old President's mining policy may seem to modern economists, it was greatly resented by the Randlords in 1895.

Even at this stage, events in South Africa might have moved to a peaceable solution. Opposed to each other were the obstinate old President, who as a child had taken part in the Great Trek, and who believed that the earth was flat, and Cecil John Rhodes, the magnate and imperialist, whose methods of achieving his grandiose ends could be both crude and unscrupulous, and whose impatience and recklessness were to increase as his life ran out. Kruger had always represented the extreme of Boer
nationalism, and he was falling more and more under the influence of his German and Dutch advisers, the so-called 'Hollander clique', headed by Leyds. Rhodes, however, was still far from being the idol of the Jingo imperialists. His expansive vision of federation included Briton and Boer alike, and he was until the fatal year of 1896 working hand in hand to this end with the moderate Cape Dutch leader, Jan Hofmeyr, and his Afrikaner Bond.

In the Free State, President Brand had exerted his great moderation and wisdom in the direction of friendly relations with the Cape Colony and eventual confederation on a non-racial basis where whites were concerned. In the Transvaal itself, there was considerable Boer opposition to Kruger and Krugerism. This opposition was based on the resentment felt by many Transvaal Boers with Cape links and Cape orientation against the opinionated and arrogant 'Hollander clique'. The opposition included such individuals as Joubert, Schalk Burger, Louis Botha, Chief Justice Kotze, Eugene Marais of Land en Volk and Celliers of Die Volkstem. In 1892–3, indeed, Joubert was only narrowly defeated by Kruger in the presidential election. Under such men the Transvaal might have made the great and inevitable transition from the eighteenth-century veld to the modern capitalist world peacefully and gradually rather than by force.

As the first years of the 1890's passed, however, the moderating factors ceased to operate. Rhodes' impatience and Kruger's intransigence grew; the clamour of the Uitlanders, whether magnates or rank-and-file, swelled, and the Colonial Government became increasingly nervous about German intervention and the consequences of continued local Balkanization.

At the end of 1895 the interplay of these factors led to one of the most futile and unhappy events in all South African history — the Jameson Raid. The relative complicity of various British officials may remain in some doubt, but the significance of the Raid for the future of British-Boer relations was established immediately. As Dr. Jean van der Poel points out in her study of the Raid, the shielding of Chamberlain left the latter in power, a determined and temporarily discomfited imperialist, and
aroused so deep a suspicion of the British Government in Boer minds as to vitiate the Boer-British negotiations that took place in the years between the Raid and the outbreak of war. These years were not, however, without genuine attempts at compromise by President Kruger, whose Hollander advisers were now yielding place to Cape Afrikaners, by Milner and even by the Rand magnates; these attempts were amplified by the sustained mediation of Hofmeyr, President Steyn and other Afrikaners from the Cape and Free State.

The immediate effect of the Raid was to strengthen both extremes. The Cape Colony was split apart on racial lines for years to come. Hofmeyr and other Cape moderates broke with Rhodes in sorrow and disillusionment. A young advocate called J. C. Smuts abandoned his British nationality and settled in the Transvaal, where he was soon to become State Attorney. The Free State turned northward for the last time, to ally itself to the Transvaal in a full military alliance. In the Transvaal itself, Kruger’s hand was immensely strengthened vis-à-vis the more moderate opposition, and Britain became suspect, not only for her present actions but for all ambiguous deeds in the past. Lastly, the Raid arrested the slow move of all South African territories towards unity, without affecting the economic and political considerations that made such unity necessary and inevitable. Over the next few years Boer suspicions and bitterness were intensified by British attempts to conceal official complicity and to whitewash and even lionize Rhodes and Jameson.

At the centre of the storm, the Uitlanders’ last condition was worse than their first. New laws were passed which seemed to threaten their precarious civil status still further. In 1899 some 21,000 Uitlanders petitioned the Queen for protection, thereby raising again the controversial issue of suzerainty. At this stage Lord Milner, whose temperament was decisive and uncompromising, seems to have made up his mind to radical measures. He cabled London that the helotry of British subjects in the Transvaal was a matter of South African concern, and

²Twenty-three thousand however, signed a counter-petition in favour of the Government.
that to win the franchise for them would be a striking proof that Her Majesty’s Government was not to be ousted from her rightful opposition in South Africa by heavily armed republics. Joseph Chamberlain replied that he was prepared to press the franchise issue and therefore that of paramountcy to all lengths.

At the instance of the mediators, a conference was held at Bloemfontein. This was rendered abortive as much by the unyielding character of the two protagonists as by their considerable differences of viewpoint. President Kruger had by then made up his mind that no concessions could prevent a further British attempt on Boer independence, and he was prepared for war, 'firm in the confidence that the God of Battles must be on their side'. A further attempt at concessions in August failed and both sides drifted into war. Feeling that time would only work against their side, the Transvaal Volksraad drafted an ultimatum demanding the withdrawal of British troops from their border, and the departure of all troops newly arrived in Africa or still on the high seas. So began the Anglo-Boer War, which the Afrikaners call the English War or the Second War of Independence. This war left as great a scar on the group memory of the defeated as did the War between the States. Of it one of its leaders, General Smuts, wrote: 'The Boer War was other than most wars. It was a vast tragedy in the life of a people, whose human interest has surpassed its military value... (It was an) epic struggle between the smallest and the greatest of peoples'.

An epic struggle it was indeed. The British put nearly 450,000 men into the field from first to last and spent £223 million. Against them the Boers numbered 87,000 men under arms. About 40,000 of these were Transvaal burgers and nearly 30,000 Free Staters. In addition there were some regulars, cosmopolitan volunteers, and over 30,000 Cape Dutch or Colonial rebels. The fact that there were no more of the latter, despite the strongly pro-Boer feelings of most Cape Dutch after the Jameson Raid, was probably due to the firm discouragement of disloyal activities by Hofmeyr and the Afrikaner Bond.

The problem of this divided loyalty has been immortalized in C. Louis Leipoldt's Oom Gert Vertel (Uncle Gert's Tale). This poem tells of the two young Cape Afrikaners who run away to
join a Boer commando. They are caught, convicted and hanged; the same day two more follow their example. The older man, having tried to dissuade them, helps them as far as he can. Hofmeyr, who in both wars called upon the Colonial Afrikaners to show their sympathy by legal means and to contribute money to help the widows and orphans, fully understood this clash of loyalties. He had worked untiringly for conciliation in the decade before the war, despite accusations of disloyalty from both sides. Later he was both to advocate a general amnesty for the Colonial rebels and to issue a manifesto condemning the reverse process, the ostracism of the 'loyal Dutch' by Boer supporters.

The Anglo-Boer War was by no means the straightforward two-sided contest between Briton and Boer portrayed by later Nationalist historians. In the Cape, Schreiner's Government had made every effort to avert the conflict, and public opinion was obviously far from united. Even Rhodes, who was keeping in the background of Cape politics, at the end of the war's organized stage in 1900 warned the extreme anti-Boers that, while Krugerism had been overthrown, the Dutch remained and they would have to go on living together. In Britain itself there was strong opposition from the small I.L.P. under Keir Hardie, Snowdon, and Macdonald, and from such individual members of the Liberal Party as Wedgewood Benn, John Morley, Lloyd George and John Burns. The Manchester Guardian and Wickham Steed's Review of Reviews also attacked the Government. In the Khaki Election of August, 1900, seven votes were cast against Chamberlain's policy for every eight in favour. In the concentration camps which were set up for Boer women and children in the Republics, Emily Hobhouse and many other Britons worked indefatigably to improve the conditions which they regarded as a blot on their country's good name.

Apart from the continental volunteers on the Boer side, a fair number of English-speaking men living in the Republics joined the Boer commandos, and fought with them to the end. On the other hand, some Cape Dutch fought for the British, and a large number of Republican Boers took an oath of neutrality to the British after the first part of the war. Some 4,500 even joined the British forces as 'National Scouts' or 'Volunteers'.
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The actual motives of those Boers who did not support the Boer cause were various and not always deserving of censure. Afrikaner national memory is however long and censorious, and the terms 'Handsopper', 'National Scout' and even 'Loyal Dutch' still carry the full opprobrium reserved for collaborators and quislings in Europe.

The war itself fell into two stages. The first was the regular campaign which ended with President Kruger's departure for Europe in August 1900, and Roberts' annexation of the Free State and Transvaal in May and September of that year respectively. The second was that of guerilla warfare, which continued until May 1902.

The first part of the war began with the Boer successes at Magersfontein and Colenso. At this stage the Boers outnumbered the British two to one, and should have invaded the Cape Colony to increase their strength by recruiting from the rural population, which was largely on their side. For this type of warfare, however, the Boer lack of an over-all command or of discipline in the field proved fatal. Denys Reitz writes of the siege of Ladysmith: 'Discipline was slack and there was a continual stream of burghers going home on self-granted leave, so that we never knew from day to day what strength we mustered'. The tide turned for the British with the relief of Kimberley, and the surrender of Cronje and 4,000 Free Staters at Paardeberg. After eleven months, Roberts considered the war over and sailed for home.

At this stage Boer individualism and self-reliance came into its own. Small, semi-independent commandos continued to fight for the next eighteen months, and the task of suppressing them drove the British into a policy whose consequences were to embitter Boer-British relations for decades to come.

At the beginning the British held the towns and the railway lines, which were defended by barbed wire and block-houses at frequent intervals. This was intended to cut the veld into compartments which would be cleared separately. The non-uniformed Boers, on the other hand, could rely on every farmhouse for supplies and information. Despite the protests of Milner, who was entrusted with the task of reconstruction,
Kitchener urged military necessity and applied a scorched-earth policy so indiscriminately that by the end of the war hardly a farmhouse was left standing, while crops were destroyed and stock driven away or slaughtered.

As an eye-witness, Denys Reitz, wrote: ‘We rode over interminable plains devoid of human beings. We did not see a single homestead that was not in ruins, and at some places lay hundreds of sheep clubbed to death or bayoneted by the British troops, in pursuance of their scheme of denuding the country of livestock to starve out the Boers’. Elsewhere he qualifies this by referring to the ‘unfailing humaneness’ of the English soldiers, both officers and men. Contemporary accounts, indeed, abound with instances of chivalrous and comradely acts on both sides—despite the myth that has been built round it, the Boer War was in some aspects the last ‘gentleman’s war’.

The women and children and the farm servants whose homes were thus destroyed were hurriedly concentrated into canvas camps, mainly against their will. These camps were improvised and often badly run. The rations were usually those available for the army, and ideas of hygiene amongst both officials and inmates were rudimentary. The spread of epidemics amongst the Boers had been limited by their isolation. In the camps, typhoid, enteric and even measles fed on proximity, until some 26,000 women and children died. The death rate from fever amongst the British soldiers was heavy too, but the child mortality in some camps would have been sufficient if continued to ensure the extinction of the entire child population. Conditions varied from camp to camp and gradually improved, thanks to the importation of trained Anglo-Indian officials and the efforts of such individuals as Emily Hobhouse.

At the end of the war there were some 120,000 Boers and 80,000 Africans in separate camps, and the death rate was down to reasonable proportions, judged in terms of the normal high Boer infantile mortality rate. At this stage General Louis Botha expressed his thankfulness that so many of the Boers’ families were in British hands, while the ‘bitter-ender’ President Steyn adduced the state of the camps as an argument for continuing the war.
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The concentration camps were nevertheless to become the ultimate indictment against Britain. It is an indictment which persists to this day, in a form which permits national-minded Afrikaners who have experienced neither at first-hand to compare Heilbron and Vredefort with Belsen and Dachau. Ramsay Macdonald was right when he wrote after the war: 'I simply state the facts that hundreds of women fled before our columns for months and months, preferring the hardship of the veldt to the mercy of camps . . . We have to face this fact, which no one who knows the country dare dispute—that the camps were a profound mistake; that families on the veldt or in caves fared better and suffered a lower mortality rate than those in the camps; that the appalling mortality of the camps lies at our door (one of the saddest things I have ever seen in my life was a camp graveyard with its tiny crowded crosses: it looked like a nursery of crosses); that the camps have created a fierce bitterness among the women and the young generation; that when every other memory of the war will have faded away, the nightmare shadows of the camps will still remain'.

By May 1902 the Boer rank and file had had enough, although 21,000 of them were still in the saddle. There was no further hope of a rising in the Cape Colony or of European intervention, but there was hope of a Liberal Government in England. The formerly pacific Free Staters resisted longest, but finally representatives of the two Republics met at Vereeniging and agreed by a vote of 54-6 to sign a peace treaty. The peace party votes were mainly those of the Transvaalers, such as Schalk Burger, Lukas Meyer, Botha and Smuts. They were joined later by Hertzog and de Wet of the Free State. President Steyn, bitterly resentful of the Transvaalers for dragging his Free State into a quarrel which was none of her making, and then expecting her to give up her independence, resigned rather than submit. Some 'bitter-enders' refused to take the oath of allegiance, and either remained abroad or emigrated to non-British

---

³Six thousand men were dead, and 32,000 were in prison camps in the Cape, the Bermudas, St. Helena and Ceylon. On the other side 22,000 men had died, a figure that was to pale into insignificance by 1915.
territories such as Portuguese Angola or the Argentine. In the former case they joined an existing Boer colony which had trekked from the Transvaal in protest against President Burgers’ ‘liberalistic’ régime. Ultimately most of the ‘bitter-enders’ returned in poverty and disillusionment.

The peace terms were generous. Reconstruction went on apace under the unpopular but efficient Milner, and within five years both former Republics were granted responsible governments. Within eight years they and the former colonies of the Cape and Natal had entered a Union which seemed to realize the dreams of those earlier politicians and proconsuls who had dreamed of a wider unity.

Leading the reconstruction were Botha and Smuts, the Boer generals who considered that the British terms and granting of a responsible government had wiped out the ‘century of wrong’. They saw the future in a Boer-British rapprochement, a ‘single stream’ of white South Africans. The intransigent voices of the ‘bitter-enders’ were hushed, or the outcome might have been different. Nevertheless, there was plenty of cause for bitterness—families had been bereaved, farms ruined, schools anglicized, and a whole way of life destroyed. The war had given a great impetus to the growth of the Poor White problem, and for many dispossessed and restless Boers there was little to look forward to but a lifetime of labour as a bywoner or a casual labourer in the English-dominated cities.

An unorthodox and perhaps unwelcome sympathizer of the Boer cause, E. S. Sachs, has written of the Anglo-Boer War and its aftermath: ‘The older generation of South Africans still remembers the Boer War. Many of the new generation are sons and daughters of the Boer warriors. True patriots could have employed the glorious epic of the Afrikaner people and the moral courage, humanity and integrity of many Englishmen in South Africa and in Britain, to inspire a spirit of human greatness and nobility, a spirit of progress and tolerance, but unscrupulous petty politicians of the Nationalist Party perverted this glorious episode in the annals of the Afrikaner people and the human race in order to foist upon South Africa a policy of oppression, racial hatred, bigotry and intolerance’.
Even a cursory reading of modern Nationalist-inspired accounts of South African history confirms this observation. While many survivors of the Anglo-Boer War and the camps have long favoured co-operation and a wider patriotism, the trend amongst those who, by virtue of distance or youth played no direct part in the war, has been increasingly towards a narrow intransigence and a refighting of the Boer War.

An editorial in Die Volksblad in January, 1955, summed up the modern nationalistic version of the war succinctly: "In the Second War of Independence, which was waged on the insistence of Jingoes in South Africa and Britain to "break the back of Afrikanerdom", not only were 4,000 burgers killed in the field but 26,000 women and children were killed in concentration camps, even if indirectly, armed non-Europeans by the thousand were used against white Afrikaners, among other things to chase women and children to camps after their houses were burnt down, the civilizing constructive work of half a century in the Free State and the Transvaal was razed to the ground and the whole nation reduced to beggary. After the Second War of Independence . . . those crushed Afrikaners who had just lost their political independence were obliged to send their surviving children ill-clad and half-fed to schools where they had the privilege of carrying round a placard with the words "I am a dunce" or "I must not speak Dutch" on committing the deadly sin of speaking their own mother tongue."

This quotation is a good example of the simplified and partisan version of history which is all that most Afrikaans-speaking children of today have a chance to learn. In the mouths of national-minded teachers, preachers and politicians, history has become a tool to perpetuate the laager mentality of a minority group embattled forever against British imperialists, missionaries, Kaffirs, Communists, liberals and the world in general.

The highlights of this Nationalist version of Boer history or mythology are the Wars of Independence and the Great Trek, seen as "the story of a people oppressed and misunderstood, fleeing into the wilderness to escape from a tyrannous imperial power." Of this event, as a myth, Professor I. D. MacCrone
The annual celebration of that day (the Day of the Vow or Dingaan's day) at the present time, with its social, racial and religious implications, and its memories of "old, unhappy, far-off things", is an event calculated to reinforce the traditional attitude, not only by exciting emotions directly associated with those past contacts between the two races, but also by bringing into play the whole pattern of related attitudes. In such an atmosphere, group consciousness is raised to a higher and more emotional level, with a corresponding intensification of the exclusive group attitude against the Native as the traditional past enemy as well as the potential future enemy of the group. As an illustration of the power of a historical myth which has become part of the mental pattern and outlook of a group, to determine the attitudes of its individual members, it would be difficult to find a more beautiful example than that of the Great Trek.

Nationalist mythology, in keeping with its highly subjective nature, has also set up a row of villains for general stone-throwing. Most of them have been or will be named in this study. On the British side, they include Lord Charles Somerset, Doctor John Philip, the Reverend John Mackenzie, Shepstone, Chamberlain, Milner, Rhodes, the Randlords and the Reverend Michael Scott. On the Dutch side, there are such alleged 'traitors', 'quislings' and 'collaborators' as Maynier, Stockenstrom, Cloete, Hofmeyr, Botha and Smuts.

Mythology must, however, have its positive side and its heroes in order to move the masses. This was realized by the national-minded in the late 1930's. In 1938, they organized a giant ceremony on a sunny, bleak hill near Pretoria to commemorate the Centenary of the Great Trek. This was attended by 100,000 Afrikaners. Large columns of trek-wagons and

---

1In March, 1953, Dr. Otto du Plessis restated the principal names in this Nationalist Valhalla: 'President Kruger was a symbol of National Independence. President Steyn stood for Nationhood. General de Wet stood for Afrikaner Heroism on the battlefield. General Hertzog was the symbol of Sovereign Independence. Now we have a man (Malan) who stands for more than any of these—for the continued existence of White Civilization and Christianity—not only in South Africa, but throughout the length and breadth of the Continent of Africa.'
riders in Trekker dress converged on Pretoria and Blood River, the scene of Dingaan's final defeat in Natal. The ceremony and the press campaign that led up to it stirred the dormant national ardour of most Afrikaners. It led to the founding of the mass organization called the Ossewa-Brandwag and to the general identification of Afrikanerdom with political Nationalism.

The war caused some setbacks, but Nationalist ardour continued to grow. It was stimulated by the internment or imprisonment of a number of individuals who acquired martyr status by opposing the war effort and the British more actively than did the rank and file. The Nationalist Party, nevertheless, came to power in 1948 on a minority of white votes. Far too many Afrikaans-speaking voters were still not voting with the blood. Further campaigns were necessary to bring these 'loyal Dutch' or 'single-streamers' into the fold and to keep the flame alight amongst the 'ware Afrikaners'.

As in 1938, the cultural associations and churches set about organizing an ostensibly non-political mass rally, lasting four days, to celebrate the opening and dedication of the great £800,000 Voortrekker Monument that had been built over the foundation stone on the hill near Pretoria. This was an even more impressive religio-cultural festival than the 1938 ceremony. It was opened by dispatch riders, who carried lighted torches from all parts of the Union to light the lamp inside the sacred shrine. This struck a somewhat pagan note, the central sarcophagus being so constructed that a shaft of sunlight would fall on it at a certain hour, to illumine the words: 'We are for Thee, South Africa'. More than half of the £500,000 raised by public subscription for the monument is claimed by non-Nationalists to have been subscribed by the English-speaking group, mainly by large business firms. The shortfall of some £500,000 was made up by the Government.

The celebrations were attended by 250,000 people, many of them dressed in Trekker clothes, and sporting beards which had been specially grown for the occasion. They heard Dr. Malan thundering at them: 'Back to your people; back to the highest ideals of your people; back to the pledge which has been entrusted to you for safekeeping; back to the altar of the people on
which you must lay your sacrifice and, if it is demanded of you, also yourself as a sacrifice; back to the sanctity and inviolability of family life; back to the Christian way of life; back to the Christian faith; back to your Church; back to your God.

This particular ceremony could have little appeal to the English-speaking, or indeed to any other section of the population. 1952, however, was the 300th anniversary of the landing of Jan van Riebeeck at the Cape. This was an occasion that might be shared by all South Africans, white or black, English or Afrikaans-speaking. In fact, however, this pageant was early monopolized by the national-minded and was only prevented from becoming an entirely partisan demonstration by the fact that the main ceremonies had to be held in the non-national and liberal atmosphere of Cape Town. As the Rand Daily Mail pointed out, the original Nationalist intention was largely foiled by the common sense of the ordinary South African man-in-the-street; the pageant finally became a cross between a statement of unity, the Festival of Britain and a fun fair. This did not, however, prevent the Van Riebeeck celebrations from being boycotted by the majority of non-whites, for whom English-Afrikaner unity was too limited to have any meaning.

The next two occasions leant themselves much more legitimately to the expression of Afrikaner Nationalist sentiments. They were the Centenary of the Free State in 1954, and the Centenary of Pretoria, celebrated in November, 1955. Pretoria is now a modern city with some industry; it is also the administrative capital of the Union. But it holds preserved within its broad jacaranda-lined streets, like flies in amber, the seat of the Transvaal Volksraad, statues of the Boer heroes in Church Square and elsewhere, and the modest single-storey house on whose step President Kruger received his burgers, and in whose outhouses Mrs. Kruger sold the milk from her dairy cows. Now this house is a mausoleum full of pathetic personal relics, countless photographs of the President and dusty wreaths of immortelles sent to his funeral by European sympathizers.

The popular fervour aroused by such celebrations will be maintained by regular annual ceremonies at the Voortrekker Monument and all over the country, on such days as Dingaan's
Day or the Day of the Vow, which has since the Anglo-Boer War become Afrikanerdom’s greatest religio-cultural festival. This fervour will also be fanned by constant harping on the past, by the unveiling of further monuments, by the wearing of Voortrekker or van Riebeeck dress at such public functions as Government garden parties and so on.

The objective of this positive myth propagation has been to arouse Nationalist ardour amongst the rank and file Afrikaners. If it continues it may ultimately have a similar effect on the Afrikaner who has always held aloof from Nationalism, but has found himself on the margin of the English-speaking world. Still more will such pageantry have an effect on the non-national Afrikaner’s children, who are now compelled to attend Afrikaans-medium, Nationalist-dominated schools. The dynamic of this overtly non-political appeal is likely to be considerable, particularly now that the great single-stream Afrikaner leaders such as Botha and Smuts are gone.

It will be noted that the mythology now being propagated is a Voortrekker mythology. Starting with the wrongs of the frontiersmen, it proceeds via the Trek to the Anglo-Boer Wars, well-nigh ignoring the contribution of the Cape Dutch. Such is the dynamic of this mythology that the Cape Nationalists have accepted it and ignored their own fine history and fine tradition. The mythology has even forced its way into the English-speaking history books, so that today English-speaking South Africans are made to feel slightly ashamed of Britain’s part in the building of the country, and to ignore the part played by their own group in the pacification of the frontier and the opening up of the mines, ports and railways.

A historical myth is undoubtedly essential to a minority group fighting for its survival. Implicit in the Afrikaner Nationalist mythology of today however is an undue preoccupation with the past and an ancestor-worship which do not seem to fulfil Kruger’s last message to his people: ‘Take everything that is good and noble from your past and build thereon your future’.
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