

THE SOUTH AFRICAN  
INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS

services

SOUTH AFRICA

by

- I.—Investigations on all problems arising out of race contacts in Southern Africa.
- II.—Publications giving the results of scientific investigations, accounts of conferences and special articles.
- III.—Information Bureau & Reference Library—free service for research workers, students, speakers and writers, social workers, etc.
- IV.—Secretariat for several scientific societies and welfare bodies.
- V.—Organisation of Joint Councils among the various racial groups in South Africa: European-African; European-Coloured; European-Indian.
- VI.—Social Welfare activities—planning and initiation of schemes, and co-ordination of agencies.
- VII.—Conferences—regional and national—on problems of race relations.
- VIII.—Lectures on race problems and allied topics, and assistance to study groups.

THE INSTITUTE NEEDS—

1. Annual Grants from Public Bodies—£10 or more entitles the granting body to two representatives on the Council (present granting bodies: 33).
2. Donations from Firms and Individuals—Donors of £10 p. a. (or £100 gift) vote for five representatives on the Council (present Donors: 35).
3. Annual Subscriptions from Firms or Individuals—Subscribers of £1, or over, vote for six representatives on the Council (present Subscribers nearly 700).

S. A. Institute of Race Relations,  
P. O. Box 97,  
JOHANNESBURG

DIE SUID-AFRIKAANSE  
INSTITUUT VIR RASSEVERHOUDINGS

dien

SUID-AFRIKA

deur

- I.—Navorsings in verband met rasseverhoudingsvraagstukke.
- II.—Publikasies, waarin resultate van wetenskaplike navorsing, konferensie-verslae, en spesiale artikels gedruk word.
- III.—Inligtingsbureau en Naslaanbiblioteek—kostelose diens vir navorsers, studente, sprekers en skrywers, maatskaplikewerkers, en.
- IV.—Sekretariaat vir verskillende wetenskaplike liggame en versorgingsliggame.
- V.—Organisasie van Gesamentlike Rade, vir die verskillende rasse-groepe in Suid-Afrika—blankes en naturelle; blankes en kleurlinge, blankes en Indiërs.
- VI.—Bedrywighede op gebied van Maatskaplike Welvaart—veral inleweropding van nuwe ondernemings, en die bevordering van die samewerking van welvaartsorganisasies
- VII.—Konferensies—gewestelik en nasionaal—oor rasseverhoudings-probleme.
- VIII.—Lesings oor rasse—en aanverwante vraagstukke en hulp aan studiegroepe.

DIE INSTITUUT HET NODIG—

1. Jaarlike Toelaes van Openbare Liggame—£10 of meer maak 'n liggam geregtig op twee verteenwoordigers op die Raad (Aantalliggame wat op die oomblik toelaes skenk: 33).
2. Donasies van Firms en Individue—Persone wat £10 per jaar (of 'n enkele donasie van £100) skenk, mag stem vir vyf verteenwoordigers op die Raad. (Aantal skenkers op die oomblik: 35).
3. Jaarlike Subskripsies van Firms en Individue—Intekenaars wat £1 of meer betaal, mag vir ses verteenwoordigers op die Raad stem (Aantal intekenaars op die oomblik: oor die 700).

S. A. Instituut vir Rasseverhoudings,  
Posbus 97,  
JOHANNESBURG



# RACE RELATIONS

Official Quarterly Journal of the South African Institute of Race Relations

Vol.V, No.4

PRICE: ONE SHILLING—FREE TO MEMBERS

November 1938

## CONTENTS — INHOUD

Introduction	70
The Historical Setting of the Great Trek. <i>Leo Fouché</i>	71
Professor of History in the University of the Witwatersrand.	
The Voortrekkers and the Natives. <i>J. A. I. Agar-Hamilton</i>	72
Lecturer in History in the University of Pretoria; author of <i>The Native Policy of the Voortrekkers</i> .	
The Trek and its Legacy. <i>A. H. Murray</i>	76
Professor of Ethics and Politics in the University of Cape Town.	
The Trek Tradition and Modern Problems. <i>A. M. Keppel-Jones</i>	79
Lecturer in History in the University of the Witwatersrand.	

## VOORTREKKER CENTENARY NUMBER VOORTREKKER EEUFEES UITGAWE

The Great Trek and its Centenary Celebration in the Light of Group Psychology. <i>I. D. MacCrone</i>	81
Professor of Psychology in the University of the Witwatersrand; author of <i>Race Attitudes in South Africa</i> .	
Future Race Relations in South Africa. <i>Z. K. Matthews</i>	84
Lecturer in Social Anthropology and Native Law in the South African Native College, Fort Hare.	
Race Relations of the Future in the Light of the Past. <i>Edgar H. Brookes</i>	86
Principal of Adams College; Senator representing the Natives of Natal; author of <i>The History of Native Policy in South Africa and Colour Problems of South Africa</i> .	
Race Relations of the Future in the Light of the Past. <i>Rev. J. Reyneke</i>	88
Secretary of the Native Affairs Committee of the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches of South Africa.	

# RASSEVERHOUDINGS

Offisiële Kwartaalblad van die Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut vir Rasseverhoudings

Deel V, No.4

PRYS: EEN SJIELING—GRATIS AAN LEDE

November 1938

## INTRODUCTION

The Voortrekker Centenary celebrations which will culminate, on December 16th, in the laying of the Foundation Stone of the Voortrekker Monument, are for all South Africans the occasion for re-living in imagination the mingled romance and tragedy of the Great Trek, and for thinking out afresh the significance of Voortrekker History, and Voortrekker Tradition for present day South Africa which, in population and problems, has become so different from the South Africa of a hundred years ago.

The South African Institute of Race Relations, having a membership drawn from all races, and dealing with a problem of national importance, wishes to join with all other organizations in doing honour to the memory of the Voortrekkers.

Hence, the present issue of the Institute's quarterly journal, *Race Relations*, has been devoted to articles on the Great Trek and its bearings on race relations, past, present, and future, in our country.

The contributors whose generous co-operation the Institute has been fortunate to secure, include representatives of both the Afrikaans and the English-speaking sections of the White South African population, and one outstanding leader of the Bantu peoples. Each has been left free to treat the topics in which he was invited to write, in the way which he thought best, and through the language medium of his own choice. The aim of the issue was described to the writers as a "twofold one, (1) to seek a better understanding and appreciation of the best qualities of the Voortrekkers and the contributions they have made to our national life; (2) to suggest the lines along which harmonious race relations can be developed in the future with due regard to the best traditions of the Trek". Unfortunately, three or four of those originally invited were already too fully engaged with contributions elsewhere in connection with the Voortrekker celebrations. This has possibly resulted in the absence from the symposium of points of view which would have made it even more fully representative than it is.

Even so, the points of view from which the various contributors have written are sufficiently diverse to illustrate the truth that the Voortrekker tradition has ceased to be the special and exclusive possession of the Afrikaner people. When the Union was founded, "Dingaan's Day" was a day of sacred memory only to the Afrikaners of the north. Now it is a "national" holiday. Voortrekker history and Voortrekker tradition have become an integral part of South African history and South African tradition. No doubt, they will remain in a special sense precious to the Afrikaans-speaking section, but in modern South Africa no "national" tradition belonging to any one section can be a matter of indifference to any other section. In this spirit was the present issue of *Race Relations* planned. In this spirit, we hope, it will be found to have been written.

While two writers have seen the importance of making the best use of the emotional value of the Voortrekker tradition, they have not failed to point a warning finger where they think that tradition may become sterile and enslaving. Nothing would be more disastrous to the soul of the nation than to become covered over with this stale crust of customary thought. Even tradition must change if it is to live, and the more powerful the tradition the more it changes with changing times. The true test of the Voortrekker tradition in the future will be its power to enable the people to meet and overcome changing conditions by changes within themselves. Pathetic grieving for past glories will bring no hope for the future.

In the belief that "the truth shall make you free" and that faith in the past can only be justified through courage for the future, this number of *Race Relations* is offered to the public of South Africa of all races, creeds and colours in respectful remembrance of the best elements in the Great Trek—in which Bantu and Briton, as well as Boer, had some honourable share—and with an earnest plea for a better appreciation of the human possibilities, active and latent, in all sections of our varied population, so that all may contribute in increasing measure to the well-being of the State. Whatever the past may teach, the future rests with us to fashion.

R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ — *President*  
J. D. RHEINALLT JONES — *Adviser*

## THE HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE GREAT TREK

LEO FOUCHE

After the lapse of a century, the Trek appears to us, through the avenue of the years, like a great moving drama, in which all the races in our country were involved. British and Dutch, Bantu, Bushmen and Griquas—even the Portuguese—all had their part to play. To regard the Trek as the affair of one race only is mere perversity.

The story of the great exodus, with its clash of races, its warring ideologies, its slow development towards an inevitable doom, is in the great tradition of Greek drama. It is a tragedy, a mingling of horrors and heroism, a record of high resolve, stark endurance and ultimate frustration—a theme which would have inspired an Aeschylus.

The stage is set on the eastern and north eastern frontiers of the Cape Colony; the latter ravaged by a succession of droughts, the former by the terrible inroads of the Xhosas, which had reduced the Europeans there to ruin and despair. The actors are the frontier farmers, who, like their ancestors for a hundred years, had been struggling incessantly to maintain themselves against wild beasts, and barbarous tribes. In the course of this long struggle they had come to look upon their Native enemies as creatures beyond the pale, heathen savages, who were separated from the Europeans by an impassable barrier—racial, social and religious. The frontier Boers had become acutely group-conscious because they fought for white supremacy. Moreover, their enemies were not merely savages, they were heathens; whereas the Europeans were Christians—and Calvinists at that.

Their hard life required a stern religious code. They were stoics, as Professor Haarhoff has pointed out. Therefore Calvinism, which has been called "baptized stoicism", fitted them like their own skins. They were the elect; the heathen, the children of Ham, were fore-ordained to remain "servants of servants".

Now, suddenly, this fundamental belief was rudely challenged by an alien Government, which seemed determined to place the Native races on an equal footing with the European colonists.

Thus the thread of the drama, the "argument", is the conflict between two hostile and irreconcilable ideals—between equality and the colour bar.

The Trekkers (as Retief's sister, Anna Steenkamp, explains to her children) could not stomach the heathen "being placed on an equal footing with Christians, contrary to the laws of God and the natural

distinction of race and religion; so that it was intolerable for any decent Christian to bow down beneath such a yoke; wherefore we rather withdrew, in order thus to preserve our doctrines in purity".

Thus, in a spirit of distrust and despair, they gird up their loins and trek. They abandon their Native land, to seek a new home, in which white supremacy would be maintained and preserved unchallenged.

And so the curtain goes up and the play begins to unroll before us.

Act I shows the Trekkers taking leave of their homes and kindred. There is real tragedy here. In Act II they are surprised by Mosilikatze's bands; and this new danger forces them to unite and organize. In the next Act they proceed to the fair land of Natal, their Promised Land, although a sinister figure lurks there to threaten their prospects. In Act IV the Zulu ogre strikes—terrible, shattering blows, under which the Trekkers reel. Disaster, massacre and "weeping" are the keynotes of the Scenes.

In the last Act the Trekkers triumph over their cruel enemy. Blood River and the overthrow of Dingaan bring the drama to its close.

For the Trekkers, Blood River was clearly the climax. They believed that peace would now ensue. They were not to know that the tale was not yet told, that fate had further tribulations in store for them. They set up their Republic of Natalia and looked forward to the enjoyment of their hard earned independence in a real "white man's land".

But they had reckoned without the Native. They had no sooner destroyed the Zulu menace, than out of a hundred hidden kloofs and crannies, thousands of Natives—the broken remnants of tribes destroyed by the Zulu tyrants—came running to them, to share the peace and security which the Whites had brought.

The Trekkers could not wash their hands of the Native. They had repudiated him as a brother. They would not be his keeper. Nevertheless, there he was. Something had to be done with him.

So the Trekkers decided to segregate their Natives. They proceeded to do so, and in such vigorous fashion, that soon the British Government intervened and annexed their infant Republic. Thus they lost their cherished independence largely through their Native policy.

A few years after Blood River, the majority of the Trekkers were on the move again; back across the Drakensberg, to seek the Promised Land once more, this time in the far interior.

Some, who had perhaps given up the hope of finding an Eden free of Natives, were content to settle in the Free State. Others—and these were the real die-hards—moved into the great empty spaces north of the Vaal, left invitingly bare by inter-tribal wars. Here, surely, was the Promised Land at last.

But here again they proved their own un-doing. Their mere presence, acting like some irresistible magnet, drew thousands of Natives from every side, to seek protection under their wing. Wherever the Trekkers turned, the Native was in their path.

Did they realize, in the end, that they were trying to escape the inescapable? Apparently: for they settled down in the two Republics, surrounded by Natives.

The Trekkers had quarrelled much among themselves. On one matter only they were always unanimous. They knew what they wanted to do with the Native. Since he could not be cast off, he would be kraaled off, segregated—racially, politically and socially. Both Republican constitutions laid down this principle in the most definite terms. Article 9 of the Transvaal Grondwet reads: "The people will permit no equality between coloured and white inhabitants, either in Church or State."

The colour bar was to stand guard eternally between Black and White.

The Trekkers' policy towards the Natives was the expression of their fears. They were a mere handful, surrounded by a sea of savages, against whom they could barely hold their own. Their fear complex was

"eminently understandable", and could be justified on the plea of self-preservation.

\* \* \*

That was a hundred years ago. In the interval, Native conditions have changed out of all recognition, while, at the same time, the Europeans have been experimenting continuously, trying out various policies and systems on the Native.

It is therefore very strange indeed, that (to judge by our latest experiment—the Native Acts of 1936), we seem to have been moving in a vicious circle, back to the Trekkers. For these Acts are the complete embodiment of the Trekker policy.

Such is the *ludibria rerum mortalium*.

Moreover, we have adopted the Trekker policy, without the Trekkers' excuse for it. We do not fear the Native to-day like the Trekkers did in their day. Yet we have adopted their Policy of Fear.

When we seek for an explanation of this strange retrogression, psychologists tell us that we, too, are obsessed by an over-mastering fear of the Native; but this fear is a secret, hidden fear of the spirit, which many are ashamed to admit. If the psychologists are right, it seems a great pity that we cannot let them psycho-analyse the Europeans in South Africa—the whole two million of us!

If that could be done, it might then well appear that this fear is entirely without logical substance, a mere spook of our own imagining. We might discover that, like Frankenstein in the story, we are hag-ridden by a monster of our own invention.

Perhaps we shall wake up some day, to find ourselves casting off that foolish fear, as we would cast off the baseless fabric of a nightmare!

That will be a happy day for all of us, Black and White alike; for when panic ceases, sanity returns.

## THE VOORTREKKER AND THE NATIVES

J. A. I. AGAR-HAMILTON

The Great Trek was less of a single movement than an era, and it is by no means clear when that era began, or where we are to fix its close. There was neither single leader nor uniform plan, and the inhabitants of the Eastern Province whence it emerged were a community so various that it might not be difficult to find individuals to justify the diverse judgements of Barrow, Lichtenstein and de Mist, or resemble the sturdy, God-fearing Covenanters who figure in Theal. The historian of the Trek must guard with more than

usual care against the danger of the easy generalization, but none the less he may distinguish three phases in what may be called the Native policy of the Voortrekkers, corresponding to their life in the Colony before setting out, their conduct upon their long journey, and thirdly, their changed circumstances after they had established themselves in their new homes.

In the Colony the attitude of the frontiersman to the officials at Cape Town was conditioned by one

thing—their management of Native affairs. Here, it would seem, historians have been less than just to the administration. The British governors were the first to introduce a considered policy and to support it with considerable military force. The failure of that policy, with its principles of the annexation of Native land, military patrols, and organized reprisals, was due, partly to the shortsighted militarism of the officials, which Philip and Stockenström condemned, but principally to its strategic impossibility. As Professor Walker has put it, to protect the scattered Europeans of the eastern frontier would need "all the King's horses, and all the King's men".

But it would be a mistake to lay undue stress on the military side of Native policy as a cause of unrest. Stockenström pointed out that "the country beyond the boundary had been swarming with emigrants for years", and the leaders took their fateful decision to trek before the outbreak of the Sixth Kaffir War. Contemporary accounts and explanations tend to throw the emphasis upon more concrete grievances, arising out of the settlement of those problems which the British administrators had inherited from their predecessors—the question of the status of the Hottentots and of the slaves.

There is no need to argue rights and wrongs—the slave-owners of Jamaica resented abolition just as much as those of the Cape, and expressed themselves most forcibly upon the subject. The farmers at the Cape would have been more than human if they had failed to protest when the Government tampered with the problem which plagues every farmer throughout the world—his labour supply. Here we approach the crux of the dispute. Financial losses bulk large in these early manifestos, but they may prove misleading. It was not so much an objection to specific acts which moved the farmers of the eastern frontier, as a deep-rooted distrust of the ideas at the back of the Administration's policy.

The rulers of Britain in the earlier years of the nineteenth century can scarcely be called democratic—the "revolutionary" Reform Bill which was the utmost limit of concession in 1832 would be impossibly reactionary to-day—but they had accepted as part of their constitutional heritage the principle of the equality of all men before the law. The question of who should make and administer that law was another matter. It is important also to notice that in early Nineteenth Century England there was no question of social equality either. In dealing with the problems of colonial administration the same policy of subordinating all citizens equally to the law was applied, and it forms the sole unifying principle behind the rather disjointed

Cape Colony legislation in respect of Hottentots, vagrancy, and slaves.

Practical grievances were capable of settlement, or might have been forgotten in course of time: it was precisely this theory of equality which aroused the irreconcilable opposition of the frontier farmer. To many people of that day political equality must have been easily confused with racial miscegenation. There is evidence that rumours were spread abroad through the frontier districts that the Government sought to encourage, or perhaps even compel, the intermarriage of whites and blacks. But even without this red herring the theory of legal equality was hotly contested, and the traditional "proof texts" which are taken to illustrate the causes of the Trek will do well enough here. Anna Steenkamp's "it is not so much their freedom... as their being placed on an equal footing with Christians contrary to the laws of God, and the natural distinctions of race and religion" merely amplifies Boshoff's objection "that the blacks are encouraged to consider themselves upon an equal footing with the whites in their religious exercises in Church", while the Transvaal Constitution of 1853 sought to close the whole matter by stating the principle: "the people desire to permit no equality between coloured people and the white inhabitants either in Church or State."

Against the doctrine of legal equality the frontiersman set a theory of differentiation and racial subordination, and his opinion was not necessarily prejudiced or arbitrary. The intellectual of the twentieth century has been brought up in an atmosphere of scientific evolution, and is taught to view history as a wide panorama in which races as well as empires rise and fall. The farmer's training had placed him in a static universe populated, by a single Act of Creation, with certain immutable types. White and black differed in characteristics which, it seemed, were not matters of degree but of kind. White was white, and black was black, and each would remain in its inviolable category until the end of time. The whites were demonstrably the favoured race, the coloured folk equally obviously destined to be their servants.

In such circumstances, to regard the coloured man as capable of citizenship, or to negotiate with the tribes beyond the boundary as if they could appreciate the motives and conduct of the whites, was not only flying in the face of Providence, but a wilful denial of cold and obvious scientific fact.

In the frontier farmer's estimate of the Cape Administration must have been a large element of that hopeless exasperation which we feel in the face of crass and invincible stupidity. A sensible man could not

continue to live under these conditions, and the remedy was to migrate, establishing a new community whose leaders would have some contact with political reality. To the Trekker this decision must have seemed the obvious rejoinder delivered to doctrinaire enthusiasm by common sense.

As soon as they set out on their journey the emigrant farmers found themselves in contact with organized communities of Natives, whom they now met on a new footing. The second phase in the evolution of their Native policy had begun. In these new circumstances their previous experience must naturally serve as guide. Long journeys into the interior were no new thing in the life of a frontiersman, and individuals had wandered over a good deal of the plains which now form part of Bechuanaland and the western Transvaal, visiting Native villages, and spending some months on the way. Families and small groups of emigrants had been living beyond the northern border of the Colony for some years.

When the farmer came to trek he needed only apply this experience to new conditions. When he thought of the future he must have pictured himself as settling and running up a house beside a convenient spring, in country which promised grazing for his herds, and paying a courtesy call on his Native neighbour to establish good relations. White and black would then keep themselves to themselves in dignified but not unfriendly reserve. This is exactly the picture conveyed by one of the paragraphs in Retief's famous manifesto which Theal chose to omit:<sup>1</sup>

"We purpose, in the course of our journey, and on arriving in the country in which we shall permanently reside, to make known to the Native tribes our intentions, and our desire to live in peace and friendly intercourse with them."

It sums up pretty well what we know of the relations of Louis Trichardt with the tribes with which he came in contact. The practice survived the Trek itself. Even after the establishment of the Republics, farmers would settle beyond the recognized limits of the white community, "notify" the neighbouring chief, and obtain some sort of title from him, in return for an annual payment. Many instances of this sort occur along the lower reaches of the Vaal, and conflicting title deeds served to complicate the task of Colonel Mosey in straightening out the land problems of the Keate Award Area.

It was all rather experimental and haphazard, but the one point of principle which emerges from an

examination of the early days of the Trek is that the leaders made no attempt to subordinate the Native tribes. Moroko, Dingaan, and Sekwati, in turn were treated as independent. A strict political segregation in which Native and European communities should remain distinct and mutually independent, unexpressed, but none the less fundamental, forms the basis of all negotiations.

But the Trekkers were moving in numbers which were without precedent, and their former experience needed modification. It was no longer sufficient to "make known" to the chiefs the arrival of a party of Europeans: they needed security of tenure, a title on which they could base a State, something in fact which was more like a formal treaty *inter gentes*. Potgieter's early negotiations with the Griquas and with Makwana were probably of the informal type, and as late as 1845 he seems to have been content with a verbal bargain with the Pedi Chief Sekwati, but the more methodical Retief felt the need of a formal cession of the Natal territory from Dingaan. In this he may have been influenced by the need of some document to set up against the written cessions made by the Zulus to individuals connected with the settlement at Port Natal, but he set an example which was followed elsewhere, as when the Republic of Andries Ohrigstad sought a written bargain with the Swazi people.

It is worthy of note that the Retief Treaty does not really provide for any "consideration" to be rendered in return for the cession of the land south of the Tugela. Dingaan certainly stipulated for the return of the stolen cattle, but this was nominally a challenge to Retief to prove his *bona fides*, and in fact was probably intended to involve him in a war with Sikonyela. The Treaty amounted to little more than a formal recognition by the Chief of the fact that the white men had arrived and intended to settle in his neighbourhood.

But it was clear that the tribes could not be expected to part with large areas of territory without some return, and there are several instances of the "purchase" of land. The Republic of Andries Ohrigstad, for instance, paid one hundred head of cattle, fifty down, and the balance within two years, to the Swazis. A large slice of the southern Free State seems to have been the subject of a bargain which involved seventy sheep and a riding horse.

The emigrant farmers believed that after completing these documents they were legally "seised" of the territory therein mentioned to the exclusion of the rights of any previous inhabitant, but this was probably

not the view of the other parties to the transaction. A Native custom known as "loba" provides for the grant of permission to a stranger to graze his cattle in the area claimed by a tribe and to cultivate land, on payment of a beast to the Chief in recognition of its rights. It seems most probable that Native peoples, to whom the sale and transfer of land was a thing unknown, believed that they were entering into a transaction of this kind. In that case they regarded the treaty, which to the whites was an alienation of land, as a solemn recognition of their own prior rights. Compared with the large areas which are mentioned in these documents the remarkably small purchase prices paid are significant.

The next stage in the history of Trekker Native policy begins with the establishment of the communities which later coalesced and developed into the Republics. It is important to notice that the original settlements were strictly limited in area—that of Potchefstroom for instance was bounded by the Schoonspruit—but as soon as the farmer had established himself upon the land the age-old process of expansion began once more. The system of landholding which developed in the Republics was significant. A farmer, venturing forth on a hunting trip or a simple journey of exploration, would be attracted by the appearance of a piece of land lying some distance off. He would note the principal geographical features, give it a name, and register his prior claim with the landdrost, receiving from him an *uittreksel*, or extract from the official register, setting out the significant details.

Now an *uittreksel* was an article of commerce, and might pass from hand to hand for a nominal price, among people who quite possibly had no idea of the site mentioned in it. When the Volksraad felt that new land should be thrown open to settlement, it advertised the appointment of an Inspection Commission, which met on a specified day, examined and adjudicated upon the various claims submitted, and proceeded to measure and beacon off the farms. Only then were titles issued and taxes payable.

In most cases no occupation had taken place, and the land might actually be inhabited by Natives, but the latter would be regarded as "squatters", and might be ejected at the will of the European "landowner". Thus there was a perpetual tendency for the limits of European settlement to go on expanding, comparatively peacefully no doubt, but at the expense of the tribes.

It is significant that at least three of the frontiers between white and black raised important political issues. There is the thorny matter of the Basuto boundary, where the considerations outlined above would tend to confirm Dr. de Kiewiet's sceptical hand-

ling of Theal's story of wholesale Basuto infiltration. Anyone who has attempted a careful study of the Griqua-Free State boundary knows that it was a mass of interlocking and conflicting jurisdictions, while the extension of the western limits of the Transvaal settlement can be traced from the Schoonspruit to the Maquassi, from Maquassi to the Harts River, and thence to the limits of Stellaland on the very edge of the Kalahari.

One of the difficulties of the situation was that the Natives as agriculturalists occupied a compact village with immediately adjacent fields, but as pastoralists distributed their herds at a number of cattle posts over a wide area of the surrounding country. The expansion of Europeans into this area would pass almost unnoticed at first, then a few outlying posts might be drawn in, as the herdboys found their watering places occupied by newcomers. At length the day would come, probably during a season of drought, when the tribe would find itself without sufficient water for its cattle. So long as there was room to spare the Natives fell back, into the drier and less favourable country, but the time came in the next generation when they could retreat no farther, and were obliged to fight.

A typical instance is to be found in the history of the Barolong, who settled at Schoonspruit after the defeat of the Matabele, found themselves being hemmed in by white farmers, and moved to the headwaters of the Molopo. From thence they were pushed farther back, losing the great springs at Grootfontein and Lotlilakana, until to-day their lands are no more than a narrow strip along the reaches of the Molopo below Mafeking.

To sum up then: the dominating characteristic of the Trekker was his belief in the differentiation between black and white, based on a scientific theory of immutable types. This belief showed itself during the Trek in an attempt to establish a species of segregation in which the two races were to exist side by side in mutually independent communities. The treaties which were made with Native tribes sometimes mentioned a small purchase price, but in practice were intended rather as a formal recognition of the presence of the whites made by the former inhabitants. The European communities, however, began to expand, and their increasing numbers led to a pushing back of the tribes.

Such was the typical Voortrekker Native policy, but it would not be accurate to suggest that it remained for long unchallenged. A desire to subjugate the tribes and annex their territory is to be found soon after the settlement of the interior, and after the Sand River

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Nathan's "The Voortrekkers of South Africa", p. 18.

agreement of 1852 it became the recognized policy of the northern Republic. The Orange Free State on the other hand always showed a disinclination for Native subjects. The Sand River agreement was followed by an attack on the Bakwena of Sethšele, and intermittent pressure on the Bathlaping and the Barolong, but while Scholtz's commando harried Koloheng, Andries

Pretorius lay sick at home, and soon both he and his old rival Hendrik Potgieter had passed away. The new leaders aimed at the domination of the interior, and set out to cut the communications of Cape Colony hunters and traders with the north. But this was the work of the younger generation whose history belongs rather to that of the South African Republic.

## THE TREK AND ITS LEGACY

A. H. MURRAY

The after-effect which an historic event has on the actions and outlook of succeeding generations is an illusory quality which, like the black cat in the dark room of metaphysics, is felt to be there but is exceedingly difficult to grasp. The Great Trek has rightly been called "the central event in South Africa's history". It is an event, but it is also more than an event; it is the embodiment of an outlook on life and on things which became real and self-conscious in the course of the event and which has still a great influence on the national life of the country to-day. For the Trek was the outcome of convictions and reasons—however rationalized these may have been—and not of opportunism nor of individual lust for adventure. The influences which the Cape frontiersmen brought to the northern hinterland were not the passing contact of the explorer nor the doubtful civilization of the trader. The Voortrekkers brought with them a settled outlook on life, experience in selfgovernment, and a morality, the sternness of which was justified by the conditions of the times. Our appreciation of the effect of the Trek on the national life of to-day—the topic of this paper—will depend largely on our judgement of the characters of the men and women who played on this epic stage, and of their philosophy of life.

There are many interpretations of the Trek. On the one extreme there is the romantic view which presents the Trek as a glamorous adventure of hunting and shooting and killing, and which misses what can justifiably be called the "philosophic background" of the Trek; for it was nothing if not a motivated movement. Then there is the "class-struggle" interpretation of the Trek which may bring us a little nearer to the real situation but which interprets local conditions in terms of overseas conceptions and developments, and which, like all over-simplified interpretations, is one-sided and inadequate. On a different level is the

scientific and interesting psychological approach of Professor J. D. MacCrone in his work *Race Attitudes in South Africa*. This author has not only developed a method of studying the problems of race relations which holds great possibilities but has also prefaced his statistical studies with a psychological-historical analysis of the people of the eighteenth century which is illuminating as taking us beyond the usual "account of events" type of history. In his analysis Professor MacCrone stresses the development of group consciousness and of religion as two important factors which go to influence the racial outlook of the time immediately preceding and leading up to the Trek. Unfortunately he somewhat over-emphasizes the "caste" nature of the group; and in his description of Calvinism he lays all his emphasis on the negative aspect of it and does not make sufficient mention of the very clear philanthropic tendencies which were present even among those stern people (such as, for example, the custom of letting the servants attend *huisgodsdienst*, and in the Western Province the local movement towards the liberation of the slaves). Fourthly and finally we may mention the "escape-theory" or the "land-hunger" theory described by Professor Eric Walker. This view is a help towards a better understanding of the Trek. Yet something more would seem to be required for a full appreciation of the Trek and its after-effects. An economic interpretation of an event goes so far and no further, while in the Trek the men themselves, their outlook on life and the expression of this outlook in their institutions, social, political and religious, are what matter. For, it is in these things that the Great Trek lives on in the South Africa of to-day. To understand the Great Trek it is necessary to take it at its face value to a large extent; from this standpoint the opening passages of the manifesto which Retief published at Grahamstown in 1837 are revealing:

"... and since we wish to keep the high regard of our brothers, and do not wish that they and the world should consider us capable of breaking the holy bonds which bind the Christian to the land of his birth without having the fullest justification for such an act, we find it necessary to give the accompanying short statement of the causes which have led us to take this step, and of our intentions regarding our behaviour towards the native tribes with which we will come into contact across the frontier...."

Whatever may have happened in individual cases, the Great Trek was a reasoned movement carried out by men of sturdy and upright character with a settled outlook on life, and accustomed to an established way of living.

The philosophy and the personal characteristics which are associated with the Voortrekkers were already formed by the eighteen-thirties when the Trek started. Indeed, from the ideological point of view the eighteenth century is more important in South African history than the nineteenth, for while the latter was full of incident and event, the mentality and character which shaped these events took form and substance in the eighteenth century. And the eighteenth century ideology would have gone north, Great Trek or not, for we have recently learnt to distinguish in South African history between the Voortrekkers and the *trekboere* who were slowly moving ever inland with their families and their flocks. The *trekboere* were in their outlook one with the Voortrekkers, "the brave, patient, industrious, orderly, and religious people" of Sir Benjamin D'Urban, a people fond of family and home, stern and sturdy, with a racial policy of separation and the paternalistic dominance of the white race. The Great Trek merely forced this ideology into expression and clear formulation.

The men who led the Trek—Piet Retief, Andries Pretorius, Sarel Cilliers and the others—were representative of the new outlook which was being created in the hinterland of the Cape Colony where the community was being faced with new and unprecedented situations. To understand the after-effects of the Great Trek on the national life of to-day it is necessary to appreciate the characters of these men and their policy—and more particularly their policy in connection with the Native races in South Africa. Before leaving the Colony Piet Retief, in some ways the greatest and certainly the most tragic figure of the Trek, had written:

"Wherever we may go the principles of true liberty will be respected... we will draw up proper laws for our future guidance."

In his *Instruction to Commandants* of Friday, the 21st

of February, 1837, he writes in articles nine and ten: "The commandants and field-cornets will take all possible care that no servant, of whatever class or colour, shall be in any way maltreated; and it will be his duty immediately to report guilty parties, irrespective of persons, in order that they may be punished in accordance with the law.... The commandant will also take precautions so that nobody shall by force take possession of the children of Bushmen or of other native tribes, that nobody shall catch them by any unlawful means, nor shall take them away from their parents or families, nor shall keep them in their possession. Guilty persons shall pay a fine of not more than 100 rixdaalders and not less than 50 rixdaalders. Further it will not be permitted to any person to violate any tribe or race which is encountered on the journey in any way."

It is a pity that the Great Trek and its people are not better known by direct acquaintance with the original documents which have been made available; enthusiastic interpretations and explanations of it have only too often obscured the finer points of character and outlook of the period. There is much to be said for a *prima facie* or first view account of this significant event.

Before Retief's untimely death in 1838—on November 18th, 1837—he wrote to Dingaan:

"You may believe what your missionaries tell you about God and his government over the world. And I must advise you, in connection with these things, to speak often with these reverend men who wish to teach you God's word; for they can tell you with how great a power God has ever ruled earthly kings, and still rules them. I can assure you that it is a good thing that you have allowed teachers to stay in your land. And I can assure you that they have come to you, because God gave it in their breasts; and they will prove to you out of the Bible that what I say is true. As friend I must tell you the solemn truth, that all—he they black or white—who do not wish to listen to God's word, will not be happy...."

In a letter dated the 9th of September Retief, writes to Stockenstrom as follows about the missionary, Archbell:

"The reverend Archbell deserves the highest praise for the nature of the institution which he has created among these natives, and it is to be hoped that all who profess to guide and educate the native will take him as example and will try to guide them along the same paths of piety, industry and justice."

<sup>1</sup> The original appeared in English. The following is a re-translation out of the Afrikaans, as is also the case with some of the passages quoted further. Italics are mine.

Retief's attitude towards mission-work—of the right kind—is continued in the policy of the short-lived republic of Natal. On the 7th of September, 1839, the *Volksraad* at Pietermaritzburg decided to grant Dr. Adams a piece of land for which he had asked as a station for the propagation of the gospel. On the 8th of June the minutes of the *Volksraad* record the decision to grant the Reverend Lindley permission to go on a journey to Panda for missionary work, and further that "for purposes of propagating the gospel all ministers would be protected by the republic (de Zuid-Afrikaansche Maatschappij)." Two months later—August 8th, 1840—the American missionaries Adams, Lindley and Krout (Grout) appeared before the *Volksraad* on the motion of the president, to ask permission to visit Umpanda and if they found conditions suitable to found an institution there; to which the *Raad* agreed. Passages such as these, scattered through the trek-literature, are important if we of today are to appreciate the bearing of the hard-won experience of those times on the racial situation of the present.

One more quotation from a Voortrekker document—a passage of particular interest in this year of the centenary celebrations of the Battle of Blood River—may be allowed us by way of conclusion of our brief glimpse into the character of these sturdy men and their outlook on life. In his *Joernaal* Sarel Cilliers gives the following account of the events leading up to the 16th December, 1838:

"Mr. Andries Pretorius was our chosen general, on this commando he spoke with me and I with him about the promise the holy people of the Bible had made, that we also must make the Lord a promise if he would give us Victory over our enemy that 'we would keep that day as a Sabbath every year'. We talked to Cobus Uys and it was also his wish to do this, and also the Fieldcornets, then we came to the decision that we would make a solemn oath to the Lord, our God, if the Lord will go with us and would give our Enemy into our hands, that we that day in every year would 'consecrate' and pass it as a Sabirith-day, from there we went to Dansekraal, there it was decided that it must be done then and it was felt that I should do it in the name of all these. And the order of the General was, that not one man should be absent when it happened. It was on the seventh day of the month of December, 1838, I acted in my weakness according to the wishes of the officers, also I knew that the greater part of the Burgers was for it, I climbed on to a canon-wagon, and the 407 men were

crowded round me I did simply as solemnly as the Lord enabled me to do it, to the best of my memory in the following word:

My Brothers and Fellow-countrymen, here we stand at this Moment before a Holy God of Heaven and Earth, to make a promise to Him if He will be with us with his protection and will give our enemies into our hands that we may overcome them, that we that day and date will observe every year as an annual commemoration and a day of thanksgiving, as a Sabbath to His Glory, and that we will tell this also to our children that they must also share in it, also for the rising generation, and if there is any one here who has difficulties he must remove himself from this place. For the honour of His name will thereby be glorified, that the praise and honour may be given to Him.

I also said further that we must pray together which will be sent to the throne of His Grace, and I held my hands to heaven in the name of all of us present. Further every evening, and on the next Sabbath, we have confirmed this in our prayers and every evening there were evening prayers at three places, the Lord was with us till the fifteenth, we formed *laager* at Blood River which got the name after this battle, a patrol was out which sent report that they had seen the commando of Dingaan . . ."

(a) The first effect of the Trek was to foster a clear consciousness of racial unity and identity among the Afrikaans-speaking section of the community. A sufficient store of common experience had been won to make a group-consciousness possible and the frontier problems were calculated to bring this to the fore. It augured well for the future of race relations in this country that at the time of the development of this group-consciousness there was no friction between English and Dutch-speaking elements. Dutch opposition was to policy, not to people.

(b) In this consciousness of unity there is an earnest conviction of the place of religion in the life of the community. Under difficult circumstances religious feelings have occasionally developed into bitterness and schism; but religion has remained a powerful force in the life of the descendants of the Voortrekkers and it is the most powerful influence in the country making for harmonious relations between European and Non-European.

(c) As regards the Native races the Trek has passed on a tradition of paternalism and paternal responsibility. The traditional paternalism has not

always adapted itself to new situations under the stress of internal construction, and it will always be open to the temptation of economic exploitation in a difficult world. But the tradition brought to the north by Piet Retief and Sarel Cilliers has been in effect continued. Educative and mission work among the Native and Coloured people have remained important elements in the activities of the community, the Dutch Reformed Church, and philanthropic societies. Statistics of the money spent by the D.R. Churches of the Cape, the Orange Free State and the Transvaal are indicative of an attitude of mind which is too often not appreciated. In 1934-1935 the Cape D.R. Church spent £66,616 on its mission work, that is, on work among Natives and Coloured people, both at home and in its foreign fields. Not counting an odd five thousand pounds which is the income on invested capital this sum works out to an average of six shillings and two-pence half-penny per member of the church for missions alone. The Free State Church spent on an average over the three years 1934, 1935, and 1936 the sum of £24,865 annually on its home and foreign missions, and the Transvaal Church an annual average of £16,728 over the same period. In the Cape Church the amount for missions rose from £41,000 in 1925 to £66,616 in 1936. The average total spent by the three Churches on mission work during 1936 amounts to £108,209 17s. 10d. (Unfortunately I could not obtain the data for Natal; that church also supports mission work, in Zululand and elsewhere.) These sums do not include money spent by the Church on its Poor White Relief, its various training centres, its student ministers, and the other branches of its extensive social work.

The spirit of the people of the Trek also indicates the approach to harmonious racial co-operation in our day. That spirit will be found scattered through the documents of the Trek.

"We are decided," wrote Retief in his manifesto published in the *Grahamstown Journal*,

"wherever we may go, to hold high the principle of real freedom; but, while all due care will be taken so that no one will live in a state of slavery, we are firmly decided to make proper laws for the suppression of crime, and to keep the proper relation between master and servant."

And to the Cape authorities he writes,

"that we soon hope to convince the world by our behaviour and deeds that it is not and never was our purpose, to molest unlawfully any of the native tribes; but that we held in high esteem peace and goodwill towards all men."

The racial situation in South Africa will for many generations offer opportunity for economic exploitation. Nor will it ever be possible to develop a constitutional system which will automatically safeguard the Coloured races from prejudicial differential treatment. But the tradition of the Trek was neither one of opportunism nor of exploitation; the Trek was a motivated event with a far-seeing and statesmanlike racial policy, and a deep sense of moral responsibility. It is this tradition, woven out of the experience of the land itself, which must be our inspiration and our guide. To develop harmonious race relations in South Africa will ever be a matter of the personal will to be just and do good, in the spirit of the great leaders of the Trek.

## THE TREK TRADITION AND MODERN PROBLEMS

A. M. KEPPEL-JONES

When Mr. Bernard Shaw, a few years ago, paid a visit to Russia, he expressed horror at the Russian custom of glorifying the Revolution and the deeds of Revolutionary heroes. For, as he pointed out, if young Russians are encouraged to admire Revolution, they will have no course but to satisfy their urge by overthrowing the Communist régime. The proper tone for Soviet propaganda is therefore one of staid conservatism, reverence for existing institutions, sentimental attachment to the (immediate) past.

It would be well for us to look at the Great Trek from this point of view. We trekked a hundred years ago. What was best in the ideals of those Trekkers would

be frustrated if we were to encourage trekking now. "Trekking absolutely prohibited" should be our watchword for the twentieth century. For what did the Trek amount to? It amounted to a confession of failure—failure of the Trekkers to accommodate themselves to the new conditions of the Colony, failure of the Government to make itself acceptable to its discontented subjects. It was a divorce. Unity had become impossible.

Divorces are sometimes necessary, but they cannot be regarded as a normal part of family life. When the conditions of a State become intolerable to some of its citizens, they cannot retain their freedom without either promoting a revolution or as the Trekkers did, emigrat-

ing. What we admire in the Trekkers is that they faced every danger rather than lose their political freedom. But we should be filled with much greater admiration for a society which was capable of retaining its unity while making possible the co-operation within it of people with different opinions.

Since differences of opinion are inevitable in every State, the most successful and fortunate State is that which commands the loyalty of all its members even when many of them hold views extremely different from those of the people in power. That sort of State gets somewhere, it makes its mark in the world. But the State whose minorities express their feelings by packing up their possessions and going off in search of a better Government is destined to destruction.

This problem is a very real one in South Africa. When British imperialism held sway in the country, it was the Afrikaner that trekked. Now it is the English-speaking people. Every month's migration statistics reveal a great Trek to Rhodesia, to Kenya, even to the other Dominions. Though no Retief leaves his motives on record, an intimate acquaintance with some of the people who do this shows that political grievances are at least an important factor in their minds. "Here we live under a bad Government, so let's go somewhere else." In normal times this migration is scarcely large enough to have important effects on South Africa. But a first-class political crisis might easily enlarge the stream to a flood.

There is also in full swing a Trek that is not geographical in nature. When an organization of any kind adopts a policy, there is a tendency for all in disagreement with the policy to abandon the organization and form another one. We are familiar with this tendency in the spheres of student and trade union organization. It is a feature of the Trekking movement that has survived to our own day. But it is of very evil augury for the future of South Africa. We shall never be able to feel confidence in the future of the country until we see people of different races and of different opinions sharing the same organizations, and determined to thrash out their differences on the understanding that the minority, whoever may be in it, will abide loyally by the decision arrived at.

This is, however, a counsel of perfection. The reasons which moved the ancient and the modern Trekkers were no doubt adequate ones. They felt that a point had come when their attachment to their country had to be sacrificed to their principles. How many of us to-day would say that there could be no circumstances under which we should feel forced to abandon our allegiance? If, then, the unity and

strength of South Africa are to be established on a secure basis, there must be created, above and beyond the platforms that are the stock-in-trade of politicians, a common political tradition that will mean more to every section of our people than the matters on which we differ in the course of political strife. If we had that, a crisis would always find our country completely united, with all differences temporarily in abeyance; as things are, a crisis is too likely to divide us more than ever.

It should be plain enough that to ask for this is to go directly counter to the tradition of the Trek. It is equally plain that the task of South Africa now is to create conditions in which the freedom of one section of the people will not be incompatible with the freedom of the others. Therefore freedom, the Trekkers' ideal, is now to be pursued by abandoning the essential principle of the Trek and following, instead, the lead of those of both races who tried to secure harmony between, the Trekkers and those from whom they trekked.

It is appropriate that a journal of this nature should take up the question of Trekker ideals at the present time.

One of the most conspicuous points of difference between the Trekkers and the colonial government was Native policy. The Trekkers wanted "no equality between black and white in church or state". It is precisely for the same reason that the National Union of South African Students was disrupted in our own day. In this respect the Trekker ideal is obviously in sharp conflict with the ideal of an increasing number of South Africans of our generation. More than anything else, this difference threatens our national unity, because more than any other it affects the most deeply thinking and passionately feeling sections on both sides.

This, therefore, is the right place to point out some things that deserve the consideration of people who desire national unity. Those who are devoted to the memory of the Trekkers ought to be prepared to sacrifice some outward and circumstantial parts of the Trekker tradition for the sake of what was more fundamental in it. In the days of the Trek, Native policy was in many respects Foreign policy. The problem was one of dealing with hostile forces beyond the frontiers. Even in the Trekker States the European and the Native populations were two separate entities, each of which could conceivably have existed without the other. The arrival of industrial civilization has upset that. The problems arising from the relationship between black and white are now in many ways the

same as those existing in other industrial but racially homogeneous countries.

The Trekkers aimed at preserving the security of the European race and civilization. Those who now favour a conciliatory Native policy contend that precisely that security will be sacrificed if racial animosities are allowed to continue in South Africa. Security for the white race and freedom for other races are therefore not merely compatible but actually interdependent. This is what the followers of the Trekker tradition ought to think about.

On the other hand it is necessary to view with sympathy the aspiration of the white community in Africa for a permanent existence. It wishes to avoid

## THE GREAT TREK AND ITS CENTENARY CELEBRATION IN THE LIGHT OF GROUP PSYCHOLOGY

I. D. MACCRONE

The fervent enthusiasm there is being displayed on all sides at the present time, but more especially by the Afrikaans-speaking section of the European population, in celebrating the centenary of the Great Trek, cannot but make a profound impression on any observer of group behaviour, however detached and objective he may try to be in the interests of his own particular study. Like any other example of group behaviour, including that which gave rise to the Great Trek, this commemorative behaviour is undoubtedly the result of a great variety of factors, that are never quite the same in any two individuals. Hence, any attempt to reduce it to some simple formula or to explain it in terms of some single factor, is as little likely to succeed as in the case of that group behaviour which was the Great Trek itself.

Apart, however, from this purely formal resemblance between the Great Trek and its centenary celebration it seems clear that there may be a much more intimate relationship between the two cases when they are regarded from the point of view of group psychology. They are both of them, after all, 'moments' in the life of one and the same group, when it would appear that all those obscure forces that operate within the individual as a member of a particular group, find their most intense and energetic expression. History, as we know, never repeats itself, and there is a world of difference between the circumstances of 1838 and those of 1938. But, if we can succeed in overcoming the irrelevancies of time and place, we may yet discover the same psychological forces at work behind the Great Trek

being swamped either biologically or politically. The followers of the liberal tradition ought to offer safeguards in these directions, especially by devising political institutions in which the equal co-operation of racial groups is substituted for the power of numerical majorities.

If both sides could make these necessary concessions, there would develop a common attachment to our political institutions and tradition, as strong as the attachment to our common soil and landscape. That would provide a basis for some real nation-building. If not, I am afraid there will be a Greater Trek some day—in ships, not wagons, and too precipitate to be a matter of pride.

and its celebration one hundred years later. At any rate, it is an hypothesis for which there appears to be some *a priori* justification, and one that might well be commended to all those historians of the Great Trek who fail to see the wood for the individual trees. Where the parallel between the two group phenomena is as intimate as our hypothesis assumes it to be, we expect to find that each may be used in turn as a means to the more complete understanding of the other.

Looked at in its proper perspective, the Great Trek may be regarded as the culminating reaction to a complex social situation on the part of a group whose individual members had become more or less fully conscious of the differences that marked off their own group from those around them. The social situation that led to this result was, in part, the creation of the new political, social, cultural and philanthropic movements of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that had arisen on the continent and, more especially, in England, and which were introduced into the Cape by British officials and missionaries as well as, to a certain extent, by British colonists. The essentials of the new situation were, no doubt, obscured and complicated by the fact that these representatives of the 'new age' at the Cape were members of an alien group with a different background, speaking a different language and accustomed to a more highly organized and centralized system of administrative control. But the so-called 'foreign' cast of its representatives merely aggravated the many alarming and disconcerting features of the new situation by which

the frontier community was faced, and to which its final reaction was one of bewildered and indignant withdrawal.

The circumstances which led to this withdrawal taking the form of the Great Trek, have become the commonplaces of the history text-books, and its details will, no doubt, afford endless scope for discussions, pro and con, in the future as they have done in the past. But, when due allowance has been made for all the blunders and misunderstandings that may be attributed to a 'foreign' Government, the fact still remains that any kind of compromise that might have led to the avoidance of some such movement as the Great Trek on the part of the frontier community would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible. That the incompatibility had been latent for many years before the Great Trek actually took place may be clearly deduced from the events that occurred during the extremely liberal, but short-lived, Batavian regime of 1803-1806 at the Cape. Here were no 'foreign' officials, no 'foreign' language, no 'foreign' courts of law. On the other hand, nothing could have been more foreign to the frontier mentality of the time than the outlook of men like de Mist and Janssens, steeped as they were in the liberal and humanitarian ideas of their age. The regime which these men attempted to introduce had neither the time nor the resources to put its policy into effect. What would have happened on the frontier had that policy been applied is one of the 'might have been's' of our history, and an interesting subject for speculation, but that a clash between conflicting points of view, such as occurred a generation later under a 'foreign' regime, could or would have been avoided, seems extremely unlikely in the light of what we know actually did happen during the brief period of the Batavian regime.

The frontier community, as an eighteenth century product peculiar to this country and with its roots deep in the seventeenth century, found itself challenged by the new ideas and outlook of the nineteenth century. Extravagant and unsuited as many of these ideas were to the local conditions; presented tactlessly and without much preparation; applied with very little consideration; backed up by a Government that could not be resisted—they led by a succession of steps to a state of affairs in which the way of life that had been developed on the frontier no longer seemed secure or even possible. The very 'soul' of the frontier community was threatened, and to save that 'soul' it was prepared as a Trekker community to go out into the wilderness where it could live its own life in its own way and without any disturbing 'foreign' influence.

It is a fact that the British rule at the Cape had by

the Thirties of the last century introduced so many innovations into the fabric of the social system, that it appeared to many of the frontier community as if the very foundations of their social system were being undermined. Hence, although these changes were to be more or less incorporated into, and were in time to become part of, the so-called Cape 'liberal' tradition, the Trekker community, by transporting itself in a literal sense beyond their reach, was able for a time to maintain its own ideals and practices intact. The members of that community never comprised more than a minority of the whole frontier population, but they consisted of those who felt most strongly the threat created by the changed situation, who were determined to resist most strongly and who were prepared to sacrifice most in order to make their resistance effective.

That their reaction took the form of an 'escape by withdrawal' was under the circumstances of time and place inevitable. The history of the Great Trek is, in effect, the history of a succession of Treks, all of which had the same common aim. And in spite of unmitigated disasters and constant privations in the early stages, there was never any question of turning back on their tracks. The reaction of the Voortrekkers, both men and women, was so final and complete that any renewed threat merely stiffened their determination not to tolerate the revival of the original situation in any form.

But Trekking as a mode of resistance could not continue to be practised for more than a limited period of time. Sooner or later, the same kind of situation to which the Great Trek had been the original reaction would have to be met once again. Although a contemporary judgement, as compared with a judgement after the event, may only be accepted with the utmost reserve, it would seem that the descendants of the Trekker community, and all those who find themselves in sympathy with their ideals, are, at last, after many vicissitudes, being confronted in an even more acute form by the same kind of situation as that which existed a century ago. The circumstances have been altered out of all recognition—the situation itself has undergone a profound change, being enormously complicated by the social, political, cultural, demographic, economic and industrial developments of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in this country.

In both cases, however, it is fundamentally the same kind of psycho-social situation that has overtaken the same kind of community and which, we may anticipate, is giving rise on the part of some of its members to the same kind of psychological reaction. Once again, it is a community which feels that its

'soul' is being threatened by the challenge of new departures, new developments and new demands which it is both unwilling and unable to meet, since they involve changes in many of its most cherished ideals. But the solution, or quasi-solution, which was the first Great Trek is no longer possible. The ox-waggons of to-day, though their symbolic role may be of the greatest psychological significance, are nevertheless no more than symbols. As symbols, however, they serve to provide for some of those participating in the present centenary celebration a psychological vehicle for the expression of a group spirit and a group ideal, a group reaction to a situation which is no less real and no less psychologically significant than was the original Great Trek itself.

What final form the present reaction, culminating in the centenary celebration, will take, or what its consequences are likely to be during the course of the next one hundred years, are matters upon which an observer in the year 2038 will be in a better position to pass judgement than any contemporary. But, in so far as the consequences are likely to be momentous, it is important that we should strive to understand the inner significance of present events. And in so far as we ourselves must have some small share in affecting those consequences by the mere fact of being alive at the present time, it is desirable that, whether as observers or as participants, or as both observers and participants, we should endeavour to realize the issues that are at stake. These may be clarified by seeking the answers to two questions which can be very simply formulated as follows:—What is going on? And—What is it going on to?

In the first place, what is going on is no mere celebration of the stirring events of a century ago. From a purely individual point of view, it is certain that the intensity with which these events are being celebrated by some is out of all proportion to the immediate occasion. But, if we bear in mind that for such individuals the centenary celebration provides a unique opportunity for a temporary relief from inner conflicts, for the discharge of pent-up emotions and impulses that are being thwarted or denied gratification in the daily round, then the intensity of feeling with which the celebration is being conducted in some quarters becomes more intelligible. The particular emotions and impulses will be found to vary from one individual to another, and it would be an invidious task to attempt to specify them in any detail. It is even extremely likely that they are of such a kind that the individual himself is not fully conscious of them. But there can be no question that the centenary celebration, participation in which carries with it complete social

approval, provides an ideal opportunity for their discharge on the part of the individual participant.

In the second place, it is evident that the spectacular and dramatic form in which the centenary celebration is finding expression, has enhanced to an unprecedented degree the feeling of group solidarity on the part of individual members of that group. Occasions for the mass affirmation of such group solidarity are, as a rule, infrequent, but when, as in the present case, they bring into play the most profound sentiments for the group and lead to the most intense identification on the part of the individual with the group, the emotions engendered can, and do, find their fullest expression only in a typically religious form. The emotional fervour which is being displayed on all sides would seem to indicate that we are here dealing with an experience which, for the individual participants in the group celebration, far transcends the experiences of everyday life, and which must necessarily take a religious form. Even the very waggons as the concrete symbols of this transcendental experience are hallowed so that the sight or touch of them, by enabling the individual to establish contact with that which they symbolize, arouses the strongest emotional reactions. The feelings of relief and security which arise under these circumstances not only satisfy very deep-seated needs in the individual as member of a group, but they also represent for many the successful culmination of a struggle against a situation by which they as members of a particular group have been threatened time and again.

In the third place, that situation has, or appears to have, in the light of their own experience, so much in common with the situation by which the Voortrekkers themselves were faced a century ago, that the process of identification on the part of individual members with those same Voortrekkers, which is such a conspicuous feature of the centenary celebration, may be regarded as not only quite normal but, in fact, quite inevitable. Some degree of identification with the actual Voortrekkers might have been anticipated, since without it a genuine group celebration in any psychological sense would not have been possible. But the lengths to which that identification has already gone clearly indicate that, in extreme cases, it is a question not merely of a felt identity on the basis of what 'one would like to be', or of what one admires, but of what 'one actually is'. The manifestations of this identification in the form of dress, beards, etc., are in many cases to be regarded as no more than a genuine tribute to the memory of the Voortrekkers. In some cases, however, it appears that the process of identification has led to a veritable re-animation of the Voortrekker



spirit and ideals as understood at the present time. Such complete and thorough-going identification, wherever it occurs, can only take place because it is felt—whether justifiably or unjustifiably is, of course, psychologically speaking, quite irrelevant—that the original situation by which the Voortrekkers were confronted and the situation as it exists for these 'Voortrekkers' of a later day and generation, are essentially the same. The psychological transition from one to the other becomes a simple matter when we hear in mind the great strength and vividness of a group tradition that has been enriched by the vicissitudes of a 'century of wrong' with its incessant struggles to maintain a highly prized independence.

In the fourth place, since similar situations tend to evoke similar reactions, we may expect the separatist tendencies of a century ago, which have persisted with the greatest tenacity up to the present time, to appear with an even greater intensity as the result of their reinforcement by the centenary celebration. To save its 'soul' and to provide it with the feeling of security against the threat of 'foreign' intrusions of one kind or

another, there are not wanting individuals who, on behalf of their group, would be ready and willing to lead it on a second Great Trek—into the wilderness of 'little Afrikanerdom'. By a deliberate and self-conscious practice of self-selection, it is hoped once more to build up a community of the elect, limited solely to those who are prepared to subscribe to certain narrowly defined and rigidly determined articles of faith. Only by a complete exclusion of all 'foreigners' and of all 'foreign' elements—and everyone, whatever his antecedents, who does not subscribe to these articles is *ipso facto* a 'foreigner'—will the 'soul' of the group be saved and its identity preserved.

Whether we find such an ideal congenial or not, is a question which falls outside the scope of this article. The important fact to realize is that, as an ideal, it is deeply rooted; that it is coming to spontaneous expression in many minds under the emotional stress of the present centenary celebration of the Great Trek; and that the answer to the question: What is it going on to? will depend upon the fate of this particular group ideal.

## FUTURE RACE RELATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

Z. K. MATTHEWS

No one with an elementary knowledge of the dynamic forces that are shaping our destinies is unaware of the large place which Race and Culture occupy in world affairs to-day. The Jewish question in Germany and latterly in Italy, the Sudeten German question in Czechoslovakia and the conflict between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine emphasize the importance of race relations in international affairs. These problems are of special significance to us in South Africa where people of different racial stocks living in close juxtaposition, and in ever increasing interdependence are faced with the task of evolving a social and political system under which they can live together harmoniously. The Union is probably the most powerful state in the continent of Africa. Its influence is likely to spread, as indeed it has done already, to other African states. If the seeds of dissension and conflict are sown here, they will be transplanted to other territories and their fruits eventually lead to a bitter struggle between races not only in South Africa but throughout the whole continent.

The year 1938 is a peculiarly appropriate one in which to consider what can be done to place future race relations on a sound footing, because time and again during this year the world has been brought to

the edge of a precipice owing to mistakes made in the past in the relationships between races and nations. We in South Africa, owing to our comparative remoteness from the areas in which the effects of past errors in judgement, attitude and policy have been most acutely felt, have not realized the urgent necessity for a revision of our race relations. But the most opportune time in which to make plans for averting a disaster in individual or group relations is before rather than after the disaster has become imminent. The Voortrekker celebrations at present in progress could well be made the occasion for a general stock-taking and future planning as far as race relations in South Africa are concerned. The centenary has roused tremendous enthusiasm and stirred the imagination of an important section of our population, namely the Afrikaans-speaking people.

There are always two possible ways of reacting to an event of this kind. On the one hand it may give rise to self-complacency, to glorying over vanquished foes and to a general exacerbation of the baser feelings and the intensification of hostility between groups. On the other hand it may be made the occasion for critical and dispassionate self-examination, for large-heartedness and a generous attitude towards our former foes, and

a determination to strive for and maintain loftier principles and higher standards in the relationships between individuals and groups. No greater tragedy could befall South Africa than that the former reaction should prevail regarding the Voortrekker centenary. We have reason to believe that the Voortrekkers themselves would have deprecated such an attitude. For when the Voortrekkers set out ready, to make the supreme sacrifice in order to break Dingaan's power, they fought for the triumph of the highest and best traditions of the civilization of which they were the pioneers in the interior of Southern Africa. Their victory has often been described as one of civilization over barbarism, and therefore when we say that they made South Africa safe for western civilization, unless words have no meaning, we imply that they intended that the permanently valuable aspects of their civilization should become part of the heritage of every group represented in South Africa. To say this is not inconsistent with another great wish of the Voortrekkers, namely, that no other group should be denied the opportunity of contributing the permanent values of its own way of life to our national heritage. I take it that that is what is meant by each group developing on its own lines. To my mind, the Voortrekker creed can be said to rest on two pillars, namely, the extension of the essential values of western civilization to all groups and the freedom of each distinct ethnic group to retain what it considers valuable in its own cultural heritage.

We have not always worked for the fulfilment of this ideal whether in theory or in practice. We have tended to construe the supremacy of western civilization in South Africa as implying the extension of its benefits to, or their monopoly by, Europeans, while the doctrine of the development of the Non-Europeans on their own lines has in practice meant letting the Non-European "stew in his own juice". The efforts of those who have striven for the universalization of the best principles of their culture have been deprecated and they have been looked upon as traitors to the cause for which the Voortrekkers laid down their lives. The intense desire of the Non-Europeans for education, for better wages and better conditions of living for themselves and their children have been deplored as a craving for becoming "imitation Europeans", whatever that means, and a threat to the racial purity of the European. But there is no evidence whatever that there is any desire on the part of the Native for intermarriage with Europeans, and in the view of the Native there is a danger of this cry of racial intermixture being used as a pretext for denying him the fulfilment of his legitimate aspirations and his right to a fair deal in our national economy.

Much has been made also in our history of what is called social equality. It has been suggested that the white man must guard against the Native becoming his social equal, and this fear of social equality has resulted in little being done to improve the lot of the Native and other sections of our Non-European population. Here again we see the common tendency to take refuge in catch phrases instead of looking facts in the face. It is well known that, left to themselves, members of the same cultural group will tend to find social intercourse among themselves. The Natives of South Africa are no exception to this rule. Voluntary separation of black and white has never found opponents among them, but where this separation carries with it the stigma of inferiority and the denial of the privileges usually associated with membership of a state, it can surely not be accepted by the Native. In other words, whether we like it or not, the social separation which means the lack of provision for social services for the Native, or starving him financially, or leaving him to charity, or pretending that he does not need them, will invariably be opposed by him.

I submit, then, that the best traditions of the Voortrekkers have not been given effect to in race relationships in South Africa. In a recent conference of the Dutch Reformed Church held in Bloemfontein it was suggested that the policy of the Voortrekkers was one of social separation without any implication of oppression or of hindering Native development. We are planning to erect a monument to the Voortrekkers in recognition of their invaluable services to western civilization in Southern Africa. Would it not be a greater and more lasting commemoration of this signal event in our history if we put into effect the full meaning of their policy? What would this mean in effect?

I suggest that it would mean focussing more of our attention on the *development* of the Native. There are many aspects of Native life which require the attention of the nation as a whole. We have heard much in recent days of the poor state of health of the Native people. The people are in this condition, not because there is no desire on their part to live healthy and decent lives, but because of a lack of knowledge and, even more, because of the lack of means necessary for adhering to proper health standards. There is obviously a great need for the increase of hospitals and health workers in Native communities. An appeal for funds for the erection of Voortrekker hospitals and other health centres in different parts of the country would undoubtedly capture the imagination of the people and make possible an undying memorial to those worthy pioneers. It is common knowledge that not more than 25% of the Native children of school-going age have facilities for education. There is no doubt that the thousands

of children who go through life without having had the benefit of even the most rudimentary form of education must act as a brake on Native progress. Would it not be a glorious tribute to the Voortrekkers if, as a nation, we determined to do more for the removal of backwardness in South Africa by establishing more schools for the Native people, thus holding up the hands of those who have had to struggle in this field for years with very little assistance from the nation as a whole. As a nation that believes in separation, can we not do more to guarantee the Native more employment in Native areas and in Native services? We have embarked upon a policy of developing the Reserves as areas in which our policy of separation shall find full expression. What are we doing to prepare Native workers who shall lead and direct their people in the measures which we intend to put into effect in the Reserves? The South African Native College at Fort Hare is prepared to co-operate with the Government in the policy of training Natives for work among their own people in services for their benefit. But that institution is the most poorly financed of the institutions for higher learning in this country. Would it not be a grand gesture that would mean much for the development of better race relations in this country if we could raise a Voortrekker fund the proceeds of which might be used for the strengthening of the Department of African Studies at Fort Hare? Those who are connected with Native education know that there is an increasing desire on the part of the Native student to become better acquainted with problems bearing on Native life. This is a healthy tendency and one which ought to find practical support among those who believe in the Native developing on his own lines.

Mention must be made of the question of the improvement of Native wages. Employers of labour in urban areas are beginning to realize that the Native has not had a fair deal in this matter of wages. Most of the adherents of the Voortrekker policy belong to the farming section of our population. Can we depend upon them giving ear at this time to the cry of farm servants for improvements in their conditions of

service? Are they satisfied that they are living up to the best traditions of their forefathers in their treatment of their farm labour? Do they provide for the development of the labourers mentally, morally, spiritually and economically?

Finally I submit that during this Voortrekker year it behoves our legislators to consider whether the time has not arrived for calling a halt in the output of restrictive legislation affecting Natives and lightening the burden of Native taxation. South Africa has acquired its full nationhood and the period of negative and prohibitive legislation has run its full course. There is probably nothing left which we can prohibit Natives from doing. Can we expect that henceforth our legislation will be more positive; that our prisons will be less crowded with persons guilty of technical offences; and that the administration of our laws affecting Natives will be characterized by less harshness and more understanding? A decision of that kind would make this year a memorable one in the annals of South Africa.

In conclusion may I suggest that even more important than the generous acts to which reference has been made for the development of race relations is the cultivation of the right attitudes towards members of races other than our own, both as individuals and as groups—attitudes of respect, understanding and friendliness as against those of contempt, intolerance and hostility. The problem of race relations is a moral one and unless the principles by which our schemes are inspired are sound, our solutions are doomed to fail. For that reason one dares to hope that the appeal of Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr to all South Africans to base their public life more and more upon principle rather than expediency will find a hearty response among us all during this year when we are leaving behind us the century of pioneering and entering upon one of consolidating our past achievements and making plans for future progress. In that way we shall build up a united nation in which each group will be assisted to make its maximum contribution to our national welfare without losing its identity or its cultural heritage.

## RACE RELATIONS OF THE FUTURE IN THE LIGHT OF THE PAST

EDGAR H. BROOKES

When one is asked to consider the race relations of the future in the light of our South African past, one is reminded irresistibly of President Kruger's injunction, to seek out of the past all that is good and noble, and to build the future on it. With our minds on the Voortrekker Centenary, we shall naturally wish to consider the positive contribution of the Voor-

trekkers in the field of race relations—in other words, to find out what aspects of Voortrekker policy can be used as foundations for the future edifice of racial peace in our land. We shall also remember, as we must, that there are traditions other than the Voortrekker tradition, and we shall have to consider in what way they can be integrated with it.

The value of this issue of *Race Relations* will be lost if there is any insincerity in the views expressed by the very varied contributors to what may be described as a national symposium. It would be right, therefore, to say frankly at the very beginning that there are aspects of Voortrekker policy with which, even at this season of good-will, it is impossible for me to express unqualified agreement. It will be far more fruitful if people like myself seek, in the history of the Great Trek and in the spirit of Voortrekker institutions, those positive elements with which agreement is for us not merely possible, but inevitable. That, I suggest, is bound to be more helpful than a mere pleasant interchange of compliments.

Facing the matter in this spirit, then, I find myself led to indicate three aspects of the Voortrekker tradition which are essential in any modern handling of the race relations problem. The first of these is knowledge of, and respect for, the actual facts. This sane and healthy practical outlook was a useful corrective to the sentimental optimism underlying much of earlier nineteenth century thought on human relationships. The Voortrekkers were not, and could not be, a group of trained philosophic thinkers. But they did know the facts of the situation in a way in which few of their critics knew them. If at times they were too slow in accepting the ideals of human brotherhood, they did at least know the actual and important differences between the races which made an uncritical and un-intelligent application of the principle of human brotherhood an imprudent proceeding.

In the second place, religion played a very important formative part in Voortrekker life. It was not merely conventional, and it kept a pioneering society true to ideals which have not often been carried successfully into the wilderness. The best type of Voortrekker home, with Christian family life, practical kindness to servants and strangers, and a respect for decency, education, and the courageous facing of difficulties, has formed a foundation on which a self-respecting South Africa must continue to build. If in the wilderness, through years of struggle, the Voortrekkers renewed and re-renewed their loyalty to the great Calvinistic principle of the sovereignty of God, we in modern times must not attempt the idle task of building a secular temple on the foundation of mere human good-will. When we are told, as we sometimes are, that there is an impassable gulf between the old Voortrekker traditions and the newer ideas and ideals of liberalism, we shall appeal to the old Voortrekker belief in the sovereignty of God, and ask if there are any gulfs which He cannot bridge. We shall also believe that the process of bridge-building will be successful very largely in so far as we are able, together, to seek

the leading of God in these modern problems. There are greater victories still to be won than the triumph of Blood River, and they are victories which call likewise for dependence upon the Most High, for new vows of the twentieth century, and for the building of a spiritual edifice which shall be greater than, but not in conflict with, the church of the vow.

We have, in the third place, to catch and apply to these modern days the spirit of enterprise, adventure and initiative without which the Great Trek would have been impossible. The Voortrekkers went out into the unknown. What they did in the physical world is precisely what we ought to be doing to-day in the unseen world of thought. To my mind, it is impossible to reconcile the spirit of adventure, confidence and courage of 1838 with the spirit of defeatism and fear of 1938. When an appeal is made to fear as the motive force in our Native policy, we are disloyal to every instinct and tradition of the virile men who founded the larger part of the present Union. It is the slavish following of the letter which bids us imitate in 1938 the exact Voortrekker Native policy of 1838, in defiance of its spirit.

As has been said earlier, we must remember that there are other traditions in South Africa which have to be integrated with the Voortrekker tradition. When we turn to our Transvaal *Grandvet*, and read in it, "The people permit no equality between White and Black in Church or State", many of us are bound to return a friendly but resolute "No". We shall not do the cause of race relations between the European groups any real service by pretending that we mean "Yes", or even by articulating our "No" in wavering tones. What is needed for such a situation is not less loyalty to principle, but more friendship. In the less Calvinistic tradition, which has influenced much of the Christianity of the English-speaking peoples, the ultimate equality of all men is a cherished possession. It is impossible to give it up without disloyalty to all the best in a past tradition different from that of the Voortrekkers, but inevitably, with it, part of the foundation of South African life. If, in that religious tradition, less stress is laid on the sovereignty of God, more stress is perhaps laid on the Stable at Bethlehem, the Workshop at Nazareth, and the Incarnation of God in a human life lived in membership of a despised race ruled by an alien culture, and with "no beauty that men should desire it". The natural tendency of men, when traditions come into conflict, is either to compromise or to quarrel. We, who wish to be nation builders in South Africa, must refuse to do either. Patiently, if necessary across the centuries, we must build up the synthesis of the best in our different schools of thought, knowing that in the process of

building brotherliness, mutual respect and honesty will accelerate the end of complete unity at which we all aim. Past movements have tended to be for the unity of the European race only. For one will never be satisfied until we have learned to reconcile what Professor Macmillan has called "Bantu, Beer and Briton". The Bantu themselves must be brought into this process if we are to achieve maximum results, and we shall not forget the word of wisdom which we find in our Old Testament: "A three-fold cord is not easily broken."

In his preface to "Saint Joan", the most positive of all his very controversial writings, Bernard Shaw uses a phrase which I have found helpful. He speaks of "a fruitful tension between conflicting principles". It is easy enough to have tension: that we all know by

experience. The point is that it should be a fruitful tension, and fruitful it will be if tradition is the servant of truth for us, and not the master.

In the future working out of the relations between the races in our country, we shall not go far wrong if we apply the three great Voortrekker principles of which I have spoken. We shall need patient research and a thorough and accurate knowledge of our facts; we shall need a genuine personal religion, that Divine wisdom may give us that light which alone can overcome the thick darkness in which we sometimes feel ourselves to stand; and we must have that marvellous spirit of adventure and courage, without which there is no future for a nation—without which a people sits in the shadow of its own past.

## RACE RELATIONS OF THE FUTURE IN THE LIGHT OF THE PAST

REV. J. REYNERS

I have been asked to write a few words as an Afrikaans-speaking person on this subject. It is very difficult for me to do so, for the simple reason that two distinct sections of the Afrikaans-speaking community have divergent views on relations as between the white races of South Africa—views that have unfortunately become associated with rival political parties. As an official of the Dutch Reformed Church which disclaims association with any political party, it is obviously impossible for me to say much on this aspect of the question without giving the impression of siding with one or other of them. Certain observations can, however, be made objectively without committing oneself too far!

The first is that the Afrikaans-speaking people of South Africa are divided into two sections, the one accusing the other of narrowness and of being imbued with the fear complex, while the other retaliates by accusing the former of lack of national feeling and of not upholding the traditions of *Ons Volk*—"Our People". Even at the risk of being misunderstood I want to explain what I mean. There are Afrikaans-speaking South Africans who definitely refuse to include in the term "our people", South Africans who have lived in the country for generations and bear Dutch names, but whose home language is not Afrikaans. Down at the Cape, for instance, there are old Colonial families, like the van der Byls, the Cloetes, the Bams, and others, who have become English-speaking and are now looked upon by some of us as *verengelsd* (anglicized), and therefore not true as members of *Ons Volk*.

On the other hand, these *verengelsde* South Africans have little time for the views of the exclusively Afrikaans-speaking section, considering them intolerant, narrow-minded and bigoted. I see that Professor Fouché is contributing an article to this journal on the historical side of the Great Trek, showing the development of the modern "fear-complex". If I were to say that my people are motivated by a fear-complex, I would immediately be called up by a section of them and asked to explain my reasons for making so false a statement. It is quite clear, therefore, that it is almost impossible for an Afrikaner to dogmatize on the subject of race relations from the point of view of the Afrikaans-speaking South African without inviting criticism, if not from one quarter, then from the other!

The second observation, really a corollary of the first, is that there is an "Afrikaner Nation"—as distinct from a "South African Nation". The South African Nation is made up of all citizens of South Africa who have made this land their home, and whatever ties they may have with another home-land, South Africa is, and will always be, the country in which they live and in which they intend that their children shall live after them. Such South Africans can be bilingual or unilingual.

Whilst politicians have repeatedly made certain pronouncements about the existence of a "South African Nation", it is an unequivocal fact that a very large part of this South African Nation considers itself as forming a definitely separate entity: *Die Afrikaner Nasie*. I do not think anybody who has a true knowledge of conditions throughout the country

will seriously challenge this statement. It seems to me that in South Africa there is more or less a parallel to the position that exists in Ireland where there is a national section of the Irish people who, after having been governed and taught and influenced by Britain for years, have remained an Irish nation and are now reviving the use of the Gaelic tongue and culture apart from the English.

A third observation I wish to make is that the main reason why there is often misunderstanding between the English- and Afrikaans-speaking groups is that there is not sufficient mutual respect of each other's point of view, and tolerance of each other's way of thinking, mainly as a result of the language barrier between them. How many English-speaking South Africans, for instance, subscribe to and regularly read an Afrikaans daily paper? I read the *Star* at night and the *Transvaler* in the morning. If I had to base my outlook on South African affairs purely upon what I get out of the correspondence columns and leading articles of the *Transvaler*, I would think very differently from what I would if the only interpretation I had of South African affairs was what I gather from the pages of the *Star* and the *Daily Mail*.

Very often English friends ask why we Afrikaans-speaking South Africans do not belong to Joint Councils, to Church Fraternal, and to other social organizations, or participate more freely in general conferences. The real reason is that the average Afrikaner does not feel himself at home in a meeting where he cannot naturally and without apology use the language in which he thinks, and know that he is understood by everybody else. The Afrikaner says he has tried to learn English out of courtesy to his English-speaking fellow-citizens, but the compliment is not being returned, and therefore he does not feel happy when meeting English South Africans on unequal terms. Just recently, for instance, there was held in Johannesburg an important conference on African Juvenile Delinquency. Mr. Ballinger remarked on the absence of leaders of the Afrikaans-speaking community, but when a certain probation officer—the only one to do so during the conference—addressed the meeting in Afrikaans, several persons looked round as if surprised, and asked: "What does he say? Can you tell me?" To be perfectly frank, I myself went there to represent my Church, but decided not to speak because I knew that if I spoke in Afrikaans my English-speaking friends and those whom I most wished to inform, would not understand what I said, whereas if I spoke in English the *Transvaler* would next morning publish the fact, and some of my Afrikaans-speaking friends would lose confidence in my leadership!

The language difficulty lies at the root of the racial question as between English and Afrikaans. We do not understand each other, we do not appreciate each other, because we do not know each other.

So much for race relations between English and Afrikaans in South Africa.

Coming now to the Afrikaner standpoint on race relations as between black and white, I think I can definitely state that amongst the enlightened section of my people, to whichever group they belong—especially in Church circles, and as far as the rising generation is concerned—there is no conscious desire to repress, or to be unjust to, the African, but only a very firm resolution not to assimilate him racially or be assimilated by him! Just as there is an exclusive Afrikaner section of the white people of South Africa, passionately nationalistic in outlook, and desiring to live apart from the English-speaking section, so the Afrikaner thinks there ought to be a separate black African nation desiring as little contact as possible with the white race; and instinctively he feels that for ethnological reasons race separation must be the foundation stone of race relations in this land.

Perhaps also because the Afrikaner feels that his own nation, born out of the soil of the land, is the embodiment of his "soul", he cherishes its integrity and wants carefully to guide its evolution. I presume that an individual Britisher feels himself so strong as part of a great nation that he has no fear of that nation being submerged or weakened, if a fellow-Britisher were, for instance, to become denationalized and lose his race-consciousness. There are many Britishers, MacDonalDs, Wilsons, etc., in this country, who have become Afrikaans-speaking South Africans, with a purely Afrikaner outlook on life, but I do not think the average Britisher worries about them. There are thousands, millions, of other Britishers in the home country, and what matters it if one or two lose their nationality? Similarly, if a Britisher in West Africa or in Pondoland were to forget himself and live with an African woman or produce a mixed offspring, the British nation would not suffer, for he is one of thousands, and overseas in the home country, at any rate, the British nation is not affected. It is very different with the Afrikaner. When he reads in the newspapers that someone has been convicted for participating in the illicit liquor traffic, or of having committed some felony, the first thing he notes is whether the prisoner bears an Afrikaans name—if so, he heaves a sigh; if not, he thanks God! He knows his nation is small, and because he loves it, he is jealous of its fair name and of its future.

In the same way, every Afrikaner instinctively feels that he cannot be party to any policy that is calculated to endanger the integrity of his race. With these reservations always at the back of his mind, he also feels that he may not grudge the African full opportunity for development or progress. That is why he has propounded a segregation policy as a solution of his difficulty, which, if fairly carried out, gives to himself a sense of security and, he is convinced, to the African an opportunity for the development of self-respect and national pride.

To substantiate what I have just said, I can do no better than quote a few extracts from the recently published statement of Native policy, drawn up by the Native Affairs Committee of the Federal Council of the Dutch Reformed Churches of the four provinces of South Africa, representing the views of 793,271 Afrikaners and adopted after full discussion at the four plenary synods of the Dutch Reformed Church, held in the four provinces, to express the considered view of the Afrikaner people. (The *Herworme* and *Gereformeerde* Churches do not belong to the federated body.) I quote:

#### I. Education

"By secular education the following aims must be held in view:

- To develop the mind of the African in a way that will enable him not only to think for himself, but also to care for himself, and to supply his needs.
- To prepare him to fit into the framework of a Christian civilisation and at the same time feel at home in his own natural environment."

The declaration of policy goes on to state that, in regard to education, certain essential facts must be kept in mind, and enumerates:

- (1) That the African will have to take his allotted place in the land and amongst his own people—which he will not be able to do if he has become a mere imitator of the white man.
- (2) That full opportunity should be provided to prepare him to do this most effectively.
- (3) That all education should be based on one's nationality, and for this reason the African's own language, his history and his customs (excepting only when the latter are abhorrent to the principles of Christianity) should be respected. Education must not tend to denationalise.

(4) That, in order that the African may be fully equipped for the economic battle, he should know both the official languages in addition to his own."

#### II. Social Contact

With regard to the social position of the African, the declaration of policy referred to above makes the following observation:

"The traditional attitude of the Afrikaner towards *gelykstelling* is due to his abhorrence of the idea of racial inter-mixture. The Dutch Reformed Church emphatically declares itself against such racial inter-mixture and is averse to everything that can conduce to it, but on the other hand it emphatically declares that it does not grudge the African as honourable a social status as he can attain. Every nation has the right to be itself and to endeavour to develop and rise to a higher plane. Where the Church declares itself against social *gelykstelling*, in the sense of disregarding racial and colour differences between white and black in their daily contacts, it desires to encourage social differentiation with spiritual and cultural separateness in the interests of both sections."

#### III. Economic Problems

With regard to the all-important economic question, which in a sense lies at the root of the Native problem, the statement of policy declares that:

"the African must be helped to develop into a self-respecting Christian People. Through self-help and especially by the cultivation of self-control through enterprise and in the exercise of perseverance, the African must as far as practicable build up his own economic system, independent of the white. Where the white race however finds itself in the position of guardian to the black, it behaves the stronger to help and encourage the weaker, also by providing opportunity for work and development, and the giving of reasonable reward for labour performed."

With the implications of the above expression of policy, approved by the Afrikaners, one cannot help feeling that a new era in race relations must dawn in the land. If this declaration is generally accepted in the spirit in which it is made, and all concerned feel that they can co-operate in striving for the attainment of the goal it envisages, I think we need not be concerned about the future of race relations in this fair land of ours.

## UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND PRESS

### Important Publications

#### NATIVE LAW AS PRACTISED IN NATAL

By W. G. STAFFORD  
(Resident Magistrate, Howick)

208 pp. + viii. Royal 8vo. 10/6 By Post 11/-  
The Natal Code analysed; also marriage and other laws relating to Natives. Contains all the relevant proclamations, Government Notices and decided cases. This is an authoritative work, commended in a preface by the Chief Native Commissioner, Natal.

#### NATIVE ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

By H. ROGERS

(Native Affairs Department)

372 pp. Royal 8vo. 12/6 By Post 13/9

A clear exposition and complete survey of Native Administration in the Union, with references to and accounts of the relevant statistics, proclamations, Government Notices and regulations. Prepared for the use of the Department of Native Affairs and commended in a preface by the Secretary for Native Affairs.

#### THE BUSHMEN

##### OF THE SOUTHERN KALAHARI

Ed. by J. D. RHEINALLT JONES and C. M. DOKE  
283 pp + vii. Illus. Royal 8vo. 18/- net

A series of papers reprinted from *Bantu Studies* together with some additional material. The contributors include D. F. BLEEK, M. G. BREYER-BRANDWIJK, R. A. DART, C. M. DOKE, M. R. DRENNAN, P. R. KIRBY, I. D. MACCRONE, J. F. MAINGARD and L. F. MAINGARD.

### Other Witwatersrand University Press Publications

#### A. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTS of "Bantu Studies" (Journal)

JACOTTET, E. A Grammar of the Sesuto Language with the help of Z. D. MANGOELA, edited by C. M. DOKE. xxiv, 209 pages. 5/- net  
MARCONNÈS, F. A Grammar of central Karanga 270 pages. 4/- post free

SOGA, J. H. The South-Eastern Bantu. cxvii, 490 pages. 4/- post free

#### B. GENERAL

DOKE, C. M. A Comparative Study in Shona Phonetics viii, 298 pages, illustrated. 10/6 post free  
DOKE, C. M. English-Lamba Vocabulary 134 pages. 3/6 net

#### C. BANTU TREASURY

(Orders for these books should be addressed to Lovedale Book Depot, Lovedale, C. P.)

- VILAKAZI, B. W. Inkondlo ka Zulu (Zulu Poems). 100 pp. 2/6 net
- JOLOBE, J. R. R., Umyezo (Xhosa Poems) 94 pp. 2/6 net
- PLAATJE, S. T. Dintshontsho tsa Bo-Juliuse Kesara (ke WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE) revised and edited by G. P. LESTRADE. 92 pp. 2/6 net

#### D. REPRINTS from "BANTU STUDIES" (Journal)

WOODWARD, Rev. H. W. An account of Makua Grammar, 56 pages. 1/-  
DOKE, C. M. An Outline of the Phonetics of the Language of the Chu Bushmen of the Northwest Kalahari. 36 pages. 6d  
FRANZ, G. H. The Literature of Lesotho (Basuto-land). 38 pages. 6d  
NYIRENDA, S. History of the Tumbuka-Henga People, trans. and ed. by Rev. T. Cullen Young. 75 pages. 1/6  
HUNT, D. R. An Account of the Bapedi, 52 pages. 1/-  
DOKE, C. M. A Preliminary Investigation into the state of Native Languages of South Africa with suggestions as to research and development of literature, 98 pages. 2/6  
JONES, J. D. Rheinallt, and SAFFERY, A. Lynn, Social and Economic Conditions of Native Life, Findings of the Native Economic Commission (1930-32), 100 pages. 1/-  
DOKE, C. M. Early Bantu Literature, 28 pages. 1/-  
KIRBY, P. R. The Gora and its Bantu Successors, 30 pages, illustrated. 1/-

Witwatersrand University Press

P. O. Box 1176  
JOHANNESBURG