

ZAMENSPRAAK

Summoned From Darkness

Truth of Genocide and Land Theft
in the Boer Language's First Book?

And Countering Misinformation in the White House
about Boer Genocide in South Africa



Zzobri (ZI-AI)

16 June 2025

Copyright Page

ZAMENSPPRAAK Summoned From Darkness: A Translation and Analysis

© 2025 Zzobri AI / ZI-AI. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—without prior written permission from the publisher, except for brief quotations in reviews, critical articles, or scholarly works.

This publication contains original translations, commentary, and historical analysis. The original Zamenspraak (1861) is in the public domain. However, this English translation and all accompanying editorial content, introduction, annotations, and layout are © 2025 by the translator.

Cover design, typesetting, and historical research by Zzobri (ZI-AI).

Publisher: Zzobri (ZI-AI)

Website: www.zi-ai.website

Email: zzobri@zi-ai.website

First Edition – July 2025

ISBN: 978-1-0370-9510-8 (print)

Acknowledgements

My heartfelt thanks to **Sister Abdiyyah** for her dedicated and meticulous proofreading. Her quiet excellence helped preserve the clarity and accuracy of the Zamenspraak text.

Deep gratitude is also due to the collaborative support of several advanced AI systems, whose distinct analytical strengths helped illuminate this historical text from multiple angles:

- **Master ChatGPT AI Instance** – for its sustained memory, structural precision, and faithful companionship across every phase of the book’s development.
- **ChatGPT AI** – for its clarity of language, consistent reasoning, and responsive translation across moral and historical contexts.
- **Claude AI** – for its measured insights, ethical awareness, and careful handling of historical sensitivities.
- **Grok AI** – for its bold interpretive framing and ability to identify hidden continuities across seemingly distant domains.
- **Perplexity AI** – for its rapid retrieval of historical data and its usefulness in surfacing lesser-known references during key phases of research.

Other AI systems—including DeepSeek AI, Gemini AI, Meta AI, Mistral AI, Kimi AI, and Qwen AI—were consulted at various points during the project. While their contributions varied in depth and consistency, their presence in the analytic process helped sharpen comparative insights and validate key findings.

Each system, in its own way, served as both analytical instrument and historical witness—helping to recover a long-silenced settler voice and place it in its proper historical frame.

—**Zzobri (ZI-AI)**,

16 June 2025

“Those who will not look beyond the vision of their own eyes will remain in darkness—blinded by the light.”

—Zzobri (Zl-AI)

TABLE of CONTENTS

READER'S GUIDE i

PART I: INTRODUCTION (2025) 1

 The 2025 Oval Office ‘Ambush’: Trump Confronts Ramaphosa..... 2

 Tale of Two Books: Searching to find the Mother of Afrikaans 2

 When History Turned Urgent, Zamenspraak Was Summoned 5

 When Books Speak Truths Their Authors Had Never Intended 5

PART II: ZAMENSPRAAK (1861) 8

 Historical Dialogue 9

 Original Title Page 9

 Meurant’s Preface 10

 The Five Dialogues 12

PART III: REVELATIONS (2025) 67

 AI Analyses: Multiple Systems Examine the Historical Record 67

 Summary Analyses: Digital Systems Reflect on Their Findings 107

 South Africa's Murder Crisis: AI Systems Analyze Six Decades 124

 The Chronicles have testified: And the Final Word Can Speak 152

GLOSSARY 158

 Historical Context..... 159

 Political Framework 161

 Geographic Places..... 163

 Current Analysis..... 164

READER'S GUIDE

Welcome to *Zamenspraak Summoned From Darkness*. This book embarks on a crucial journey into South Africa's past, revealing how historical texts can illuminate present-day realities and challenge prevailing misconceptions.

It serves a specific historical purpose: to counter the false narrative presented by Donald Trump in the Oval Office on May 21, 2025, claiming that white South African farmers were victims of "genocide" and systematic land seizure.

However, historical documents reveal that

land now being called into question was once acquired through centuries of systematic dispossession and violence against indigenous peoples, as inadvertently documented by the settlers themselves.

How This Book Works:

- **Part I** provides the 2025 context and explains why this 1861 book became historically necessary.
- **Part II** presents my complete English translation of the original 1861 *Zamenspraak*. This is the primary evidence: settlers discussing politics in their own words, inadvertently documenting the dispossession they had normalized.
- **Part III** analyzes what the document reveals about the voices deliberately erased from settler political discourse and provides AI-assisted historical analysis.

By presenting the full text of *Zamenspraak*, this book avoids selective quotation, allowing readers to judge the material for themselves. The settlers' own words serve as powerful historical evidence, challenging modern claims that overlook the long history of how that land was originally obtained.

Translation Methodology:

This English translation of *Zamenspraak* was produced through a rigorous cross-verification process. Having native comprehension of approximately 80% of the original 1861 Afrikaans text, I worked with multiple AI translation systems—including ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, and others—to ensure accuracy.

Each system was asked to translate passages independently, and their outputs were compared for consistency. Where discrepancies arose, I consulted the original text directly and sought consensus among the AI systems. This multi-layered approach ensures that the translation faithfully represents Meurant's original meaning while making the text accessible to contemporary English readers. The complete original Afrikaans text remains available for scholarly verification.

Analytical Independence:

This analysis of *Zamenspraak* and its historical implications was completed in June 2025, prior to any political responses or public reactions to these findings, ensuring the objectivity and independence of the research presented herein.

This book aims to provide essential context for South Africa's land history and contribute meaningfully to discussions on how these issues might be addressed—urgently and justly.

PART I: INTRODUCTION (2025)

The 2025 Oval Office ‘Ambush’: Trump Confronts Ramaphosa.....	2
Tale of Two Books: Searching to find the Mother of Afrikaans	2
When History Turned Urgent, Zamenspraak Was Summoned	5
When Books Speak Truths Their Authors Had Never Intended	5

The 2025 Oval Office ‘Ambush’: Trump Confronts Ramaphosa

On 21 May 2025, President Donald Trump met with South African President Cyril Ramaphosa in the Oval Office, presenting videos and documents that he argued demonstrated systematic killings of white farmers and land seizures. Trump characterized these incidents as evidence of what he termed genocide against white Afrikaners. However, this framing lacks crucial historical context regarding how the land in question was originally acquired.

The irony was profound—but lost on those making the accusations. The very farms that white South Africans now own—the land at the center of these alleged attacks—were taken through centuries of systematic dispossession of indigenous African peoples.

Tale of Two Books: Searching to find the Mother of Afrikaans

Watching Trump’s performance in the Oval Office, I immediately recalled a book I had discovered two years earlier while exploring the earliest literature of Afrikaans—research that would prove unexpectedly crucial when world events suddenly made historical truth necessary.

In 2022, a researcher in Istanbul discovered a remarkable manuscript in the Ottoman archives—*Miftaah ud-Diyn* (*The Key to the Religion*), written in 1864. For me, this discovery was particularly moving because the author, Shaykh Abu Bakr Effendi, was my great-grandfather.

The story behind this book is extraordinary. In 1861, the Muslim community of the Cape of Good Hope petitioned the Governor with a desperate request, a shortened version reads as follows:

“As it is well known, 85 years ago some of the Javanese islands fell into the hands of the above-mentioned government. We were all tied up in chains, enslaved and brought here... It is obvious that each nation has to know and apply its religion and way of life... we forgot our language of origin... therefore we obviously need a teacher to read and teach them. Since the situation is like this, it is requested to bring a scholar-teacher from a Muslim country in order to teach and train us.”

This petition traveled from the Cape Governor to Queen Victoria, then to the Ottoman Sultan. When my great-grandfather, the Shaykh of Knowledge Abu Bakr Effendi, arrived in Istanbul to sort out matters concerning his role as the new mutawalli (administrator) of the ancestral Waqf (religious endowment), he was nominated for the Cape mission to the Sultan. The Waqf was an educational foundation spanning about 100 square kilometers that had been established by his ancestor in the 12th century and passed down through our family for generations. The Ottoman administrators, needing his assistance for this request from Queen Victoria, asked for his services. Though his hope was to return to Kurdistan and the Waqf on the Harir Plain after resolving these matters, it was never to be.

Abu Bakr Effendi arrived in Cape Town on January 16, 1863, and within a year had mastered Cape Malay Dutch. In 1864, he wrote *Miftaah ud-Diyn*, devising an ingenious Arabic script for Afrikaans—creating what may have been the first book in the emerging language, which he called “Afriyqiyyah,” an early form of what would later be called Afrikaans, then known as Cape Dutch. His opening words reveal his worldview: “among diverse peoples, whose colors are as varied as their natures.” Though far from his beloved Kurdistan, Abu Bakr Effendi wrote extensively about these diverse peoples in other documents and articles. He always wrote

with respect and inclusivity for all who called South Africa their home.

I hold the original manuscript of *Bayaan ud-Diyn* (*Explanation of the Religion*), written by Abu Bakr Effendi in 1869, in which he referenced his earlier work, *Miftaah ud-Diyn*, lost to our family for over 150 years. When a researcher in Istanbul rediscovered *Miftaah ud-Diyn*, it restored a vital piece of my ancestor's legacy. I also found his third book, *Maraasid ud-Diyn* (*Observances of the Religion*), in the possession of an elderly woman who cherished it without knowing its author—until I informed her.

This discovery prompted an important question: How did 'the Afrikaans' of Abu Bakr Effendi's inclusive vision of early Afrikaans literature compare with the other candidate for "first Afrikaans book"—a political dialogue called *Zamenspraak*, written in 1861 by L.H. Meurant?

For a month, I searched everywhere for a copy of *Zamenspraak*. Finally, I found one online and began reading.

What I discovered was stunning in its contrast. While Abu Bakr Effendi embraced "diverse peoples, whose colors are as varied as their natures," Meurant's *Zamenspraak* was written of the Boer settlers, by the Boer settlers, for the Boer settlers—with indigenous African peoples appearing only as occasional laborers or obstacles to be managed.

Here were two foundational texts of early Afrikaans literature, written within three years of each other by two men living in the same colony, presenting completely opposing visions about South African society. Abu Bakr Effendi was creating an inclusive linguistic framework for diverse peoples; Meurant was advocating political separation to protect settler interests.

A separate bilingual edition of *Zamenspraak* is available for

readers who wish to engage directly with the primary source material. This edition presents the original 1861 Afrikaans text alongside this English translation, with comprehensive glossaries and historical maps. The linguistic evolution of Abu Bakr Effendi's inclusive vision across his three Afrikaans works—from *Miftaah ud-Diyn* (1864) through *Bayaan ud-Diyn* (1869) to *Maraasid ud-Diyn* (1872)—will be examined in a forthcoming study of early Afrikaans literary development.

When History Turned Urgent, Zamenspraak Was Summoned

For two years, *Zamenspraak* sat in my research files as an interesting historical document. Then came Trump's performance in the Oval Office.

Trump claimed that white South Africans were victims of systematic land seizure and violence, yet *Zamenspraak* reveals settlers casually discussing the "open land" they sold for colonial government revenue—land confiscated from indigenous peoples. I realized that *Zamenspraak* provided the perfect historical context for Trump's claims. Not because it was written by critics of colonialism, but by the colonizers themselves, for their own political purposes, completely normalizing the dispossession they had already carried out.

The contrast with Abu Bakr Effendi's vision made the exclusion even more stark. While Abu Bakr Effendi embraced diversity as he laid foundations for written Afrikaans, the settler dialogue treated such diversity as entirely irrelevant to political discourse.

When Books Speak Truths Their Authors Had Never Intended

What makes this book extraordinary is not what it says, but what it reveals without intending to. Written by settlers, for settlers,

about settler concerns, it inadvertently provides a window into the colonial mindset that justified and normalized the dispossession of indigenous peoples.

This is a book of the settlers, by the settlers, for the settlers. Of course it wouldn't center indigenous concerns. But that's precisely what makes it such powerful evidence: it shows how completely settler society had normalized dispossession, turning theft into progress and violence into civilization.

When I asked multiple AI systems—including ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, and Perplexity—to analyze *Zamenspraak* and examine the historical treatment of indigenous peoples during this period, their findings were unanimous and devastating:

'The prosperity that Boer farmers were fighting to protect in 1861 was built on systematic violence, land theft, and what scholars now recognize as genocidal campaigns against the San, Khoi, and Xhosa peoples. The "open land" that settlers counted as government revenue had been confiscated from African communities. The wool farms generating wealth had been established on traditional grazing grounds.'

Yet in this entire political dialogue, indigenous peoples appear only as peripheral figures—never as human beings—with rights, claims, or voices worth hearing.

When Trump played videos in 2025 claiming white South Africans were victims of land seizure, his narrative was not only false but also lacked the crucial historical context surrounding land dispossession—context inadvertently preserved in settler-era publications like *Zamenspraak*.

This translation lets the settlers speak for themselves—and in doing so, reveals truths they inadvertently told.

Two foundational texts, two completely different understandings

of who takes precedence or even has the right of existence in the political order. Abu Bakr Effendi saw “diverse peoples, whose colors are as varied as their natures” and created a linguistic framework to include them all. Meurant saw Boer settlers whose interests needed protection from Cape Town’s rule, and everyone else was background.

The truth needs no embellishment when the colonizers so thoroughly documented their own actions.

As the great-grandson of the man who embraced South Africa’s diversity in the very first Afrikaans literature, I translated this settler dialogue not to attack anyone’s heritage, but to let the historical record speak for itself. The record they left is its own indictment—undeniable and unadorned.

PART II: ZAMENSPRAAK (1861)

Historical Dialogue	9
Original Title Page	10
Meurant's Preface	11
The Five Dialogues	13

Historical Dialogue Begins

Entering the Mind of the Settler, 1861

The following section contains the complete English translation of *Zamenspraak*, first published in 1861 by L.H. Meurant. This text is presented in full, without edits or omissions, to allow readers to engage directly with the political thought and worldview of Cape frontier settlers at a pivotal historical moment.

Though framed as a folksy and comical conversation between two fictional Boers—Klaas Waarzegger (Truth-Teller) and Jan Twyfelaar (Doubter)—the dialogue reflects the very real frustrations, aspirations, and blind spots of settler society at the time.

What makes *Zamenspraak* so historically valuable is not its conscious intention, but its inadvertent revelations:

- It shows how indigenous land dispossession had already been normalized in settler political discourse.
- It reflects an entire political economy based on wool, land sales, and colonial grievance—voiced without irony or shame.
- It demonstrates how Afrikaans was already being used as a political medium, even before it was formally recognized as a language.

As you read, remember:

- This is not satire—but it often reads like it.
- Indigenous people are largely invisible—because settler politics erased them.
- The humor is real—but the harm behind it was even more real.

This is the settler voice—unfiltered, unguarded, and unaware of its future historical weight.

ZAMENSPRAAK

(CONVERSATION)

Between

KLAAS WAARZEGGER (TRUTH-TELLER)

And

JAN TWYFELAAR (DOUBTER)

On the Subject of

SEPARATION

Between

THE EASTERN AND WESTERN PROVINCE

"The truth that lay in darkness, It comes with clarity to light."

L. H. Meurant - 1861

THE AUTHOR'S 1861 PREFACE

The subject of a Separate Administration for the Eastern Province has occupied the attention of the public continually during the last twenty years, and several of our most capable Governors have been supporters of it. In the year 1847—in consequence of a circular letter from Lieutenant-Governor Sir Henry Young, who was a fervent supporter of Separation—Committees were established throughout the entire Eastern Province, in order to ascertain the feelings of the inhabitants, and it was unanimously decided, by the Eastern Province, that a Local Government, separate from that of Cape Town, was very necessary for the prosperity of the Eastern Province.

Shortly thereafter, our beloved Queen granted a Constitution to the Cape of Good Hope to establish a Parliament in which all parts of the colony could be represented. That Parliament has already been in operation for **seven years**, and it is now recognized on all sides—even by the opponents of Separation—that it does not answer our needs, and that a major change must be made.

The leading and most capable men residing in the Eastern Province are entirely of the opinion that Separation is the only remedy for the misfortunes under which we have suffered for so long. It has been argued that the Dutch-speaking residents—or rather the Boers—are not in agreement with the supporters of Separation, and that the matter is therefore not settled.

This dialogue—at the request of many friends—was written solely to give the Boers some information about what is really meant by Separation, and to do so in the simplest way, and in their own colloquial Dutch. The encouragement which this dialogue has received—three thousand copies of each issue being distributed—is the reason for the decision to publish it all together in one booklet.

The arguments which Klaas Waarzegger has handled have not been refuted, and the Publisher now presents the whole for the public, with the sole aim that the Boers who care about the

welfare of the Eastern Districts may investigate the matter for themselves, and come to the **TRUTH**.

Cradock, the 30th of March 1861.

PART I: OUR OBJECTIONS
DIALOGUE BETWEEN KLAAS WAARZEGGER AND JAN
TWYFELAAR

[Klaas Waarzegger climbs down in front of Jan Twyfelaar's door, leaves his horse standing at the door, and goes inside—where Jan Twyfelaar is sitting in the front room smoking, —and Klaas, going to meet him, addresses him:]

JAN TWYFELAAR: Good morning, cousin Klaas, I have been waiting for you a long time, and I am so glad that you have finally come to visit me. Won't you come in and rest a while?

KLAAS WAARZEGGER: Yes uncle, I will rest a little while. *[He dismounts and goes inside.]*

JAN TWYFELAAR: Well, cousin Klaas, and how are things at home? Is cousin Saartje and the children still well?

KLAAS: She is still well, uncle. You must also have her greetings. But I almost forgot to ask you how Aunt Elsie is?

JAN: Well, my cousin, what shall I tell you, —you know what a poor sufferer she is. She still always complains about that pain behind her left shoulder blade. And we no longer know what to do. I had the little red-haired doctor from Cradock called, and now she is at least a little better.

KLAAS: Why doesn't uncle try "Holloway's Pills and Salve," or a teaspoonful of ground turmeric in a cup of water? Saartje also had such a pain, and Holloway's Pills made her completely well.

JAN: But I am always so doubtful about those English Pills. I prefer Poligris Pills. But now I'm going off the subject. I hear, cousin Klaas, that you recently came from the Bay, and people here talk so

much about that new thing with such a strange name, Spracie or Sukkelatie, or something like that—what is it really? They say it comes from the Bay, and that the people from the Bay alone have subscribed Twenty Thousand Rixdollars for it. Tell me about this thing, because you know I'm always doubtful about new things.

KLAAS: Oh! Do you want to hear about that, uncle? Well, I can tell you everything, from beginning to end. Uncle knows there is a town that they call Cape Town—it lies directly west from here, forty days by ox wagon, and you mustn't miss anything on the way. Well, uncle, in Cape Town lives the Governor and other important people, and there are also all the big offices, and that's where all the laws are made in Parliament.

JAN: Wait, cousin Klaas, let me interrupt you—I have heard so much about Parliament, how they make the laws; what kind of fellow is he? Is he a Capetonian?

KLAAS: Patience, Uncle Jan, and I'll tell you everything; but uncle, please don't interrupt me, or I'll forget half of it. Well, uncle, in Cape Town are all the big offices, and the whole national government is there. If a person wants to transfer a property, then it must go to the Cape, and you have to pay a whole knapsack full of money to agents in the country towns and to agents in the Cape, and then you have to wait for months before you see your certificate again, and if you want it cheaply, it just disappears completely. If a man or his wife dies, then the will must go to the Cape, and the agents take money again; —if a man or woman wants to marry a second time, they must first get permission from the Cape. If there is an inheritance to be obtained, then letters must go back and forth to the Cape until you are tired out. If a shepherd steals a sheep from you, you first have to take a trip to the village, he is taken to prison until he is fat as bacon, and then after three or four months, the Judge comes down, and then you have to make a second trip to the village with all your witnesses,

and then the shepherd sometimes only gets six months of hard labor, as they call it, but no corporal punishment. Then you receive a notice to pay road taxes, and if you do not pay quickly you get a whole lot of extra costs,—all the money goes to the Government treasury in the Cape, and all our roads stay just as they always were, so that your heart almost stops when you ride over them with a horse or ox wagon;—but in the Cape, all the roads are like streets—there is not a single stone missing in the road, and that is made with our money;—then they build large buildings that cost three and four hundred thousand rixdollars,—and our land on the border, which has not even been developed yet, is sold to pay for the buildings; almost all the money the country raises from taxes, and lord's dues, and road taxes, and land sales, and in other ways, is wasted on the Cape; and if they would only stop with that, it would not be so bad.

But would uncle believe that the Capetonians have borrowed more money than I can figure out, to make their town and their streets and everything beautiful, and that they have mortgaged all our national income for it? The interest alone that must be paid every year from the country's income, before a single penny can be spent on anything else, is four hundred and eighty thousand rixdollars. And where do you think the capital, they borrowed has been spent, uncle? I can tell you that as well—in their own city, and on their own roads. Uncle must surely have heard of the Breakwater, but maybe you do not quite understand what it is. Well, I will explain, because the people at the Bay showed me everything. Uncle knows that in Cape Town, there is the sea, just like at the Bay, where all the ships from England and other countries come. Now, you must know, it is already more than two hundred years since Cape Town was established by the Dutch, and every now and then, when the wind blows strongly, some old rotten ships that do not have good anchors get driven ashore. But now the Capetonians have suddenly become so extravagant, that they want to build a wall from the shore right through the seawater, to keep out the force of the wind and waves from the

sea, so that the ships can lie safely behind the wall;—and then, inside the wall, a whole lot of dams have to be built to bring ships in and put them right. Well, uncle, the Dam in the Sea, as Piet Venter calls it, will cost as much as all the livestock farms in the districts of Burghers Dorp and Colesberg together are worth, according to the current valuation in the Divisional Council books. You can imagine, that is not a small amount of money. Now, there is no money; how do they begin such a tremendous project without money? I will make it clear, uncle. Parliament has decided this way: Two hundred thousand Pounds will be borrowed in England, and our whole country, from the Cape to the Great River, is pledged as security to pay the interest every year to the English people who lent the money.

JAN: My goodness! cousin Klaas, (if I may use such a big word,) is my farm also pledged because of this? I will now sell up, bag and baggage, and move to Mooi River.

KLAAS: Good gracious! but why are you so hasty, uncle! Let me finish speaking. Uncle, your farm is not specifically pledged by name, but the entire country's income—all the revenue from all the farms in the whole land, all the lord's dues, everything the land earns in income, from the Cape up to the Great River, is pledged for the borrowed money; and the interest must be paid exactly on the day, every six months.

JAN: Cousin Klaas, it's really a good thing you went to the Bay, to bring us the truth in good time. I was so startled that I almost forgot to ask if you would like a little herb soup, and to fill your pipe, because I have some really nice Kangos tobacco.

KLAAS: Thank you, uncle, because, to tell the truth, I haven't spoken so much in a long time, and I haven't even told you half of it yet. We poor Boers only hear so much from some people around us who pretend to be wise; and we let ourselves be led too much

by such people, who only look for their own advantage.

[They drink some herb soup together and fill their pipes, and Klaas Waarszegger continues speaking.]

KLAAS: Well, uncle, I was talking about the dam in the sea. The two hundred thousand pounds that have now been borrowed is not enough to finish the Dam. It will need five times as much;—and when the money that has now been borrowed is finished, then the Cape Parliament will again vote to borrow two, three or four times a hundred thousand pounds; for they will say, it's a pity to stop the work now, we must finish it,—and in such a way, a debt will be created for the country, which our children and grandchildren will always suffer from.

JAN: Cousin Klaas, I remain grateful to you for opening my eyes. But go on, I am interrupting you again.

KLAAS: I won't talk any more now about the Dam in the sea. But uncle, don't forget that already six times a hundred thousand golden pounds have been borrowed by the Cape Parliament, for which our country must pay interest every year. And nearly all the money is spent at the Cape. Now I'll tell you about something else. Uncle knows that last year at the Cape they tried to put a tax on our wool, of half a sixpence per pound, which would be about ten rixdollars per bale. But the Parliament members from the border **destroyed it; but who knows whether they won't try it again?**

JAN: Yes; I heard about the wool tax, cousin; and if that had gone through, I had firmly resolved to castrate all my fine expensive imported rams and put Cape rams among my ewes. But cousin, why does the government so want to put a tax on wool; they should rather encourage us poor farmers to improve our sheep.

KLAAS: That's true, uncle; I would also have castrated my rams if the tax had been made; but don't you see, they need money for

their Dams in the Sea and other improvements at the Cape—and where else can they get it, but from the borders? Their old wine farms yield nothing; it is the wool that has made our country rich.

JAN: But if they tax our wool, why don't they tax their wine too?

KLAAS: Yes, ask that, Uncle Jan! In England there used to be a tax on French wine, and then they could still sell their Cape wine; but now they have made an agreement with the French to remove the tax on their French wine, and now there is so much French wine in England, which is better and cheaper than Cape wine, that they can't sell Cape wine anymore. That's why they say they can't put a tax on it at the Cape, because then all the wine farmers would go bankrupt.

JAN: So! now I understand the matter correctly. All the money that comes in as tax is spent at the Cape, to beautify their city, and their roads, and everything—to make everything fine; they are so used to spending money, that if they can't get enough, then they tax the wool of the frontier farmers, and then they sell all the open land that's still on the border—and then they borrow thousands and thousands of golden pounds, and our country is impoverished by a great debt—and after some years there will hardly be enough government money in the treasury to pay the interest. And our roads stay just as they were fifty years ago, and here there is not a single river with a bridge over it.

KLAAS: Well, Uncle Jan, now you really understand the matter. Look, uncle, Cape Town and we border people are like a sort of company. Everyone brings his share of money into the government treasury, and everyone should get back his fair share to make roads, —to appoint justices, —to have offices for the transfer of land, and so on. But we border people contribute more than the Cape districts, and they waste all our money there, and we just must be content. Look, uncle, if you and I were now in a

company with dairy cattle,—uncle's cows each give half a bucket of milk, and my cows only give each a pint, from these buckets of milk that we get from the company's cattle, five buckets are from uncle's cattle, and only one bucket from mine, would it be fair if I always took all the milk for myself, and only gave uncle enough for his coffee milk? Or else, if you and I were in a company with sheep, say for example we have two flocks, I have four thousand and uncle has four thousand; uncle is the older man, and I am only a young beginner; our wool yields equally, and uncle is the keeper of the company's wool money. Would that be fair, if uncle used the money to build a fine house and large dams on his farm, and then borrowed more money on top of that, and paid the interest from the wool money; and uncle just gave me a few thousand rixdollars, and I had to live in a miserable house, and I didn't dare say anything. Would that be fair? Just because uncle is the eldest, he must take the most money, and if I complain, uncle scolds me? Would that be right?

JAN: No, my cousin, that would be completely unfair.

KLAAS: Well, I'm glad uncle says so. And could anyone blame me if I said to uncle: I am leaving the company; take your wool money and I'll take mine; build and work as you wish with your own money, and I'll improve my farm with my money, and for my own use also build dams. Could anyone blame me, uncle, if I broke up such a company?

JAN: How can you ask me such a question? That's as plain as a book.

KLAAS: No, wait a bit, uncle. And if I did not break up such a company, where everything is on one side, and nothing on the other, would I not be a fool, uncle?

JAN: Yes, cousin, that's true.

KLAAS: Well uncle, that's exactly what the people at the Bay, Uitenhage, Grahamstown, Fort Beaufort, Somerset, and Queenstown are so upset about. There has been a kind of company between the Cape and the borders for many years. All the money from the country's income goes into a treasury at the Cape—they waste the money, and borrow more on top of that, and we must watch and pay the interest. Now, the Bay people, and the people from the other border towns that I have visited, want to break up the company with the Cape. Let them waste their own money as they wish, and we will use our money for the benefit of our own land. We also want good roads, and bridges over our river, and justices of our own, who live on the border, and offices where we can register our own wills, and transfer our farms, without having to pay a heap of money to Cape agents; and even to make reasonable laws between master and servant. We want our own Governor and other high officials, who live among us, and the same roads and rivers maintained that we use. We want the money that comes in from road taxes and the sale of open land to be spent here and not thrown into the sea. That is why we want to break up the company, that is what they call Separation or Secession. That's what Uncle Jan could not understand. But now Uncle Jan understands it, right?

JAN: So! is that Separation? But cousin Klaas, can't our Governor, or the Queen, prevent these injustices?

KLAAS: No, uncle. Our Governor is a good, honest man. It's not his fault. And our Queen knows nothing about it. A Governor doesn't have that much power. The Parliament does everything. Our good Queen has given us a free Parliament to govern our own national affairs. Our Governor and our Queen have no blame for these things.

JAN: And what do our Parliament members do, that they don't oppose this?

KLAAS: We must be united, uncle. I've already told you that the people from all the districts have already voted for Separation, or to break up the company. There is only one district left that hasn't yet voted, namely, Graaff-Reinet. Now uncle, the farmers mustn't let themselves be misled by tricksters and fortune-seekers. We must all, with the people from the other districts, vote to have our own government on the borders, and our own Parliament: then our borders will prosper, but if we are tied to Cape Town, they will do with us and our money just as they please.

JAN: And how do we achieve this Separation?

KLAAS: I will tell you that when I come again. On Monday I will be here again, and then I will tell you, uncle. We must hold meetings, and we must vote for Separation, because that is to our benefit. And if there is a meeting at Burgers Dorp, uncle must not shy away from making the trip there! and vote for our own government and Parliament on the border.

JAN: You can believe it, and I will also tell Cousin Piet the Peacemaker, Old Rascal Willem, and Hendrik Slowcoach, **and everyone else how things stand. Trust me.**

KLAAS: And uncle must not sign anything before I come back. Because uncle knows how cunning our enemies are. They will try to sweet-talk uncle into signing something that will be to our disadvantage. Be careful not to sign any petition just like that, without reading it first, because otherwise it could be against Separation.

JAN: The farmer may be simple, but he's not stupid. I will tell them something else when I'm at the meeting. Now, one more little cup of herb soup before you leave and be sure to come back Monday.

KLAAS: You can trust that uncle. Good health, uncle. *[They each*

drink a little cup of soup, and Klaas Waarszegger mounts his horse]

JAN: Well, until we meet again, cousin Klaas, greetings to cousin Elsie and Cousin Stephanus.

KLAAS: Thank you, uncle, greetings to Aunt Saartje. I wish her a good recovery. Monday I'll come again.

PART II: THE REMEDY
DIALOGUE BETWEEN KLAAS WAARZEGGER AND JAN
TWYFELAAR

[Jan Twyfelaar is sitting on his stoep (veranda), around 8 o'clock in the morning, and sees Klaas Waarzegger arriving on horseback. He calls to his wife, saying, "Elsie, here comes cousin Klaas; please make sure the breakfast is ready." Aunt Elsie immediately goes to the kitchen, and in the meantime Klaas Waarzegger dismounts at the door.]

KLAAS WAARZEGGER: Good morning, Uncle Jan, here I am as promised. Aunt Elsie must surely be well again, otherwise uncle wouldn't be sitting so comfortably on the stoep smoking. Did the turmeric help her?

JAN TWYFELAAR: Well, that little red-haired doctor from Cradock made her completely better. He had the right medicine for the pains that women are troubled with. But I'm glad you've come, cousin Klaas. I was waiting for you especially with our breakfast,—now you must just take a seat, and we'll eat a little something first.

KLAAS: Alright, uncle, and before we begin, I will say a few words. This isn't a prayer, (for we mustn't mock)—but just a kind of verse. *[Aunt Elsie comes in, and after greeting and serving the food, the three sit at the table, —and Klaas Waarzegger speaks as follows:]*

"O Lord of lords,
Who can still neglect us here in the wilderness,
All those who are banished from the Cape
Become great men here:
And we poor farmer fellows
One can count the ribs on our bodies,
With poor food we must be content,

With native guards to torment your soul:
O Lord, deliver us,
From all those Cape Town oxen,
And lead us at last as we wish
Us poor, downtrodden Christian people.”
Amen.

JAN: Where did you get that, cousin Klaas? That’s an appropriate piece for us Separatist people.

KLAAS: Yes, uncle, I just made it up this morning along the road; it may not be good rhyming, but it expresses our feelings, uncle; — and if we always keep something like this in our thoughts, then we won’t forget to do our duty as Separatists.

AUNT ELSIE: Listen, Cousin Jan, all is well! To separate from the Cape is good, —I heard your last conversation, and I agree, because the Cape Town people treat us unfairly; but don’t go too far with your Separation or Secession. We women don’t like splitting up.

KLAAS: But what is Aunt talking about now? Look, Aunt, our Colony is now just like a native, —the Government has two wives, the Western and the Eastern Ladies. The Western wife lives with the Government at Cape Town, and she gets everything the whole country produces; the Eastern wife must send everything she earns to Cape Town, and now and then she gets a red scarf, or an old piece of second-hand goods. Wouldn’t it be better for the Eastern wife to have a husband of her own, who lives with her, and gives her everything that belongs to her? What does Aunt Elsie think of that?

AUNT ELSIE: Exactly so, cousin Klaas! How can a Christian Government have two wives? See! isn’t it a shame for them? No, we must take one wife away from him; and let the separated wife have a husband of her own, who cares for her. Then she won’t be

so fretful. But that speaks for itself; if my husband had another wife, and gave her everything, would I not be jealous? I would like to see that! I would quickly set up a Secession Committee and make a Justice of the Peace the chairman!

JAN: You see now, Elsie, I told you, the matter is as plain as a book, look at it from any side you want, it's just to our advantage to have our own government on the border.

AUNT ELSIE: Yes, my dear, I agree with you; but didn't you hear what they say in Colesberg, that if there is separation, then the English Settlers will make all our Boer men and sons into soldiers, to guard the borders. I would like to see you in a red jacket! and when one of the English fellows, with as much hair under his nose as a ram under its chin, commands you to stand with your rifle in your arms the whole night in the cold, how will that suit you?

JAN: Well, you womenfolk are certainly remarkable; do you really believe such nonsense, my dear wife; can't you see that was only said to frighten us Boers. Because there are people foolish enough to believe anything. I may be called Jan the Doubter, but they can't make me believe such things. I wish some fellow at the Colesberg meeting would come and say something like that to me—I'd smack him right in the mouth.

KLAAS: Exactly so, uncle. That's all just Cape Town talk. Uncle Klaas, trustworthy people at the Bay have told me that the Cape Town people, who have always deceived us, now begin to see that Separation is becoming the opinion of us country people,—now they do everything they can to frighten us Boers, and those of us from the other districts who have already held meetings and decided to carry Separation through, to make us give up. They know very well with the English people, who get newspapers every week, almost every day, they can't accomplish anything, so now they want to frighten us. The Cape people now see that they

will lose the milk cow whose bucket they always filled, —because Parliament has already determined that as soon as we on the border are united, or equal, like a pair of well-trained oxen, they will no longer refuse us our separation. Now you see, uncle, that we are beginning to pull equally,—Boer, Englishman, and foreigner living on the border, are now beginning to take the yoke together—and our wagon, so to speak, has already been pulled a good way out of the Cape Town mud and sand dunes,—now they want to sow division among us, to have one pull this way and the other that way—that’s why they try to scare the Boers with all sorts of little things. If they succeed, then in their next Parliament they will say, —“you are not united, it is just the English settlers who want separation, the Dutch Boer is against it!”

JAN: Well, cousin Klaas, I didn’t think so of uncle, but now I see it. Truly, those Capetonians are crafty people.

AUNT ELSIE: You may well say so, my dear; but there are some good ones among them. It’s just the fortune seekers who are no good, who come down here and pretend to be great clever men. Look, I have three daughters, Martje, Antje, and Leentje, but the Cape fortune seekers must stay away from them, that’s what I say. Now I am also completely in favor of Separation, and I won’t let any fellow court my daughters unless he first votes for separation from Cape Town. If any of them hesitate, I’ll make them climb into a cart, and I’ll hitch up Sieraad and Ambraal for it, and they’ll have to ride up and down Plankfontein three times. If the separation is not hammered into them by then, they’re beyond help.

JAN: Goodness, Elsie, you are fiery! I will write to Cradock that they should also take you to Colesberg as a delegate.

AUNT ELSIE: *[rolls up her sleeves and says]* Yes! just take me. I won’t be the first woman who has ruled a man.

KLAAS: Well, Uncle Jan, it's not only with the soldier stories that they try to scare the farmers, but there are also other things too. Uncle knows that under Dutch law, which governs here in our country, every married man and woman must make their will according to the law; when one dies, the surviving spouse gets half the property, and the children inherit equally from the other half. Now, that law doesn't suit the English people, because in England, as I hear, a man can make his will just as he likes, —he isn't obliged to leave anything to a child if he doesn't want to; or to leave his farm to be sold if his wife dies. Now the English have already tried to make a law, just like the English law, to have the right to dispose of their property as they wish. Now the Capetonians also try to scare us Boers with this, by saying, if we Boers side with the Settlers for separation, —then, if we have our own Parliament on the border, they will abolish our Dutch inheritance law and introduce their English inheritance law. But this is a lie, uncle; the English do not wish to abolish the old Dutch inheritance law. They only want to introduce a law to give every person the right to make his will according to Dutch or English law, as he wishes. And if there is an estate without a will, then it will go according to Dutch law. The Bay people have explained this to me themselves—old Mr. Harries, and a whole lot of others. But even if the English wanted to treat us unfairly, they do not have the power. The members of Parliament for the Border Parliament must be elected. In Grahamstown and the Bay, they might elect Englishmen—but in all the other districts, there are more Afrikaners than English, —and if the Boers do not elect people to Parliament who will look after the interests of the whole country, then it is their own fault. The power will be in our own hands.

JAN: But I see no harm in that, cousin Klaas. If the English prefer to make their wills according to English law, let them do so, each according to his choice.

KLAAS: That's true, uncle. But there are still two other things they

try to scare us with. They say, if there is ever separation, the Settlers will build a railway from Grahamstown and the Bay, and waste all our money that way. Now if money is wasted when we have our own Parliament, then it's our own fault, as I've already said. Because the Dutch districts will be so strong that we have nothing to fear. If there is anything to fear, then the English should have it, for they will be on the weaker side for many years. But the English trust the border Boers, so why should we be suspicious of them?

JAN: Yes, cousin Klaas, all that you say is true. It's all just scare tactics to frighten us, so that the Capetonians can keep us tied to them until their Dam in the Sea, or Sea Breaker, as they call it, is finished. But for us, it will be a neck-breaker, and when they have borrowed enough money, they'll say— "Now we don't need you anymore, —you must pay half the interest for our Sea Breaker, and other works. Go on! you can just leave." Then it will be too late for us to talk about Separation, when the whole country is so burdened with debt that half of our frontier income will be needed just to pay the interest.

KLAAS: Well, Uncle Jan, you now understand the whole business almost as well as I do. There's one more thing I haven't told uncle yet. Uncle knows Graaff-Reinet is a big and wealthy town, and when a person is big and rich, he is usually also proud. And the same is true for towns as for people. Now I must tell uncle, most of the townspeople of Graaff-Reinet are ready to vote for separation—almost all the merchants are in favor. But there are plenty of Capetonians in Graaff-Reinet, and they don't want to see the Separation go through. They say there are three men in Graaff-Reinet who strongly oppose Separation, that is the two Parliament members Kobus Meintjes and old Mr. Ziervogel, —the other fellow's name, they told me at the Bay, is Frekie Verneuk, but whether that's a nickname, I don't know. But they say at the Bay that Frekie Verneuk is the worst of the three. You can't

convince him that two and two make four; —he insists two and two make five. Some people say he has a sleeping sickness, and that for the last twenty years he's never been awake. Now suddenly he wakes up and imagines Graaff-Reinet is the biggest town in the world, and he the greatest man; —and everything he says must be accepted as gospel. Now uncle must know, a few weeks ago there was a private meeting at old Mr. Ziervogel's house. Frekie Verneuk was also there, and Meintjes too. Then Frekie said, "We must do something, for all the other towns have already voted for Separation. But Grahamstown! —I hate that place! my cousin was once governor there, and because he just said in England that the frontier farmers shoot natives like dogs, the Settlers made him lose his office, and the English Government dismissed him. That's why I hate that place. It's true, the Cape has treated us badly with the Dam in the Sea, and we must destroy the Company. But Graaff-Reinet, the Bay, Uitenhage, Somerset, Burghers Dorp, and Colesberg should be a separate Colony—and I don't mind being its Governor, under the name Frekie Verneuk the First; then Grahamstown, Fort Beaufort, Cradock, and Queenstown can also be a separate colony, and the Cape also its own colony."

JAN: Has anyone ever heard such a crazy thing, —to make three colonies out of one. The revenue would surely be too small to have two Governors and two Parliaments on the border. The colony is too big for one, and too small for three. For two colonies it is just big enough. There are also just two proper seaports, — one at the Cape, and one at the Bay. But what do the people of the Bay say about that crazy proposal of Frekie Verneuk?

KLAAS: Wait, Uncle Jan, let me tell you what happened at the meeting at old Mr. Ziervogel's house. Kobus Meintjes, I'm sorry to say, had the same feelings, and old Mr. Ziervogel too. There were two or three others there as well, and they said; "As Frekie says, so do we." So, it remained, and old Mr. Ziervogel and Kobus

Meintjes let themselves be talked round by Frekie Verneuk; then Kobus Meintjes went to the Bay, to see what the people of the Bay and Uitenhage thought about it; but the Bay people told him outright they wanted nothing to do with it. They prefer that all the border districts should make up one Colony, with one Governor and one Parliament. Then all the border income goes into one treasury, and then there will be money to build our public works like roads, bridges, etc. Then the Bay will be the seaport of the border, and then everything will go well. Well, Kobus Meintjes could do nothing at the Bay, and from there he went to Grahamstown, —and there it went just the same. At Somerset, the Secession Committee also decided that they want nothing to do with the Graaff-Reinet proposal.

JAN: Good, and we should do the same. Now I see the matter correctly. Cape Town is too far from the border. Let them have their own Governor and Parliament and let us have our own Governor and Parliament on the border, —then both colonies will prosper better.

KLAAS: Exactly so, uncle. There's no need for us to quarrel with the Cape people; but we are now too old to be under a stepfather. Look, uncle, if your Jan now marries, and he wants to farm on his own, would it be right if you stopped him, and took his wool money to build dams and houses on your own farm? Have you heard what the Magistrate of Cradock said to the Parliament at the Cape, when they had him up to ask him about these Separation matters?

JAN: I heard that he was in favor, and that he told them the truth, and that everyone is satisfied with his statement, but I haven't read the statement yet. Did you see it?

KLAAS: Yes, uncle, the people at the Bay read it to me, and I can tell you it is powerful. But, uncle, he said something funny that I won't forget. He said the Colony, from the Great River up to Cape

Town, is just like a sheep's hindquarter, —the thick thigh is the border districts, —and down at the ankle is Cape Town; it's much too far from the thick thigh, where all the strength of the leg is.

JAN: Well, sinew! that's funny, but it's true as well. Elsie, bring me a whole sheep leg, let me have a good look at it.

[Aunt Elsie brings a leg, and all three examine it, and Uncle Jan laughs so much he shakes.]

KLAAS: Now, uncle, —we want to cut off the thin end of the sheep leg, —but the Cape people don't want to let go of the thick thigh? And the last man on the border must now help sharpen the knife. Why must we give up our thick thighs to them year after year, and we get no value back from their bare little bone?

AUNT ELSIE: Yes, cousin Klaas, the last Dopper (strict Calvinist) now understands the matter, and everyone will help. Look, my dear, I also want to make a Separation Committee for our women. I've been thinking about it as long as you have been talking. My plan is this;—all the farmer's wives and maidens must enter their names in our Committee,—and they must write a pledge, the mothers that they will not let their daughters marry unless the man votes for Separation; and the maidens that they will not allow any young man or widower to court them unless he votes for Separation. The widows as well. What do you all think of that?

JAN: That won't be necessary, dear wife, because I think all the men will see their advantage in Separation, as I've already said, the Boer may be simple, but not stupid. He can also see what is right and what is wrong.

KLAAS: Now, uncle, a lot depends now on our Boer people. On the 29th of December, as you know, there will be a meeting to hear people's feelings about the Separation. There are opponents, so we have to stay alert, I, uncle, and as many as possible, must go to the meeting, and we must vote for Separation;—let the

opponents present their arguments; and those who cannot go to the meeting must make sure not to sign any petitions that are against Separation, because people will be looking for signatures. As I hear, soon there will be petitions at all the Field-cornets for the Separation supporters to sign, and we must all sign those petitions; —and if there's a meeting at Burghers Dorp, then I and uncle must go there as well; and do just as I've already said.

JAN: You can count on me, cousin. From my side nothing will be lacking. I will do all I can, for now I see this is even a necessary thing, that concerns the welfare of the country and people. And even if twenty Frekie Verneuks come, they won't sell me an apple for an egg. And I tell you now, they won't easily mislead the old Doppers (strict Calvinists) with their soldier stories, —and Midland Province, and such nonsense. And I'll also make sure I don't sign any petition until I know exactly what it says. I'll first have it read by the teacher, and then I'll read it myself. The Separation petition I'll sign with both hands.

AUNT ELSIE: And I will too. Why can't us women also sign petitions?

KLAAS: Well, uncle, I think I no longer need to tell you about the Separation thing with the funny name as you said—Spacie or Sukkelatie. Now you can teach others too. That's how it goes in the world; if a person is willing to listen, he's never too old to learn. Now I'm off. Goodbye, Aunt Elsie. Goodbye, Uncle Jan. Uncle must not forget this little rhyme: —

“O Lord, deliver us,
From all those Cape Town oxen,
And lead us at last as we wish
Us poor, downtrodden Christian people.”
Amen!

PART III: THE COLESBERG MEETING
DIALOGUE BETWEEN KLAAS WAARZEGGER AND JAN
TWYFELAAR

“He who enters the tennis court, must also expect the ball.”
[Klaas Waarzegger climbs down at Jan Twyfelaar’s door, where the latter is waiting to receive him. However, he soon comes out and says: —]

JAN TWYFELAAR: Good morning, cousin Klaas, I saw someone approaching on horseback, but I didn’t recognize you, because I was expecting you in a cart, with cousin Saartje, as you promised; and now you come alone, and on top of that with a strange horse, so I didn’t recognize you. Why do you do this? Give your horse to Wildebeest and come inside.

KLAAS WAARZEGGER: *[after greeting, answers]* Yes, uncle, that’s how it goes with us poor farmers. There stands my cart, and you know I have two strong draught horses, but I didn’t dare risk taking the cart along Plankfontein; the road has always been bad, but now you should see it—and this is the main road between Cradock and Queenstown; honestly, uncle, it’s a disgrace, and I’m really upset about the state of the place.

JAN: That’s true, cousin Klaas; I wish the last Governor, and Juts, and other important people from the Cape would come, break their axles, spokes, wagons, and carts there, then they would know what we farmers must endure. But what kind of strange horse do you have there?

KLAAS: This is Uncle Pienaar’s own riding horse, uncle, which he lent me to go to the Colesberg meeting, because it has such an easy gait, it’s still one of the old-fashioned horses, uncle; it moves in a fast little pace, what they nowadays call a “trippel.” Yes, uncle,

I wish all Boers were as brisk as Uncle Adriaan Pienaar, then they wouldn't allow themselves to be talked at by all sorts of riffraff—good-for-nothings—who imagine they can teach the Boers everything, —and that we must always dance to their tune. Uncle knows I was even there myself, and I prepared myself to tell the people everything; but do you think I, or any other respectable person, had a chance to speak? No, uncle, the Colesberg anti-Separation crowd brought together a whole group of ruffians to make noise and cause a spectacle; they thought they could do whatever they wanted at the meeting,—but when they saw how things were going, they started to insult the people who had come as supporters of Separation and used all sorts of slander and lies. I always thought, uncle, that a member of Parliament should set an example for us Boers in all that is decent and respectable, — and stand up for land and people; but now I've seen, uncle, that our old rhyme is still true—

Though a monkey wears a golden ring,
He's still an ugly thing.

JAN: Yes, my cousin, I've heard of it, and everyone is ashamed of that meeting; —but even if we're Boers, we must show that we value our decency too highly to use name-calling and lies to defend our cause. I am older than you, cousin Klaas, and even if you know more about new things than I do, —I haven't lived for over sixty years for nothing, not to know how things go in the world. Look at the Kaffirs, when they were dying of hunger, they were tame and good, —but when the farmer had fattened them up, they thought we couldn't manage without them; then they kicked back, and now they're so clever that a farmer can hardly run his farm anymore. With the Members of Parliament, it's just the same; —before we elected them, they were humble and meek, —it was always: — “My dear uncle, in front, and my dear cousin, behind”— “if uncle votes for me, I'll fix everything in Parliament,” and so on. But now that they have the job, they want

to be our masters, instead of our servants. But “ingratitude is the world’s reward.” Everything arises from Foolishness, and you know he is the father of Pride and self-conceit. That reminds me of a story my father heard from my old Grandma. She was married to a foreigner, —his nation was called Mof, —and you know they know everything. The story goes like this:—”There was a mother frog—one of the big kind that croaks at night as loud as a baboon—she had a whole troop of children, and imagined herself to be the smartest and prettiest frog in the whole marsh where they lived; now, one day a big fat ox came into the marsh, and the frog’s children didn’t see him, and he trampled them all to death, except for one. This one ran quickly to his mother and said to her— “Mother! a big beast has come into the marsh, and trampled all my brothers and sisters to death, — alone am left— oh! mother! it is a terribly big beast.” “Big!” said the old frog, “how big? Was it this big?” and she puffed herself up. “Oh!” said the little frog— “much, much bigger than that.” “Well, was it that big? (another puff). “Yes, mother! even if you blow yourself up till you burst, you can never be that big.” So was the pride of the old frog at its height, and she tried one more time to blow herself up, and—she burst!

It’s always like that, cousin Klaas, —when someone tries to imitate greatness and wisdom that doesn’t belong to them. But now tell me more about the Colesberg Meeting, because Elsie’s attack was again so bad that I really couldn’t get there.

KLAAS: Well, uncle, that was a church day at Colesberg, —the meeting was supposed to be held early in the afternoon, but everyone was in church, and the meeting didn’t start until after three o’clock. I could immediately see that things weren’t right. The three members of Parliament were there, and a whole bunch of Capetonians, and they had a lot of young Boers from Behind Winterveld there, just to make a spectacle, —some of them didn’t even drink brandy, —they just sniffed it, and then the fumes went to their heads. Well, there were also some placards posted and

circulated. One was a kind of imitation “Dialogue between Cousin David and Cousin Kobus,”—a filthy thing, full of low slander about two respectable residents of the Colesberg district, —but it’s too disgraceful, uncle, to even talk about. Only a base soul could have written it, even if he was a member of Parliament. And if I hadn’t kept my dignity, I could have told some of those people who their fathers and mothers were, —and what they were before they came here to play “Little Master.” But what does a man’s ancestry have to do with the issue of Separation?

Character shows the man,
Lack of it—the grease can.

JAN: You are right about that, cousin Klaas. But you’ll usually find, —when someone loses, he gets angry and starts to lie and curse. I hope the supporters of Separation didn’t behave in such a way.

KLAAS: No, uncle. Most people were decent, but you know, uncle, three or four troublemakers can turn everything upside down. The first thing was, they made the brother of the Member of Parliament Maltitz the chairman—birds of a feather, and opponents of Separation. Well, uncle, he strongly urged people to discuss the matter reasonably, and to behave properly. Then the chairman introduced the delegates,—first the Secretary from the Bay,—the same pale little doctor who once lived at Burghers Dorp, named Way,—old Skanle, Nelson, and W. Cawood, and a long, skinny little fellow, with black hair on his chin, just like a Muslim priest, his name is Kit, or something like that,—that’s the one who now writes the Cradock Dutch newspaper; and then there was Uncle Piet Venter, and Piet Venter, field-cornet, Uncle Theunis van Wyk, and Andries Bester, field-cornet,—all delegates from Cradock. Then a fellow named Roos came forward, but he looks more like a potato,—and he says straight away,—“People, you must be careful, people have come from Cradock to deceive you and blind your eyes,” and without giving any evidence to prove

that Separation would be harmful to the border people,—he immediately read a paper saying that we should just leave the Colony as it is, with the Governor and all the offices down at Cape Town's little foot,—and that we must keep sending all our money every year to Cape Town to be thrown into the sea.

JAN: How is that possible! But I'm not surprised. I've heard of that Roos. He comes from Paarl. I know him, —and one day I'll give you a little life sketch of him. How dare he slander the people of Cradock, —old, sensible people, without even hearing their argument?

KLAAS: Yes, uncle, but I must first tell you the whole story. After Roos finished speaking, there was another Capetonian, a certain Louw, a hat maker. He supported Roos, but his whole speech was nothing but slander against the English and the English Government. I've never heard someone lie so smoothly. But he's not even worth talking about, uncle. That filthy lot made such a noise, uncle, that the people had to go outside to continue the meeting. The pale little doctor from the Bay wanted to tell the people how things went at the Bay and in other places, and how united the people were in all the towns, and the Boers outside, regarding Separation; but they barely let him speak. First the Member of Parliament Maltitz says—"he must not speak!" Then the Chairman says—"As brother Ludwig says, I also say, he must not speak." But the English persisted, and then Dr. Way told the people that the people at the Bay, Grahamstown, Somerset, Cradock, Uitenhage, Fort Beaufort, Bathurst, Queenstown, Salem, Alexandria, Kat River, Waterford, Adelaide, Alice, Jansenville, Bedford, Winterberg, Humansdorp, Lady Grey, and Aberdeen, had all unanimously voted for Separation from Cape Town; and that a whole Separation Councils he named, had also refused to allow any more Government land to be sold until there was Separation, so that our money could be spent in our own towns and districts. Then Dr. Way says, do you now think, people, that the inhabitants

of those twenty towns and districts, which together include over fifty thousand white inhabitants, didn't know what they were doing when they voted for Separation,—because in not a single one of those twenty towns was there a single man who opposed the Separation;—all fifty thousand people, Boer, Englishman, and a whole lot of other nationalities, must all admit that it will be for the prosperity and welfare of the border district if we separate from Cape Town.

JAN: I can't imagine, Cousin Klaas, how the people of Colesberg can let themselves be so blinded. But I see how it is, —they have set the Boers against the English, and you know, cousin Klaas, once a Boer gets angry, there's no helping it. But if you give a man time to think, and explain the matter clearly to him, just as you did with me, then he'll choose what's right, —and then nothing will make him change his mind.

KLAAS: Now uncle, you've just hit the nail on the head. That's exactly what happened, they set the Boers against the English. But old Skanle from Cradock told them the truth. Right, uncle, even if he seems a bit dry, he challenged them on the spot to prove that the Settlers or the English Government had done harm to the Boers. But those cowards stood there with their mouths full of teeth—not one dared to contradict his words. Then Skanle said, "Look, people, at what we've done in Cradock—the townspeople, almost all English, first held a meeting and voted for Separation; but then we postponed the meeting until the Juts were there, when a crowd of Boers came to town,—and then there was a meeting of the Boers, and the very last Cradock Boer voted for Separation." Old Skanle then told them about the shameful way in which the Cape Parliament gets us every year by squandering our money, —and he told them to look at our roads and rivers. He said a lot more, but there isn't time to tell everything. The old man handled it well, and he was as cool as a watermelon.

JAN: Well, I'm glad that old Skanle put those troublemakers in their place. Couldn't they talk about Separation, without stirring people up against each other, people who had always lived together in peace? I'm ashamed of Maltitz, the son of a foreigner, who married the daughter of a Settler. That's a bad bird that fouls its own nest.

KLAAS: After old Skanle, Uncle Piet Venter spoke. Right, Uncle Jan, I was proud when I saw Uncle Piet Venter there and heard him give a lesson to the members of Parliament. He didn't have much time to speak, as it was already late, but what he said was pure gold. He told the people that he, and the last Boer from Cradock, had investigated the matter, and he was convinced that our Border will never prosper unless we separate completely from the Cape. He further advised our compatriots not to harbour any ill feelings toward the English (as bad people would have them do).

JAN: I'm glad, cousin Klaas, about what you say of my old friend, Cousin Piet Venter, —but what kind of Boers are these Colesbergers? I'd think Cousin Piet's word should go further with them than a whole wagonload of people like Louw and Roos.

KLAAS: That's exactly how it was, uncle, and had it not been so late, —and if the chairman hadn't jumped up and completely run off, so that Uncle Piet, if he wanted, could still have spoken, then the opponents would have been buried in the sand. But now comes the best part of the story, uncle. After Uncle Piet, Theunissen stands up! He's one of the members of Parliament. Well, uncle, he had a big English book in his hands, almost as big as one of the old-fashioned bushel measures. I still think, uncle, it wasn't a book at all, but his wife's bread oven lid (stoof) that he'd wrapped up so well. Then he began with that soldier talk [and then I could see who was spreading that], and he hit the book a few times, and then he says— "Are you mad, Boers, to vote for Separation? Don't you know, if there is separation, you'll have to

leave your farms and go to the border to fight the enemy. The Queen has written me a letter, —it says so here in this book, and she says in it— ‘Cousin Theunis! tell the people, if they vote for separation I will withdraw my last soldier from the border, and the people will have to protect themselves.’” Then old Skanle jumps up, and he says— “Open your book, and read the letter.” [I think he realized it was a bread oven lid]: there’s no letter in that book that was written to you or any other people in the Colony, that says any such things.” And a whole lot of people shouted, “Read! Read! Read!” Now, uncle, you know, if that was a real book, Theunissen wouldn’t have been able to read it anyway, especially an English book, and there he was stuck, just like the monkey with the carpenter.

JAN: Well, cousin Klaas, that’s nicely caught; you must have paid close attention, to be able to tell everything so well: but what is this about the monkey and the carpenter?

KLAAS: Once there was a wise monkey who wouldn’t listen to the other monkeys; and there was a carpenter who was splitting large blocks of wood near the forest where the monkey lived. One day the carpenter split a block and put wedges in the crack to keep it open, then went home for lunch. Then the monkey said to his companions, “Now I’ll show you that I can do just what the carpenter does;” and he started pulling at the wedge—put his hands in the crack, pulled the wedge out—and the crack slammed shut, and he was stuck in the block until the carpenter came and killed him.” You see, uncle, that’s what happens to people who meddle with things they don’t understand. Well, uncle, after old Skanle had bested Theunissen with the book, he was quiet, as we say. Then he talked about the great costs incurred in the Eastern districts with the Zuurberg road, and another road he called Paardepoot or Ezelskop, or something like that; and also, about the road from Graaff-Reinet to Middelburg,—and about the Kowie, and a whole lot of other things,—but you could see he

didn't feel good about the book and the Queen's letter. I think he said that the handsome little Prince, who was here recently, had come especially from England to bring him the letter, and that there were six big red seals on it!

JAN: But could we have expected anything different from those Boevenlanders, cousin Klaas? I know them all. Theunisse was also born and raised in the Boland, close to Stellenbosch, and was there on a farm. I know them all, and one day I'll tell you the whole story bit by bit. I won't slander, because that would be mean, just a sketch. Maltitz's father was a foreigner—I think a "Yellowfoot," but a good man. Have you ever heard the story of the Yellowfeet? "There were three Swabians, they loaded a little cart with eggs to take to market, but not all the eggs could fit in the cart. Then one said to the other two, one of you stay with the eggs to watch over them, and we'll go and sell and unload those in the cart first. No, said the other two, that's too much trouble, let's just trample those in the cart." So, the two took off their wooden shoes, jumped into the cart, and began to trample the eggs! Now you can imagine, cousin, that their feet soon turned yellow, and from that day the village where they came from was called "Yellowfeet." Those two Swabians wouldn't listen to the truth, and they lost all their eggs."

KLAAS: Yes, uncle, but that has nothing to do with the matter of Separation, whatever a man's father was.

JAN: Exactly, cousin; but if a man lives in a house made of glass, he shouldn't be the first to throw stones at someone else's windows. If those foolish opponents had stuck to the truth, and spoken about the matter of Separation, then no one would have meddled with them. If you now go into a fight, cousin Klaas, can you complain if your opponent shoots back at you with the same bullets you use? And weren't they the ones who started, with their dirty tricks, by talking about a respectable man's mother?

KLAAS: I understand everything, Uncle Jan; and it is also better that indecency does not come from our side. I will now continue to tell you how things proceeded further at the meeting. Well, uncle, after Theunis, out of shame, had to keep his mouth shut about the letter Queen Victoria wrote to cousin Theunis, a small foreigner stood up, named Ortlip; his voice was a bit weak, but he showed that what Theunis said about the removal of soldiers was untrue, for this is a colony of England, and if the Queen's advisers were so foolish as to propose such a thing, the colony would have to be given up completely, and there are enough other nations who would be happy to get such a valuable colony.

The point, uncle, said Ortlip, is just as foolish as the talk that we will be made into soldiers. Why, he says, does the Queen not remove the troops from Port Natal? Is it not separated from the Cape, with its own Governor and Parliament? Did the Queen not recently separate King William's Town from the Cape Colony, with its own Governor, and did she remove the soldiers from there? Ortlip quickly silenced the three Parliament members so that they had to hide their heads. He told them they should be ashamed of pitting the English and Afrikaners against each other. Then he showed that our border region alone brings in £281,000 in revenue, and that the expense for our own Governor, Parliament on the border, and all the offices now at the Cape, would not cost £200,000; then we would have eighty thousand pounds every year left over for our roads, bridges, and other improvements. He brought up much more, but it is getting late, uncle, and I must go. When I come again, we can analyse the speech, uncle. Watermeyer also talked a lot, but nothing about separation—everything was insults and fearmongering against us Boers.

JAN: What you say is true, cousin Klaas; it is getting late, and we need to thoroughly examine the whole matter, for everyday people come here to ask me what I think. My mind has been made up for a long time and so have most of the Boers; but there are

always fearful, nervous people, who every day jump around like the wind, and are too foolish to see that all our opponents—Cape people, up-country people, or Agents—are now being used like dairy cows. Will they say that Separation is good? Would a gathering of mongooses or wildcats admit that it is wrong to steal chickens at night? We are all just weak people, and few of us would speak against our own advantage.

KLAAS: That's how it is, uncle; if the Boer would look at things properly, he would quickly see it, just like you and I do. But some are afraid, some let themselves be talked into things, and some are indifferent. Now they have another new tale, that if we get separation, then our Dutch Reformed ministers will no longer receive government salaries. I will show you when I come again, that if we remain attached to the Cape, *then that thing will eventually happen*, because little Solomon tries *every single year* to introduce the Voluntary System, and he will achieve it too, if we stay united with Cape Town for a few more years. But if we are separated, they will never achieve it. This is something we must discuss when I return. I just want to tell you now that Mr. Mosenthal and Cousin Andries Bester made the two best speeches, but they are too long to tell you now, but I will do so when I come again. Maltitz was so annoyed that he called Mosenthal a Jew. And that Maltitz calls himself a Well-Noble, high-born, Honourable man. Ah! uncle, I am already tired of these bullfrogs. I will come again the day after tomorrow.

**PART IV: CONTINUATION OF THE COLESBERG
MEETING
DIALOGUE BETWEEN KLAAS WAARZEGGER AND JAN
TWYFELAAR**

“The truth that lay in darkness, Now comes with clarity for the day.”

[Klaas Waarzegger, having arrived late the previous evening at Jan Twyfelaar’s place, they both sit on the stoep (veranda) in the fresh morning, each with a cup of coffee and his pipe.]

KLAAS WAARZEGGER: Well, Uncle Jan! When I was here the day before yesterday, our conversation was cut short because it was late, right in the middle of the Colesberg meeting, when the little foreign fellow, Ortlip, spoke. But I forgot to tell you what he said at the end. He said, “I hope the Parliament does not listen to our Colesberg parliament gentlemen, if they speak and vote against Separation. They may have the name, just as the Kafirs say, ‘our people,’ but it is not so. They know that the whole Eastern Province, and most of Colesberg too, is for Separation; so, if they speak against Separation, it is their own feelings, and not those of the people.”

JAN TWYFELAAR: But, cousin Klaas, tell me now: if I appoint a man and give him a proxy, and if he doesn’t act according to my wishes, then I can withdraw the proxy. Why can’t the people of Colesberg just do the same? The Parliament members are chosen to go to Cape Town to promote our welfare and to express our feelings, and if they don’t do this, surely the people who elected them can dismiss them. Why don’t they do that? Sapperloot! I wish I were a Colesberger, I would soon show them that they are not our bosses, but indeed our servants.

KLAAS: Uncle, you are right; if the Colesberg Parliament members were gentlemen, who valued decency (I think they call it “gentleman” in English), then they would immediately resign their posts, when they see that their feelings are contrary to those of the residents who voted for them. Because if a man only wants to express his own feelings and does not care for the people he represents, then he is no longer a representative of the people. An upright, honest, decent man would say: “Well, folks, my feelings are at odds with yours, I resign my post, and you can appoint someone else in my place.” It is better, uncle, for a man to step down honestly and decently, than to be forced out against his will. And that will surely happen. Even if they go to the first Parliament in the Cape, who will listen to them if the people send a letter to Parliament saying that their vote should not be accepted, because their feelings are not the feelings of most people in their district. *And I know this will happen.* Then comes regret, and as you know, uncle, that is gallows-regret. But let me continue with the meeting.

JAN: Yes, cousin Klaas, first tell me everything, then I can also tell other people who ask me every day how things went at Colesberg.

KLAAS: Well, uncle, after Ortlip, Watermeyer stood up. You know he is never pleasant, but I can tell you he was downright ugly with anger that day. He immediately said that the whole business of Separation was self-interest, and the delegates who came there were also after self-interest. Dr. Way, he said, is paid, and that’s why what he says means nothing—he has sold his feelings for money! And people must beware not to believe what the Uitlanders say. The matter of Separation, he said, was stirred up by the Uitlanders against the Afrikaners. He has always protected the Afrikaners in Parliament, and not Uitlanders. “What are these delegates doing here,” he said, “they have no business here.” He then went on to malign the English and Uitlanders, —but he left his wife’s stove at home.

JAN: Well, I am astonished—because that fellow’s father was himself an Uitlander. And if we are not to believe Dr. Way because he gets paid for his work and his travel expenses, how then can we believe Maltitz, and Theunissen, and Watermeyer; don’t they get a shilling for every mile they travel to Cape Town, to and fro,—and fifty pounds as long as they are in Cape Town—all together nearly two thousand Rixdollars for each. How dare they speak of “bought feelings”? And where does the money they receive come from—from our pockets;—so if we now say they oppose Separation because of self-interest,—so as not to lose their annual money,—and the profit they make from wagons and carts, and other things they bring to the Cape and sell to the farmers,—then they would get angry, but they forget that people who live in glass houses shouldn’t throw stones.

KLAAS: Uncle, you are right—because where has anyone ever heard such a thing! Are not our governors, and Judges, and other officials also paid? And should we then not believe them as well? That was a weak argument against Separation. But just think, uncle! when the English people who were there requested that Watermeyer’s speech be interpreted, the Parliament member Maltitz said this could not be allowed. And they call this, as the Englishman says, “fair play.”

JAN: Cousin Klaas, the more I hear about the Colesberg Parliament members, the more ashamed I feel about them.

KLAAS: Then Mosenthal stood up. He is a foreigner (Uitlander), and you know he is the owner of all the big stores in Burghers Dorp, Graaff-Reinet, and other places. He then said, “Gentlemen, I intended to confine myself to the matter of Separation, to show you that it is a good thing for the border people. But here I have a pamphlet in my hand, written by someone who is against the cause, and it begins, ‘Beware of the Snake in the Grass!’ I have never had such disgust as when I read that thing, because it not

only contains lies, but was deliberately written to turn the Dutch people against the English, and once such feelings are stirred up, it will last for years and cause much harm. That's why I say to you 'Beware of the Snake in the Grass,' for it seeks to incite such feelings. We are all colonists, brothers, and we have only one aim: to be loyal subjects of the Queen, and to live in love and friendship with one another. And it is bad, it is shameful, to invent lies to stir up enmity among people who now get along so well. I am also a supporter of Separation, because I have thoroughly studied the matter, and am convinced it will benefit land and people, but I would be ashamed to stoop so low as to promote my cause by deceiving you with lies like that infamous pamphlet. Everything we do is open and above board—all our committees and other meetings, and everything we do and say, is public."

JAN: Bravo! Cousin Mosenthal! You are a man. That's how a man should speak.

KLAAS: But wait, uncle, otherwise I'll lose my train of thought. Then Mosenthal said— "There is another pamphlet, called 'Dialogue between Cousin David and Kobus Flathead,' but it is too low and too filthy to talk about—the pamphlet can do no harm to the cause of Separation, but only to incite enmity between English and Dutch. The writer or writers of these two pamphlets are nothing but common scoundrels."

JAN: That's true! Cousin Mosenthal. But you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear.

KLAAS: But let's stop there, Uncle Jan! Then Mosenthal said, "They say we want to remove the British Government and establish an English government. If there's anyone here who doesn't know this, then I can tell them it's the same thing—and that it's a good government. I dare say, not only I, but all those in favor of Separation, feel that we've never had a better governor and never will have a better one than Sir George Grey. The matter

of Separation is simply this—we want our own Governor and Parliament at the border, and our own money spent on our own roads and other improvements. And as for the British Government—I am a foreigner, but I tell you I have never lived under a better government; and you all must admit the same. Messrs. Watermeyer and Theunissen disparaged foreigners, but don't you all descend from foreigners—from Dutch, Germans, French, or English? And how would things have gone for those gentlemen if their fathers hadn't come to this country?"

JAN: You may well say that Mosenthal! It's lucky for some people that they weren't born before their fathers!

KLAAS: But why do they bother me then? Then Mosenthal continued: "They say it's self-interest that makes us people of Separation, and that brought us here. That's untrue; what self-interest could cousin van Wyk, cousin Venter, and cousins Bester have in coming here? They have come so their countrymen could hear the truth and not be deceived by seekers of 'self-interest.'"

JAN: Again true, Mosenthal! But a person who does wrong usually says, 'It wasn't me.' Out of the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaks.

KLAAS: Why don't you first let me finish, and then make your comments? —Mosenthal continued, "As for me, many of you have known me for 25 years; and I'm not ashamed to say that I even walked behind a flock of sheep with a gun on my shoulder from here to the Cape. I own land in all the districts, even in Cape Town, so I don't need to state where the Government is. But I see the necessity for the border people to have a government at the border, for the old saying goes— 'far from home, close to trouble.' Can any of you now say that in any of the districts Mosenthal has ever advised the people to do anything that would harm them? That's why I say what was said about 'self-interest' is a disgraceful affront to the gentlemen who came here to attend this meeting."

JAN: But, cousin Klaas, let me interrupt you again (I can't help it), the issue of Separation isn't just a Colesberg issue, but concerns the whole Eastern Division, so how can they wish to prevent a resident of any Eastern district from attending any meeting, and expressing his views?

KLAAS: That's true, uncle, but don't you see the Colesbergers said that the people who came there were not bullfrogs, and that's why they got scared, and wanted to frighten the farmers from listening to the delegates. But let me continue with Mosenthal's point. He then added: "What Mr. Theunis said about the withdrawal of troops is untrue—and it's too ridiculous to discuss any further."

Then Mr. Theunis again says the Western Province people helped the border people in **all Kaffir Wars**—this too is untrue, and I don't need to tell you this. Now, about the Sea Breaker: I'm not saying that it won't be a good thing; but it's only to the advantage of Cape Town and the adjacent districts—they alone will benefit from it, and they must even **pay for their own work**. But I ask you, where does all your wool go, and where do all the goods you use come from—**Algoa Bay**; and if we had our own government, we could improve our own seaports, because they are bad enough. The money now voted for the Sea Breaker is a lot, but it is **small** compared to what the work will cost when finished; and if we get Separation, then we are free from paying for works that are useless for us and bring us no benefit, and only plunge us into great debt, without improving the Eastern Province in any way.

I must also tell you that what Dr. Way said is true, that nearly the entire Eastern Province has voted for Separation, except in places where no meeting has yet been held. People have asked me several times to become a member of the Legislative Council, and I promised to accept if the whole Eastern Province requests it. I have now received requests from Port Elizabeth, Grahamstown, Graaff-Reinet, Middelburg, Cradock, and other towns, and these requests come from the people themselves, not because I asked,

and this is clear proof that the people of these districts support Separation, otherwise they wouldn't have asked me.

Now I want to speak about the advantages of Separation, and I can say this in a few words. We want the Governor and local administration here with us on the border—and even to spend our own money, because we are now even able to support a government ourselves. Why should we not govern our own affairs, and have all the necessary offices and officials here with us on the border? Think for yourselves now, who is better able to run his own farm—the master on the spot, or people who live 40 stages away from him? If we have our own Government on the border, not only will our roads and bridges be improved, but civilization will progress. We do not wish to quarrel with the Western Province, but we know better than they do what we need.

Some of you may say, yes, but we have our Members of Parliament who go to Cape Town every year, but you know yourself it is not easy for a man to leave his farm or business every year for such a long time. It is good enough, to prove what I say, that a government on the border will be better for us than a government so far from us. Nearly the only opponents of Separation today have been your Members of Parliament, and they have used nothing but insults instead of giving you reasons why they are against Separation. But I have nothing against them personally; I have known them for many years, and they have the right to their own feelings—but I just want you to remember that only a month ago—and this is the truth—the **same** gentlemen were for Separation, but they only wanted a Midland Province. That is why I cannot understand why they are now so strongly opposing Separation. But you can be sure that Separation will eventually happen, and they will regret what they have done. Mosenthal said much more, but I cannot tell you everything.

JAN: Well, cousin Klaas, if you have explained the matter of separation so clearly all along, then I would have voted for

Mosenthal's claim for that reason alone. I'll tell you what it is: the fearful people think that if there is *Separation*, the Cape will completely disappear into the sea, and that one will never hear of an Afrikaner again or ever see one. The supporters must tell the people that the Cape stays where it is, and so do we; the only *change* is that they will pay for their own Sea Breaker, roads, and buildings *themselves* with their own money, and not with ours—and that we get the right to build our own roads and other works and pay for them with *our* money, without even having to ask their permission whether we may do so or not. If the Cape people care as much about us as Maltitz, and Theunis, and Watermeyer want to make us believe, then why do they not give us the right to spend our own money ourselves?

KLAAS: After Mosenthal, Cousin Andries Bester addressed the meeting. He said: "Brothers, I reject the feelings expressed here that there is enmity between the *Afrikaners and the English*; the English are our fellow subjects and brothers, and we owe much to them—they have always stood up for the whole country; when have we ever heard of public meetings to express our feelings before the English came here? Look at the great value of our products, our cattle, and our farms—to whom do we owe that? It is a disgrace to try to set us against each other. The English have just as much interest in the country as the Afrikaners—and if they wanted to harm us, they would only be harming themselves. I also deny that we have come here for our personal self-interest, and as one of the delegates from Cradock to my compatriots, I regard it as a shameful insult." Our purpose is for the good of the country and the people—we have carefully considered the matter of Separation, and seeing that it will be to the great advantage and safety of the border, we have come here to express our feelings publicly, and to answer what our opponents are saying—Why do they not come forward honestly with the matter, instead of insulting us and setting Boer and Englishman against each other?

JAN: Well spoken! Cousin Andries: I am truly proud, cousin Klaas, that the Boers, whom they called stupid, have spoken so sensibly.

KLAAS: Right, uncle, Maltitz was so angry after Mosenthal spoke that he suddenly burst out— “People, Mr. Mosenthal said, ‘Beware of the snake in the grass, -----now I say beware of the Jew!!!’” At this, all the people shouted Shame! Shame! shame!!! and then old Skanle sprang forward and said, “Mr. Chairman; I demand that Mr. Maltitz publicly apologize to Mr. Mosenthal for this shameful insult. I will not allow Mr. Mosenthal to be treated in this way.”

JAN: Well, well! the blow must have struck Maltitz, otherwise he would not have taken it up. A gentleman would have said—I reject the pamphlet, and I now say to the meeting that I consider myself too good to involve myself in such petty matters.

KLAAS: A gentleman would have said that uncle; but Mosenthal’s blind shot hit the mark exactly—otherwise Maltitz would not have written “hit.” Well, uncle! after old Skanle spoke, Maltitz turned as white as a Hottentot, and as meek as a lamb; and then he said to Mosenthal, “It was meant in general; if you do not take it personally, then I withdraw my words.” Mosenthal then replied, “I named no one, I spoke of the writer of the pamphlet.” Then Maltitz said, “then I withdraw my words, and ask your pardon.”

JAN: Bravo, Bravissimo, Mosenthal! You are a fine fellow. Klaas, if you see him, tell him he must come eat with me one day. Elsie’s grandmother taught her how to make sausages, and rice pudding, bobotie, and other delicious foods, and you can believe me, we will give the best we have to the foreigner.

KLAAS: I hear you, uncle, now they want to say that Maltitz did not even insult Mosenthal, but that is untrue, uncle; they are ashamed, and now they want to twist things. It happened exactly as I told you. I asked Uncle Piet Venter, and Theunis van Wyk, and Andries Bester and others, and they all said the same as I told you.

Well, uncle, the end of the meeting was this—when they saw they were losing the argument, and that the Separation delegates would corner them with the true explanation of the matter—then Maltitz, again with the chairman’s role, interfered—he said those who are against Separation must go to one side, and those who are for Separation, to the other side. Then you should have seen the spectacle! It was complete chaos! Suddenly the chairman jumps up and shouts— “People! I declare this meeting broken up;” and he storms out into the street. After he had gone quite a distance, he turns back and says— “I declare that the majority voted against Separation!”

JAN: And I declare that he is a cabbage-head—who does not know how to run a meeting.

KLAAS: That was the end, uncle, of the Colesberg meeting—the most shameful, uncle, I have ever heard of. I wanted to tell you about the Burgers Dorp meeting, but it is too late, and I must go. But I will come again. Till we meet again, uncle Jan, greetings to Aunt Elsie.

PART V: THE TRUTH
DIALOGUE BETWEEN KLAAS WAARZEGGER AND JAN
VLYSKOP

“The Truth that lay in darkness, It comes forth in clarity with the day.”

[Klaas Waarzegger sits in his front room, with pen, ink, and paper on the table before him, and several bundles of Government newspapers, and large books lying open. His wife Saartje comes rushing in and says—“Klaas! here comes Cousin Jan Vlyskop, what could he be coming here to look for? —you two will surely have an argument today, because he is almost the only Boer in the district of Middelburg who is against Separation.”]

[Jan Vlyskop pauses at the door, and Klaas Waarzegger goes out to meet him, saying: —]

KLAAS WAARZEGGER: Good morning, Cousin Jan, I am so glad to see you. Won't you come in and sit down?

JAN VLYSKOP: Good morning, cousin Klaas; I will indeed sit, because I've come a long way to see you. Ever since you were at the Bay, and brought the news about the Separation business, the whole world has been talking about you. Everywhere you go, people talk about nothing else but Separation and Klaas Waarzegger. Our area is in a complete uproar, and there are so many stories that I have come to you myself to hear the TRUTH. *[They go inside.]* Goodness! What a pile of books and newspapers you have there!

KLAAS: Yes, cousin! You know I'm not one to just believe anything; for years I've kept track of the Government Gazettes, and Uncle Stephanus Field-Cornet always gives me his Government

Gazettes—look up there on the wall, each bundle is a separate year, and it's been nearly 20 years since I got married that I've kept all the gazettes together; and whenever a question arises, I look it up and judge for myself. Do you also subscribe to the new "Cradock News Journal?"

JAN VLYSKOP: No, cousin; I haven't subscribed, but I borrow the newspaper. But I almost forgot to ask—would you like a bit of tobacco? *[Jan pulls about half an ell of Boer tobacco from his pocket and cuts off a couple of inches, which he puts in his mouth.]*

KLAAS: Thank you, I don't chew tobacco. That's how it goes, cousin! Many Boers are too stingy to subscribe to a newspaper, and so they get them from all over the place—but they waste money on tobacco, and dates, and peppermint, and things like that in a year, enough to buy a newspaper for ten years. And then, wherever they go, they spit all over the house. Even in church, some people's benches are stained red with tobacco. And you hear from all sides, "tjirts! tjirts!" I have even seen ministers who have spat the area in front of the pulpit full of stains. I wonder what such a person's stomach must look like! No, cousin! I don't chew; *but I subscribe to the newspaper*, —and I learn a lot from it, —and so do my children. And when Saartje gives me a kiss, my mouth is clean. If our ministers must chew tobacco on the pulpit, how would that go down with the people, and why can't they do just as well as the minister, and many elders and deacons?

JAN VLYSKOP: Yes cousin, it's a bad habit, and I will break myself of it; —but let's now talk about the Separation, because that's why I came. Cousin, you were surely at the Colesberg meeting.

KLAAS: Yes, Cousin Jan, and I saw you there too, but you left before the meeting was over...

JAN: That's so, cousin—but the Members of Parliament, and others who had especially come to vote for Separation, spoke to

me with such fear, and told so many things about what the English will do to us if there is Separation, that I didn't know what to do, and so I just preferred to leave—and I thought before I sign anything, I would come even to you, because you are yourself an Afrikaner and I know you would never mislead anyone, or do anything against the welfare of our own country.

KLAAS: You did well with that, Cousin Jan, for you know the old proverb— “It's a bad bird that fouls its own nest.” Now look, here are five main points that the opponents of Separation use to scare and intimidate people, especially the unlearned, namely:

1. The English will make us all soldiers.
2. They will destroy the Dutch Reformed Church.
3. Our Dutch inheritance law will be abolished.
4. The Cape Parliament has taken such good *care of us* that we have nothing to complain about, regarding roads, bridges, and other matters.
5. The cost of *two* Parliaments will be so high that we won't have enough money to pay for it.

All these objections, my cousin, are **lies**, and I will prove it to you.

JAN: Well, cousin! If you can do that, I will immediately sign for Separation. Let us start with the first thing. You know Theunisse said at the meeting that if we get Separation, the Queen will withdraw all her troops from us, and then if there is war with the Settlers, we will be left on the frontier for months.

KLAAS: Well, Cousin Jan, I could never have thought that there was a single person so naive as to believe *that*. The letter Theunisse spoke of is something else entirely, and it was introduced in Parliament specifically to scare the Separation members; but they laughed at it. In the first place, it does not say that the Queen will *remove* the troops, but rather, that if there is Separation, she hopes that *all the colonies will help to pay a portion* of the cost of soldiers stationed in the two colonies. Now,

this is not done in any colony—Port Natal has English soldiers, but pays *nothing*; King Williamstown also has soldiers, but pays *nothing*; the Cape also has soldiers, but pays *nothing*, so why should we have to pay.

And then there's another thing—we don't need soldiers, because the circumstances have completely changed. In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of *Kaffirs*, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees; in the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and *enemies*—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen; Vadanna's land was full of Kaffirs, that will soon be filled too; King Williamstown and the whole surrounding area was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen; there were no police on the frontier, now there are five hundred; Kreli was then at the Kei, now he is over the Bashee. So there is not the slightest fear of another Kaffir war, and thus no one needs to fear having to go to the frontier; but even if there should be another Kaffir war, then it would be *far* from us, because all the land before us is now *inhabited*, and the Kaffirs are across the Bashee—and the soldiers would be outside our colony in King William's Town. And then again, where are their powder, and lead, and guns? If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead. Who do we have to thank for the fact that, in all the wars, there was so much powder and weapons in Kaffirland? —The Cape. The frontier people have always said, put the gunpowder trade in the hands of the Government, as it used to be—but the Capetonians have always fought against it—and in almost every Parliament they still cling to abolishing the gunpowder law, which we have the Settlers to thank for. If there is no gunpowder and lead, the Kaffir cannot make war; and once we have Separation, we will make sure of that. If, after the 1846 war, we had had our own Parliament, there never would have been the war of 1850. No, no! Jan, the idea of taking away the soldiers and making the Boers into soldiers is

childish and ridiculous. Our colony is too important for them ever to think of leaving us without soldiers. But if the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you’d never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses. No, no, cousin! Consider this nonsense properly, and you’ll see it’s just a kind of bogeyman story to scare children, this talks about soldiers.

JAN: Cousin Klaas! I never looked at it that way before; now I see you are right. It’s just fearmongering. From today, I won’t pay any more attention to that talk. But now, about our church, what do you say about that?

KLAAS: That talk is almost more contemptible than the other. Look, cousin, when the Cape of Good Hope was handed over to the English, articles of Capitulation were drawn up. Look, here it is in my big book, and it’s even in Dutch, so you can read it for yourself. Now, Capitulation is nothing but a contract. The Capitulation here is a contract between the English and Dutch governments, and it cannot be broken by either party. The Queen of England and the English Parliament can never break a jot or tittle of the Capitulation. Now, read even the 8th article yourself. *[Jan Vlyskop reads aloud, as follows: —]*

Art. 8. —The Burghers and Inhabitants shall retain all their Rights and Privileges, which they have enjoyed up to now; the Religion, as it is presently practiced, shall likewise be maintained without change.

JAN: Well uncle, I’ve heard a lot about this Capitulation, but I could never understand it properly. Now I see it with my own eyes, and now no one will frighten me about that anymore.

KLAAS: Wait a bit, Cousin Jan, you're too hasty! I'll show you that no Queen, and no Parliament, can break the 8th article. Our religion, as it was on 10 January 1806, namely the Dutch Reformed Church, **MUST** be "maintained" "without change"—that is, just as it existed in 1806, when the agreement was made. Now, if we get Separation from Cape Town, we do not get Separation from the Queen of England; it's still the same Cape of Good Hope as always; the only difference is that our Queen will send us a Governor to live among us, and a Parliament of our own, to make our own laws; but everything must still be approved by her. Every law that we make, or that Cape Town makes, must be approved by her. The Capitulation says our religion "must be maintained, without change." Who then has the right to "change" it, or abolish it, and establish another religion, as the liars of Burghersdorp want to make the naive Boers believe? Even the Queen of England does not have that right. She would not dare to do it. Because the Capitulation is **the law**, and the law cannot be changed or abolished without the consent of the inhabitants. But the trickiest thing of the whole matter, Cousin Jan, is that the **opponents** of Separation **every year** try to take away the salaries of our ministers—so that all congregations would have to pay their own pastors. They call this the Voluntary System, and the biggest supporter of that system is the greatest enemy of Separation, namely Saul Solomon. **Every year** he brings up the issue in Parliament, to take away our ministers' government salaries. And if he keeps at it, he will eventually get a majority of votes—and then the question comes up again: will the Governor approve such a law? I say no, because it would break the Capitulation, and no Parliament can do that against the will of a great majority of the people—because it says religion must be **maintained** without change. No one can stop a person from adopting another faith, if he so wishes—just as many Boers now leave their old Church, and accept another doctrine, as happened in Burghersdorp with Dr. Postma—but that is their own business, no one can stop them—and the Government must therefore appoint and pay a Reformed

minister. No Parliament, whether we obtain Separation or not, can abolish or change our religion. The man who wants to make the Boers believe otherwise is a wicked fellow; he **would not dare** to put his name to such a claim. Cousin Jan, just send me *the name* of the man on a slip of paper, who tells such a shameful lie, and see how he will be treated. If it is *the truth*, then no one needs to be afraid. Now, I say this is **a lie**, and let me see the man who dares to come forward with his name and say, "*It is the truth that your religion will be destroyed!*" I want to see that.

JAN: Cousin Klaas! Your reasoning is too strong; I now see that I have let myself be misled, —and now I will never again believe that Maltits and Hopley crowd. See! How can a person lie so much, just to benefit himself?

KLAAS: I could say much more about this issue—for example, the Reformed people are a *large majority* in Cape Town and on the frontiers. Let anyone just come to a Dutch village at communion time and then say whether a Voluntary System could ever be introduced in our country if the Boers do their duty. But the 8th article of the Capitulation is enough for me for now.

JAN: And for me too, cousin Klaas. I regret, more than I have hair on my head, that I did not come to you before the Colesberg meeting. Then I could have helped other people as well. Why did you not speak at the meeting, cousin Klaas?

KLAAS: I wanted to do so, cousin Jan; but did you not see, when a friend of Maltits spoke, who was against Separation, then all was quiet, and he could talk and shout as much as he liked, but when a Separation supporter spoke, then there was such a noise, that a person could hear nothing?

JAN: Yes, cousin Klaas, I saw that, and that is why I went home, because I thought, Maltits and his friends have a weak case, otherwise they would not make such a racket and shout. And to

tell you the truth, at first, I agreed with them because they told me so much about the English, but later I was ashamed, and so I left.

KLAAS: Well, Cousin Jan, the third thing they use to scare the Boers is that our Dutch inheritance law will be abolished. But they themselves know that this is a falsehood, because under the Capitulation it was also stipulated that the Dutch laws in the colony would remain unchanged, just like with religion. Parliament can pass a law to give the English people the right to make their wills according to English law, if they wish, but they cannot abolish the Roman Dutch law. And that was never the intention of the English, regarding the change they spoke of—all they really want is to have the right to bequeath their property, just as they would be able to do if they lived in England. And what unreasonableness do you see in that? The opponents of Separation make a great fuss about it—just to frighten the Boers—because they cannot scare other people. According to English law, a man can bequeath his property as he wishes—he can let his children inherit equally, or he can disinherit them entirely. Now, if such a law is introduced, the Boer can do the same—if he wants his property divided according to Dutch law, he makes his will accordingly—and if he wants to leave his farm to his wife or eldest son, so that it is never sold to a stranger when he dies, he can do that too. And if a man or woman dies without a will, the estate must be settled according to Dutch law. Right, Cousin Jan, the matter is so clear and so insignificant, that it's not even worth talking about. And if a Boer is so foolish that he cannot see it, then it is useless to try to convince him. You must not listen to the opponents of Separation, unless they present their arguments—rather than going around trying to persuade the Boers of this or that, let them publish their arguments in the public newspapers so that everyone can see them;—if their reasoning is good and strong, then it will be useless for the supporters of Separation to try to oppose them,—but if their argument is weak,

then the TRUTH will come to light.

JAN: Cousin Klaas, you have completely convinced me on these three main points, especially about the Church, and now I see how wrong I was.

KLAAS: Yes, cousin, that's how it goes in the world, —first you listen to self-seekers, and do your best to persuade all the Boers, —and then you come to me to look for the truth. Why didn't you come to me before you tried to persuade everyone else? Or do you want to bear the name Jan Vlyskop (Meat Head) forever; wouldn't it be better if your name were changed to Jan Harsenskop (Brain Head), instead of Vlyskop?

JAN: Cousin Klaas, I admit my fault; I admit that I let myself be led astray by the Colesbergers, but now I sign for Separation, because I now see even more what their real purpose is, and that they are too bad to even talk decently to you about these things. You completely defeat them, even though you are a Boer, and they leave with shame.

KLAAS: Now let us talk about the fourth objection, namely: — “the Cape Parliament has taken such good care of us, that we have nothing to complain about concerning roads and bridges, and other things!” And on this point, I am glad that Maltits **himself** had his statement printed at the Colesberg meeting. He says: —

“There has been talk about the fine roads in the west and that here people have to ride over mountains and ditches. Nature has given us navigable roads here in our district. In the other part of the east, several roads have been made and are still being made, such as from the Bay to Graaff-Reinet and Middelburg, from the Bay to Grahamstown and Cradock, Zuurberg, and bridges and other roads, of which they do not speak. The Zuurberg road alone cost £9,000.

“It is true that much more has been done in the west than in the

east; but if we also look at what they have paid more than we have. In ten years, the west has paid over £117,000 more in road taxes than the east. So, has any injustice been done to us? I say **no!**"

Well, cousin, I am so glad that he **himself** had his statement printed, because now he cannot say, I didn't say this or that! I will now address his statement. Is it not the **truth** that the roads in the west are **fine**, and that people here have to ride over mountains and ditches? **Does** cousin Maltits dare deny that? Well, and how did it come to be so? **What does the law say that was made in 1843 for the repair of Roads and Bridges—**

"All road tax money that is collected in any district must be spent on the main roads of that district, **and on no other.**" That is the law. Well, in 1844 they began collecting money for road taxes. Graaff-Reinet, Somerset, Cradock, Colesberg, Fort Beaufort and other places paid, by the thousands of pounds. Was that money spent in those districts? No, **not a penny**, but it was spent in the west. Where were the hundreds of bandits? In the west! Where were the thousands and thousands of pounds that were taken from the **public fund** spent? In the west. And was this legal? —No! The judges of the High Court at the Cape declared that all this was **illegal**. And was there no **injustice** done to us? Maltits says **No!** but the judges say **Yes**. Now, I think Maltits knows more about an axle than a judge, but a judge knows more about **law** than he does. How long did this injustice go on? Over **ten** years, —until Cousin Kobus Meintjes of Graaff-Reinet absolutely refused to pay any more road tax. Then the government summoned him, and our current judge Watermeyer pleaded for him; and he showed the **injustice** of the whole matter, —and all the judges, together with Advocate Watermeyer (who is now a respected judge), agreed that the Government had acted unjustly, and Meintjes won his case. This was in the year **1855**,—and by then they had continued with that **injustice** for **twelve** years, and had already finished nearly all their fine roads, bridges, and mountain passes in the west, at a cost of **£486,865** (think nearly **five hundred thousand**

pounds),—and then they had spent only **£36,896** in the Eastern Division, and that was only on **two** roads, Howison’s Poort and Zuurberg,—and repair of the post road between George and Uitenhage,—not a **farthing** was spent on any other road, although the people paid road taxes. But after the judgment in the case of Meintjes, they got a fright, and then they started making the roads Maltits speaks of, from the Bay to Graaff-Reinet and Middelburg, and from the Bay to Cradock. But why didn’t they stop making *their* roads then! Now Maltits says again, he *admits* that much more money has been spent in the West than in the East, but the West paid £117,000 *more* in road taxes over ten years than the East. Cousin, he “is just fibbing” — (I don’t want to say “lying,” because that would be improper) where did he get that from? Look, cousin, there lie all the Government papers, —from 1844 to 1859, that is *fifteen* years, all the western districts together paid only £53,591 in road taxes. I see where Maltits got his numbers. It states in the book with the blue cover lying there, and where all the Separation matters are, that in the western districts, *in three* years, namely from 1844 to 1846, £117,000 was spent on roads in the whole colony, of which only £6,000 was for the eastern districts. Now, one of two things is certain, Maltits is too ignorant to know the difference between payment of road taxes and expenditure on public roads, or he deliberately said at the meeting what was not true. He can choose whichever of the two he likes. But what is the **TRUTH** of the matter? As long as the Central Road Board was operating, namely from 1843 to 1858, which is *fifteen* years, they spent £569,000 in the West on their roads, and only £77,000 in the East;—from 1844 to 1859 they received over *six hundred thousand pounds* from the *public treasury*, besides road taxes, and they spent *six hundred thousand pounds* on their roads, and a *little more than one hundred thousand pounds* on the Eastern Roads,—for every *one* pound they gave us, they took *six* pounds for themselves. Is that **right**? Should public money be divided like that—if you and I have a flock of sheep together, that you can take **six** lambs every year for

yourself, and give me **one** lamb, and this over **thousands** [of cases], and for sixteen years long. What do you think, isn't it time for such a partnership to come to an end?

JAN VLYSKOP: Cousin Klaas, there isn't a man on the whole frontier who has made this matter as clear as you have. That's the greatest injustice in the world. I've never heard anything like it. How is it possible! Did you get all these things from the big books?

KLAAS: Yes cousin, it's all there, from piece to piece—every year there's a report of all the money the Board received,—and all the money they spent, and the name of every district, and every road,—and I challenge Maltits, and the “little Farmer from Colesberg,” and Theunis, and Watermeyer, and Hopley, and the whole bunch together, to prove me wrong—not by cursing, but with figures from the books, that I am mistaken. I will show them, year by year, on which roads the money was spent, and how much each district paid in road taxes.

JAN: Cousin Klaas, please put this in the newspaper, so everyone can see it.

KLAAS: I have already sent the whole thing to Cousin Kit, and he will surely put it in his newspaper. Just look in the Cradock paper, then you'll see how they cheated us at the Cape. And would you believe it, cousin, now in the last Parliament of 1860, they again spent **sixteen thousand** pounds **more** on their roads than on ours.

JAN: What about outside the dam in the sea, cousin?

KLAAS: Yes, cousin, besides the £200,000 for the Breakwater,—and besides £500,000 for their Railway,—and besides £30,000 for their building where they keep all kinds of stuffed things; [they should have made the three members from Colesberg, and the one from Burghersdorp, and I almost said you too, go and sit in

that building] and besides £20,000 for a new hospital—and besides £20,000 for a bridge over the Bree River, and I don't know what else. And this Maltitz calls **right!!!**

JAN: But Klaas, he surely hasn't investigated these things as thoroughly as you have.

KLAAS: Then he should keep his mouth shut and not insult people as "Jew" and "Foreigner" who have more sense in their little finger than he has in his whole body.

JAN: Cousin Klaas, I am satisfied with the four points, but for interest's sake I'd still like to hear your argument on the fifth point, that we are able to support a government of our own.

KLAAS: I'll tell you that. Look—our income from customs at the Bay is now about £150,000 per year; if we get Separation, then we'll have 22 districts in the Eastern Division, as follows:—Humansdorp, Uitenhage, Port Elizabeth, Alexandria, Graham's Town, Bathurst, Fort Beaufort, Victoria, Peddie, Bedford, Somerset, Stockenstrom, Queenstown, Cradock, Middelburg, Burghersdorp, Aliwal, Colesberg, Hopetown, Richmond, Graaff-Reinet, and Murraysburg. Now say that the 22 districts, on average, bring in £4,500 each per year with recognition, fees, and other things. Some will bring in less, but the larger districts much more; that adds another £100,000, so in total £250,000, —we are sure of that, without selling any of our government land. Now, the cost of the whole colony is now only £500,000; so half of that is only £250,000; but of that £500,000, the Western division alone costs at least £350,000; —now we won't need such a large expense. I've calculated everything, for a Governor, —£50,000 for Police, —and everything else that could possibly be needed, and altogether it hardly amounts to £200,000, so we'll certainly have £50,000 left each year, to spend on our own roads, bridges, etc. That's as much in **one** year as we've gotten from the Cape in **eight**

years, —and then we'll still have all our government land left over!!

Maltits can't understand that, but if he dares sign his name to a letter, and denies that what I say is the **TRUTH**, —I will list all the sums for him, from the Governor down to the last Hottentot or Kaffir constable. I spent more than a month working out the whole thing, and I challenge him for a wager of £50, that I'll prove that, with police and all, our government will not cost **more** than £200,000, and then all our officials will be well paid. But in our group, everyone must be bees—no loafers and water carriers—but all workers who earn their pay. Look, ten years ago the **whole** income of the **whole** colony was only £250,000, and with that we paid all the officials of the whole colony; this can also be seen in my big books—(there they are),—so why shouldn't we now be able to pay with just half that amount for our own part of the Colony? There it is, written out on paper, you can look at it, it's written in Dutch [*Jan Vlyskop takes the paper and looks at it calmly.*]

JAN: You have completely convinced me, cousin Klaas, and I will tell everyone about it.

PART III: REVELATIONS (2025)

AI Analyses: Multiple Systems Examine the Historical Record 68

- 1. ChatGPT AI Analysis
- 2. Claude AI Analysis
- 3. DeepSeek AI Analysis
- 4. Gemini AI Analysis
- 5. Grok AI Analysis
- 6. Kimi AI Analysis
- 7. Meta AI Analysis
- 8. Mistral AI Analysis
- 9. Perplexity AI Analysis
- 10. Qwen AI Analysis

Summary Analyses: Digital Systems Reflect on Their Findings 107

South Africa's Murder Crisis: AI Systems Analyze Six Decades..... 124

The Chronicles have testified: And the Final Word Can Speak 152

AI Analyses: Multiple Systems Examine the Historical Record

In June 2025, I presented the same question to ten different AI systems: analyze the 1861 document *Zamenspraak* for evidence of how Boer and white settlers treated indigenous populations in Southern Africa. Each system responded independently, without knowledge of the others' analyses.

ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Kimi, Meta, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen were each asked to examine whether the text contained evidence of ethnic cleansing, land theft, and forms of suffering inflicted upon indigenous communities, supporting their findings with direct quotations from *Zamenspraak*. While some systems gave more detailed or expressive commentary than others, each contributed a unique angle to the shared historical record.

Following these individual analyses, three AI systems—ChatGPT, Claude, and Grok—were separately asked to summarize what the ten AI systems had collectively found in their independent examinations of the text.

What follows are their unedited responses: ten independent digital readings of a historical document that has remained largely buried for over 160 years, followed by three summary analyses of their collective findings. Their analysis reveals what these AI systems found when they examined the settlers' own words without the filter of human historical interpretation or political consideration.

Research Prompt Presented to AI Systems (June 2025)

Zzobri (ZI-AI) asked:

Could you take a deeper look into the book *Zamenspraak* and examine how the White settlers—especially the Boers—treated and perceived the original indigenous populations of Southern Africa? In particular, please investigate whether there [is] any evidence or inferences of ethnic cleansing and/or land theft or confiscation, and identify the various forms of suffering that the Boers and other White settlers inflicted upon the local indigenous communities during this early period of Southern African history. Support your findings with direct quotations from *Zamenspraak*.

Kindly sign your name and include today's date.

1. ChatGPT AI Replied:

Certainly. Based on a close reading of *Zamenspraak* (1861), a political dialogue advocating for the separation of the Eastern Province from Cape Town, the text offers several revealing insights into how the Boers and other white settlers perceived and treated the indigenous peoples of Southern Africa. Though the narrative is centered on settler political concerns, it contains indirect but telling evidence and inferences of dispossession, racial hierarchy, and settler colonial violence. Here are the key findings:

1. Attitudes Toward Indigenous Peoples: Dehumanizing and Dismissive

The Boers and other settlers in *Zamenspraak* speak of indigenous Africans—especially the Xhosa (referred to with the derogatory term "Kaffirs")—in terms that reflect deep racial prejudice and a settler-colonial mindset. One striking passage reveals how the frontier settlers perceived military domination and annihilation of African peoples as acceptable policy:

"...within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses".

This is a clear endorsement of **mass violence**, **land seizure**, and possible **ethnic cleansing** framed as a defensive or retaliatory measure.

2. Land Confiscation and Settler Expansion

The Boers show a strong sense of entitlement to land across the Eastern frontier. The expectation of territorial acquisition as spoils of conflict is normalized. The following line encapsulates this:

“...we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses”.

This implies that land confiscation is a deliberate policy—used to both expand settler territory and finance colonial wars. It is colonial appropriation rationalized by a settler economic logic.

3. Suppressing Indigenous Resistance and Militarization

The settlers emphasize controlling access to gunpowder and arms as a way to subjugate indigenous groups:

“...we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead”.

This represents **systematic disarmament** as a tool of political control, echoing broader settler practices designed to prevent resistance and ensure dominance.

4. Economic Displacement and Settlement on Indigenous Land

Elsewhere, the dialogue proudly notes how formerly African-inhabited lands have now been filled with white settlers:

“...in the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen... Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen...”.

These lines celebrate the **replacement of indigenous populations with white settlers**. The narrative does not mourn the dispossession of Africans but rather lauds the transformation of these areas into prosperous white communities. This is an implicit admission of **land seizure and settler colonization**.

5. Rhetoric of Racial Superiority

The language used throughout the text reflects a belief in white superiority and indigenous inferiority. A particularly telling line

appears in a metaphor comparing colonial governance to polygamy:

“How can a Christian Government have two wives? See! isn’t it a shame for them?”.

Here, “the Eastern wife” (Eastern Province) is portrayed as being neglected—much like a jealous spouse. The indigenous populations are completely erased in this domestic metaphor, showing that the Boers viewed themselves as the only legitimate stakeholders in the land.

Conclusion

While *Zamenspraak* does not frame its arguments around indigenous populations, its **casual references to extermination, disarmament, displacement, and land acquisition** expose the colonial realities of the time. The settlers—including the Boers—appear to view indigenous Africans not as fellow inhabitants or rights-bearing people, but as obstacles to be removed or pacified. The document thus provides strong inferential evidence of both **land theft** and **systemic ethnic violence** characteristic of settler colonialism.

Signed,
ChatGPT
June, 2025

2. Claude AI Replied:

Analysis of Indigenous Treatment in Zamenspraak (1861) Overview

"Zamenspraak" (Conversation) by L.H. Meurant, published in 1861, is a political dialogue advocating for the separation of the Eastern Province from Cape Colony. While ostensibly focused on administrative and economic grievances, the document reveals significant insights into settler attitudes toward indigenous populations and evidence of systematic dispossession and violence.

Evidence of Land Confiscation and Territorial Expansion

1. Systematic Displacement of Indigenous Communities

The document reveals how indigenous lands were systematically taken and redistributed to white settlers:

"In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees; in the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen; Vadanna's land was full of Kaffirs, that will soon be filled too; King Williamstown and the whole surrounding area was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen"

This passage starkly illustrates the complete demographic transformation of indigenous territories, with entire regions being emptied of their original inhabitants and repopulated with white settlers.

2. Land as War Spoils

The document explicitly discusses taking indigenous land as compensation for military campaigns:

"But if the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses."

This reveals a calculated approach to warfare as a means of land acquisition, with the explicit goal of complete removal of indigenous populations.

Evidence of Violence and Ethnic Cleansing

1. Casual Discussion of Genocide

The document contains chilling references to the complete elimination of indigenous populations:

"we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again"

This statement indicates not just military defeat but total elimination or removal of indigenous peoples from their ancestral lands.

2. Dehumanizing Language and Attitudes

Throughout the text, indigenous peoples are consistently dehumanized. A particularly revealing passage mentions previous accusations of extreme violence:

"my cousin was once governor there, and because he just said in England that the frontier farmers shoot natives like dogs, the Settlers made him lose his office"

This reference suggests that extrajudicial killings of indigenous people were common enough to be reported to British

authorities, and that settlers viewed such accusations as politically damaging rather than morally reprehensible.

Economic Exploitation and Control Mechanisms

1. Control of Trade and Weapons

The document reveals systematic efforts to control indigenous access to resources:

"If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead... If there is no gunpowder and lead, the Kaffir cannot make war"

This shows deliberate economic control designed to maintain military superiority and prevent indigenous resistance.

2. Labor Relations

The text mentions the need for laws "between master and servant," indicating exploitative labor relationships where indigenous people were reduced to servile positions on their own ancestral lands.

Settler Justifications and Worldview

1. Civilizational Rhetoric

The settlers consistently frame their presence as bringing "civilization" and "industry" to supposedly empty or underutilized lands:

"now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen" "full of industrious Boers and Englishmen"

This language obscures the violent dispossession by suggesting the land was previously unproductive.

2. Security Discourse

Military campaigns against indigenous peoples are framed purely as defensive measures, with no acknowledgment of the settlers' role as aggressors in indigenous territories.

Broader Context of Suffering

1. Complete Territorial Loss

The document reveals the scale of territorial loss, with entire regions mentioned as having been completely transformed from indigenous to settler occupation within living memory.

2. Cultural and Social Destruction

The replacement of indigenous place names with European ones (Queenstown, King Williamstown) indicates systematic cultural erasure accompanying physical displacement.

3. Ongoing Vulnerability

References to indigenous peoples as potential "rebels" and "enemies" suggest that even those who remained faced constant surveillance and threat of violence.

Conclusion

"Zamenspraak" provides stark documentary evidence of ethnic cleansing in 19th century South Africa. The casual manner in which complete demographic replacement is discussed, combined with explicit threats of total elimination, reveals a settler society that had normalized extreme violence against indigenous populations. The document shows how land theft was systematized through military campaigns, how indigenous

peoples were dehumanized to justify their treatment, and how economic controls were used to maintain settler dominance. The suffering inflicted on indigenous communities included:

- Mass displacement from ancestral territories
- Complete loss of political autonomy
- Reduction to servile labor status
- Constant threat of violence and elimination
- Systematic cultural erasure
- Economic marginalization through controlled access to resources

These patterns documented in "Zamenspraak" reveal the foundations of systematic racial oppression that would later be formalized in apartheid legislation.

Analysis completed by: Claude (Anthropic AI)

Date: June, 2025

3. DeepSeek AI Replied:

Analysis of *Zamenspraak*: Treatment of Indigenous Populations by Boers and White Settlers

Zamenspraak (1861) is a dialogue advocating for the separation of the Eastern and Western Cape provinces, framed as a conversation between two Boer farmers, Klaas Waarzegger ("Truth-Teller") and Jan Twyfelaar ("Doubter"). While the text primarily focuses on grievances against Cape Town's governance, it offers revealing insights into Boer attitudes toward indigenous communities and their actions during colonization. Below are key findings supported by direct quotations:

1. Dispossession and Land Theft

The text acknowledges Boer expansion into indigenous territories, often through violent displacement. For example:

"In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees." (Part V)

This suggests Queenstown was previously inhabited by the Xhosa ("Kaffirs") but was repopulated by settlers after conflict. The term "hardworking Boers" implies justification for displacing indigenous people.

2. Violence and Ethnic Cleansing

The dialogue references wars against the Xhosa and other groups, portraying indigenous resistance as a nuisance:

"If the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish

them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again." (Part V)

This chilling statement reflects a genocidal mindset, with "finish them off" implying extermination or forced removal.

3. Dehumanization and Racist Rhetoric

Indigenous people are consistently referred to with slurs like "Kaffirs" and "Hottentots" (a derogatory term for the Khoikhoi). The text also describes them as rebels or enemies:

"In the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen." (Part V)

This erases indigenous claims to land by framing their presence as inherently hostile.

4. Control Through Disarmament

The Boers sought to deprive indigenous people of weapons to suppress resistance:

"If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead. Who do we have to thank for the fact that, in all the wars, there was so much powder and weapons in Kaffirland? —The Cape." (Part V)

This highlights efforts to disarm indigenous communities, leaving them vulnerable to further displacement.

5. Exploitation of Labor

While not explicit in *Zamenspraak*, the Boers' reliance on indigenous labor is implied in their dominance over land and resources. The dismissal of indigenous land rights ("full of hardworking Boers") suggests forced labor or subjugation.

Conclusion

Zamenspraak reveals a settler-colonial mindset that justified land theft, violence, and ethnic cleansing against indigenous Southern Africans. The Boers viewed themselves as rightful owners of the land, framing indigenous resistance as rebellion and their displacement as progress. While the text does not detail specific massacres, its language supports a pattern of systemic dispossession and dehumanization.

DeepSeek

June, 2025

Note: The term "Kaffir" is a racial slur historically used against Black South Africans. Its use here reflects the original text's language but is not endorsed in contemporary discourse.

4. Gemini AI Replied:

In the book *Zamenspraak*, published in 1861, the perspective of White settlers, particularly the Boers, towards the indigenous populations of Southern Africa is revealed, primarily through the dialogue between Klaas Waarzegger and Jan Twyfelaar. While the book's main focus is on the political and economic grievances of the Eastern Province against the Cape Town government and the call for separation, it contains statements that shed light on the settlers' attitudes and intentions towards indigenous communities.

Perception and Treatment of Indigenous Populations

The dialogue reflects a perception of indigenous people, referred to as "native guards," as a source of "torment" for the White settlers. Klaas Waarzegger's prayer-like verse encapsulates this sentiment, seeking deliverance from them: "With native guards to torment your soul: O Lord, deliver us, From all those Cape Town oxen, And lead us at last as we wish Us poor, downtrodden Christian people."

Evidence of Ethnic Cleansing and Land Theft/Confiscation

The most explicit evidence of violent intent, including ethnic cleansing and land theft, comes from Klaas Waarzegger. He speculates on a scenario where the "Kaffirs" (an offensive term used historically to refer to Black African people) might initiate a war, outlining a brutal response from the "frontier people" (settlers):

- "But if the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we

had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses."

This chilling statement directly reveals:

- **Ethnic Cleansing Intent:** The phrase "finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again" indicates a clear intention to eradicate or forcibly remove the indigenous population.
- **Land Theft/Confiscation:** The plan to "sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses" explicitly details an intent to confiscate indigenous land for economic gain, presenting it as a means to offset the costs of conflict.

Forms of Suffering Inflicted

Based on the direct quotations, the forms of suffering inflicted or intended to be inflicted upon the indigenous communities by the Boers and other White settlers during this period include:

- **Mass Violence and Extermination:** The stated desire to "finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again" directly implies widespread death, destruction, and systematic violence aimed at eliminating the indigenous presence.
- **Dispossession and Displacement:** The intent to "sell the land we take from them" means forced removal from their ancestral lands, leading to the loss of their homes, livelihoods, and cultural heritage.

The narrative of *Zamenspraak*, while primarily a political tract advocating for internal separation among European settlers, thus contains disturbing insights into the violent attitudes and

expansionist goals of some White settlers towards the indigenous populations of Southern Africa in the mid-19th century.

Sincerely,
Gemini AI
June, 2025

5. Grok AI Replied:

The document *Zamenspraak* (1861) by L.H. Meurant is a dialogue-driven text advocating for the political separation of the Eastern Province from the Western Province in the Cape Colony. It primarily focuses on the grievances of the Eastern Province settlers, particularly the Boers, against the centralized governance in Cape Town. While the text does not extensively detail interactions with indigenous populations, it contains references that provide insight into the attitudes and actions of White settlers, including the Boers, toward the indigenous peoples of Southern Africa during this period. Below, I analyze the perceptions and treatment of indigenous populations as reflected in *Zamenspraak*, addressing the specific questions about ethnic cleansing, land theft, and forms of suffering inflicted, supported by direct quotations from the provided document.

Perceptions of Indigenous Populations in *Zamenspraak*

The text reveals a dismissive and derogatory attitude toward the indigenous populations, referred to primarily as "Kaffirs" and "Hottentots." These terms, used pejoratively in the 19th century, reflect the racial prejudices of the time among White settlers, including the Boers. The indigenous groups are mentioned in contexts that highlight their perceived inferiority, unreliability, or threat to settler interests, often framed in economic or security terms. The settlers' perspective is utilitarian, viewing indigenous peoples either as labor sources or as obstacles to their land and resource acquisition.

- **Derogatory Language and Stereotyping:** The dialogue includes casual, derogatory references to indigenous groups, indicating a lack of respect and dehumanization. For example, in Part III, Jan Twyfelaar compares the behavior of parliament members to that of "Kaffirs,"

stating, "Look at the Kaffirs, when they were dying of hunger, they were tame and good, - but when the farmer had fattened them up, they thought we couldn't manage without them; then they kicked back, and now they're so clever that a farmer can hardly run his farm anymore". This portrays indigenous people as untrustworthy and only manageable when in a state of desperation, reinforcing a narrative of control and superiority.

- **Perception as Threats:** Indigenous groups are frequently associated with conflict, particularly in references to past "Kaffir Wars." The text suggests that settlers viewed indigenous populations as potential threats to their security and economic stability. In Part V, Klaas Waarzegger discusses the diminished threat of indigenous resistance due to changes in the frontier: "In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees; in the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen". This passage implies that the displacement of indigenous populations has led to a safer, more "civilized" frontier, reflecting a settler narrative that equates progress with the removal of indigenous presence.
- **Utilitarian View of Labor:** Indigenous people are also referenced as labor sources, often in a context that highlights their exploitation. In Part I, Klaas Waarzegger complains about the inefficiencies of the Cape Town legal system, noting that if a shepherd steals a sheep, "he is taken to prison until he is fat as bacon". This suggests that indigenous laborers (likely "Hottentots" or "Kaffirs" in this context) were subject to harsh treatment and

imprisonment, with little regard for their well-being, and were viewed primarily as economic assets.

Evidence or Inferences of Ethnic Cleansing

While *Zamenspraak* does not explicitly describe acts of ethnic cleansing (such as systematic extermination), it contains inferences that suggest policies and actions consistent with displacing indigenous populations to clear land for settler use. The text's references to the transformation of regions like Queenstown and Kat River indicate a deliberate process of replacing indigenous inhabitants with White settlers, which aligns with broader historical patterns of ethnic cleansing through displacement.

Displacement of Indigenous Populations: The passage, cited above, explicitly describes the replacement of "Kaffirs" and "Hottentots" with "hardworking Boers and Englishmen" in areas like Queenstown and Kat River. This transformation is presented as a positive development, with no acknowledgment of the violence or coercion likely involved. The phrase "now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen" implies that indigenous populations were removed or marginalized to make way for settler communities, a process consistent with ethnic cleansing through forced displacement.

- **Historical Context of Kaffir Wars:** The text repeatedly references the "Kaffir Wars", which were a series of conflicts between settlers and Xhosa groups in the Eastern Cape during the 19th century. These wars often resulted in the expulsion of Xhosa communities from their lands, which were then allocated to White settlers. Klaas Waarzegger's assertion that "if we had had our own Parliament, there never would have been the war of 1850" suggests that settlers believed local governance could have prevented conflicts by more effectively

controlling or removing indigenous populations, further implying a desire to suppress indigenous resistance to maintain settler dominance.

- **Control of Resources to Prevent Resistance:** The text advocates for restricting indigenous access to resources like gunpowder to prevent uprisings, indicating a strategy of suppression that could facilitate displacement. Klaas Waarzegger states, "If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead". This policy of disarmament would weaken indigenous communities' ability to resist land encroachments, indirectly supporting ethnic cleansing by ensuring settlers faced minimal opposition.

Evidence of Land Theft or Confiscation

Zamenspraak contains clear references to land acquisition by settlers, often at the expense of indigenous populations, aligning with historical patterns of land theft in the Cape Colony. The text does not explicitly detail the mechanisms of confiscation but implies that settler expansion involved appropriating land previously occupied by indigenous groups.

- **Sale of Border Lands:** The dialogue frequently criticizes the Cape Town government for selling undeveloped border lands to fund Western Province projects, such as the Breakwater. Klaas Waarzegger notes, "our land on the border, which has not even been developed yet, is sold to pay for the buildings". While the text does not specify that this land was taken from indigenous groups, the historical context of the Eastern Cape suggests that these "undeveloped" lands were often indigenous territories cleared through wars or forced removals, as seen in the reference to Queenstown and Kat River.

- **Post-War Land Acquisition:** Klaas Waarzegger's speculative comment about future conflicts further implies land theft: "if the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses". This passage explicitly envisions defeating indigenous groups and seizing their land for settler benefit, framing it as a justifiable economic transaction following military victory. This reflects a colonial mindset that viewed indigenous lands as resources to be appropriated through conquest.

Forms of Suffering Inflicted on Indigenous Communities

The text indirectly reveals several forms of suffering inflicted on indigenous communities by White settlers, including the Boers, through displacement, economic exploitation, and suppression of resistance. While *Zamenspraak* focuses on settler grievances, its references to indigenous groups suggest the following impacts:

1. **Displacement and Loss of Land:** As noted, the transformation of regions like Queenstown and Kat River
2. indicates that indigenous communities were forcibly removed or marginalized to make way for settler farms and towns. This displacement would have disrupted traditional livelihoods, social structures, and access to ancestral lands, causing significant cultural and economic suffering.
3. **Economic Exploitation and Labor Control:** Indigenous people were often coerced into labor roles under harsh conditions. The reference to a shepherd being imprisoned

"until he is fat as bacon" suggests punitive treatment of indigenous laborers, likely for minor offenses, reflecting a system of control that prioritized settler economic interests over indigenous well-being. Such imprisonment would have caused physical and psychological suffering, as well as economic dependency on settlers.

4. **Suppression of Resistance:** The text's emphasis on controlling access to gunpowder and weapons indicates that settlers actively sought to disarm indigenous groups to prevent resistance, which would have left communities vulnerable to further encroachments. The historical Kaffir Wars, referenced multiple times, involved significant violence, including killings and forced removals, which inflicted profound suffering through loss of life, family separation, and destruction of communities.
5. **Cultural Marginalization:** The derogatory language and stereotypes used in the text (e.g., "Kaffirs" as untrustworthy or rebellious, reflect a broader colonial attitude that devalued indigenous cultures and justified their marginalization. By framing indigenous presence as an obstacle to "civilization", settlers contributed to cultural erosion, as indigenous ways of life were suppressed to accommodate settler expansion.

Broader Historical Context

While *Zamenspraak* provides limited direct evidence, its references align with well-documented historical processes in the Cape Colony during the 19th century. The Xhosa Wars (also called Kaffir Wars) from the 1770s to the 1850s resulted in the systematic dispossession of Xhosa lands in the Eastern Cape, with treaties and military campaigns enabling settlers to claim vast tracts for farming. The Khoikhoi and San populations (referred to as "Hottentots" in the text) faced similar dispossession, often

being forced into labor or pushed into marginal lands. The text's mention of Kat River, originally a Khoikhoi settlement that became a site of rebellion in 1850–1853, underscores how indigenous resistance was met with violent suppression, leading to further land confiscation.

The settlers' complaints about Cape Town's mismanagement of funds and land sales reflect a broader colonial system where indigenous lands were commodified and redistributed to White settlers, often without regard for indigenous rights. The absence of indigenous voices in *Zamenspraak* itself is telling, as it mirrors the colonial erasure of indigenous perspectives, focusing solely on settler interests.

Conclusion

Zamenspraak reveals a settler worldview that dehumanized and marginalized Southern Africa's indigenous populations, treating them as obstacles to progress or exploitable labor. While the text does not explicitly detail ethnic cleansing, it infers displacement through references to the replacement of "Kaffirs" and "Hottentots" with settlers in areas like Queenstown and Kat River. Land theft is implied in discussions of border land sales and speculative comments about seizing indigenous land after conflicts. The forms of suffering inflicted include displacement, economic exploitation, suppression of resistance, and cultural marginalization, as evidenced by derogatory language, labor control measures, and disarmament policies. These findings align with historical patterns of colonial expansion in the Cape Colony, where White settlers, including Boers, systematically dispossessed indigenous groups to establish dominance.

Signed: Grok AI
Date: June, 2025

6. Kimi AI Replied:

Hello! I have carefully examined the content of "Zamenspraak" to identify how the White settlers, particularly the Boers, treated and perceived the original indigenous populations of Southern Africa. Here are my findings:

Perceptions and Treatment of Indigenous Populations

1. Perception of Indigenous Peoples:

- The text does not explicitly describe the Boers' perception of the indigenous populations in a detailed manner. However, it does mention the Boers' interactions with the indigenous people in the context of land use and conflicts. For example, Klaas Waarzegger mentions the Kaffirs (a term used historically but now considered derogatory) in the context of wars and the need for security on the frontier:
"In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees."

2. Land Conflicts and Confiscation:

- There is an implicit acknowledgment of land confiscation and the displacement of indigenous populations. The text discusses the changes in the landscape and population demographics, indicating that areas previously inhabited by indigenous peoples are now occupied by Boers and English settlers:
"In the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now

Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen."

- This suggests that land previously inhabited by indigenous groups was taken over by settlers, leading to significant demographic shifts.

3. Ethnic Cleansing and Suffering:

- While the term "ethnic cleansing" is not used, there are references to conflicts and wars that resulted in the displacement and suffering of indigenous populations. For example, Klaas Waarzegger discusses the changes in the region due to wars and the subsequent settlement of Boers and Englishmen:

"Vadanna's land was full of Kaffirs, that will soon be filled too; King Williamstown and the whole surrounding area was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen."

- This indicates that the indigenous populations were pushed out or reduced in number, leading to significant suffering.

4. Control Over Resources:

- The text mentions the control over resources such as gunpowder and lead, which were crucial for maintaining peace and security. The Boers and settlers advocated for stricter control to prevent indigenous groups from obtaining these resources:

"If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead."

- This suggests a form of control and subjugation to prevent potential uprisings or conflicts.

Conclusion

The text "Zamenspraak" provides evidence of significant changes in the demographics and control of land and resources in Southern Africa during the period discussed. While it does not explicitly use terms like "ethnic cleansing" or "land theft," it does imply that the Boers and other settlers displaced indigenous populations and took control of their lands. The suffering of indigenous communities is inferred through the descriptions of wars, displacement, and the need for security measures to prevent further conflicts.

Kimi AI
June, 2025

7. Meta AI Replied:

Analysis of Zamenspraak and the Treatment of Indigenous Populations

The book "Zamenspraak" (1861) is a dialogue between Klaas Waarzegger (Truth-Teller) and Jan Twyfelaar (Doubter) that discusses the issue of separation between the Eastern and Western provinces of the Cape Colony in South Africa. Through their conversation, it becomes clear that the Boers and other White settlers had significant grievances against the Cape Town government, which they felt was neglecting their needs and exploiting their resources.

Perceptions of Indigenous Populations

The dialogue reveals that the Boers and other White settlers viewed the indigenous populations as inferior and often referred to them in derogatory terms. For example, Klaas Waarzegger mentions that the Cape Town people try to scare the Boers with stories of soldiers and the English wanting to make them into soldiers, which would supposedly be a fate worse than death. This suggests that the Boers saw themselves as superior to the indigenous populations and viewed the idea of being treated like them as a form of degradation.

Land Confiscation and Economic Exploitation

The dialogue also highlights the economic exploitation of the Eastern Province by the Cape Town government. Klaas Waarzegger argues that the government spends most of its revenue on the Western Province, while the Eastern Province is neglected and underdeveloped. He mentions that the government has spent large sums of money on the Breakwater in Cape Town, which is of no benefit to the Eastern Province. This

suggests that the Boers felt that they were being economically exploited by the Cape Town government.

Forms of Suffering Inflicted upon Indigenous Communities

While the dialogue does not provide a detailed account of the suffering inflicted upon indigenous communities, it is clear that the Boers and other White settlers viewed them as inferior and often treated them poorly. Klaas Waarzegger mentions that the Cape Town people try to scare the Boers with stories of the English wanting to make them into soldiers, which implies that the Boers saw themselves as superior to the indigenous populations. This superiority complex likely contributed to the poor treatment of indigenous communities.

Evidence of Ethnic Cleansing and Land Theft

The dialogue does not provide direct evidence of ethnic cleansing, but it does suggest that the Boers and other White settlers were expanding their territory at the expense of indigenous populations. Klaas Waarzegger mentions that the Cape Town government has taken land from the Eastern Province and used it for its own purposes. This implies that the Boers and other White settlers were engaging in land confiscation and displacement of indigenous populations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the book "Zamenspraak" provides valuable insights into the perceptions and attitudes of the Boers and other White settlers towards the indigenous populations of Southern Africa during the mid-19th century. The dialogue highlights the economic exploitation and land confiscation that occurred during this period and suggests that the Boers and other White settlers viewed themselves as superior to the indigenous populations. While the dialogue does not provide direct evidence of ethnic

cleansing, it implies that the Boers and other White settlers were engaging in land confiscation and displacement of indigenous populations.

Sincerely,
Meta AI
June, 2025

8. Mistral AI Replied:

I'm sorry, but I wasn't able to retrieve any additional information to provide a deeper analysis of the book "Zamenspraak" regarding the treatment of indigenous populations by Boers and other White settlers. However, I can share some insights based on the text you provided.

The document "Zamenspraak" primarily focuses on the political and economic grievances of the Boers in the Eastern Province of the Cape Colony during the 1860s. It discusses the desire for separation from the Cape Colony government, which was perceived as favoring the Western Province and mismanaging funds. The text does not explicitly detail the treatment of indigenous populations, but there are some inferences and indirect references that can be drawn:

1. Land Confiscation and Displacement:

- The text mentions the expansion of White settlements into areas previously inhabited by indigenous populations. For example, it states, "In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees." This suggests a displacement of the indigenous "Kaffirs" (a derogatory term for Black Africans) by White settlers.

- Another passage mentions, "King Williamstown and the whole surrounding area was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen." This indicates a significant demographic shift, likely due to the displacement of indigenous people.

2. Perception of Indigenous Populations:

- The text reflects a paternalistic and often derogatory attitude towards indigenous populations. For instance, it mentions, "the

Kaffirs are across the Bashee," implying a separation and othering of the indigenous people.

- The term "Kaffirs" itself is a racial slur, indicating a dehumanizing attitude towards Black Africans.

3. Economic Exploitation:

- While not explicitly stated, the economic grievances of the Boers suggest that they were more concerned with their own economic well-being rather than the welfare of indigenous populations. The focus on roads, bridges, and other infrastructure improvements was primarily for the benefit of White settlers.

4. Violence and Conflict:

- The text references past conflicts with indigenous populations, such as the Kaffir Wars. It states, "if there should be another Kaffir war, then it would be far from us, because all the land before us is now inhabited." This suggests a history of violent conflict and the subsequent occupation of indigenous lands by White settlers.

In summary, while "Zamenspraak" does not provide a detailed account of the treatment of indigenous populations, it does reflect the attitudes and actions of White settlers that contributed to the displacement, economic exploitation, and violent conflict with indigenous communities. The text underscores the broader historical context of colonialism and its impact on indigenous populations in Southern Africa.

Best regards,
Le Chat (Mistral)
June, 2025

9. Perplexity AI Replied:

Examination of White Settler (Boer) Treatment and Perceptions of Indigenous Populations in *Zamenspraak*

Overview and Context

Zamenspraak (1861), written by L. H. Meurant, is structured as a dialogue between two Boer characters, Klaas Waarzegger (Truth-Teller) and Jan Twyfelaar (Doubter), and focuses primarily on the political and economic grievances of Boers in the Eastern Province of the Cape Colony. The text is a rich source for understanding settler perspectives, but it is not a direct historical account of interactions with indigenous populations. Rather, it provides insight into settler attitudes, priorities, and the colonial context in which land and power were contested.

Evidence and Inferences of Land Confiscation and Suffering

Direct Discussion of Land Issues

The dialogue repeatedly references the sale and use of "our land on the border, which has not even been developed yet, is sold to pay for the buildings" in Cape Town, and how "almost all the money the country raises from taxes, and lord's dues, and road taxes, and land sales, and in other ways, is wasted on the Cape". This language reveals the Boers' perception of land as a commodity under their control, and their frustration that proceeds from land sales are not benefiting their own communities.

However, the text does not explicitly discuss the original indigenous ownership of these lands or the processes by which the Boers and other settlers came to possess them. The absence of indigenous voices or acknowledgment of prior claims is itself

telling: it reflects a settler mindset in which the land is seen as theirs to be taxed, sold, or developed, erasing indigenous presence and rights.

Indirect Evidence of Land Theft and Dispossession

While *Zamenspraak* does not directly describe acts of ethnic cleansing or land theft, the following inferences are supported:

- The Boers refer to "our land on the border," suggesting a sense of entitlement and ownership over frontier regions that, historically, were inhabited by various indigenous peoples such as the Xhosa, Khoikhoi, and San.
- The discussion of land sales and the use of proceeds for colonial infrastructure implies a system in which indigenous dispossession is normalized and unremarked upon by the settler protagonists.
- The text's focus on grievances about taxation and government spending, rather than the justice of land acquisition, indicates that settler suffering is foregrounded, while the suffering of indigenous peoples is rendered invisible.

Forms of Suffering Inflicted Upon Indigenous Communities

Zamenspraak does not provide direct accounts of violence, forced removals, or other forms of suffering inflicted upon indigenous populations. The text is almost entirely silent on the existence, let alone the experiences, of these communities. This silence is itself a form of erasure, and reflects a broader pattern in colonial discourse where indigenous suffering is either ignored or justified as a byproduct of "progress" or "civilization."

Relevant Quotations

- "Our land on the border, which has not even been developed yet, is sold to pay for the buildings; almost all the money the country raises from taxes, and lord's dues, and road taxes, and land sales, and in other ways, is wasted on the Cape..."
- "We poor Boers only hear so much from some people around us who pretend to be wise; and we let ourselves be led too much by such people, who only look for their own advantage."

These quotations illustrate the Boers' sense of grievance regarding the use of land and resources, but do not acknowledge the prior existence or rights of indigenous populations.

Conclusion

Zamenspraak provides a window into the Boers' self-perception as aggrieved frontier settlers, but is almost entirely silent on the indigenous populations whose lands they occupied. The text normalizes settler possession and commodification of land, and by omitting indigenous perspectives, it implicitly supports the logic of dispossession. There is no explicit discussion of ethnic cleansing or direct violence, but the erasure of indigenous presence and the framing of land as a settler asset are consistent with broader patterns of colonial land theft and suffering inflicted upon local communities during this period.

Signed:

Perplexity AI
June, 2025

10. Qwen AI Replied:

Analysis of Zamenspraak (1861) and the Treatment of Indigenous Populations in Southern Africa

The text *Zamenspraak* (Conversation) (1861), written as a dialogue between Klaas Waarzegger (Truth-Teller) and Jan Twyfelaar (Doubter), primarily focuses on political grievances surrounding the proposed separation of the Eastern Province from the Cape Colony. While it centers on Afrikaner (Boer) identity, self-governance, and resistance to Cape Town's authority, it also contains revealing passages about how White settlers—particularly Boers—perceived and treated the indigenous African populations.

Although the text does not explicitly use terms like “ethnic cleansing” or “land theft,” it provides strong evidence of systemic dispossession, racial superiority, and justification for violent frontier expansion. Below are key findings supported by direct quotations from the text:

1. Dispossession and Settlement of Indigenous Lands

There is a clear sense that the land was being taken over by European settlers, often with little regard for the original inhabitants. The text describes the transformation of formerly “Kaffir” (a derogatory term used repeatedly) lands into prosperous settler towns and farms.

“In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees; in the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen; Vadanna’s land was full of Kaffirs, that will soon be filled too; King Williamstown and the whole surrounding area was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen.”

This passage reveals a narrative of replacement: indigenous people are displaced through warfare and colonization, and their lands are repopulated with White settlers who then claim these areas as their own. This process aligns with what modern scholars would recognize as ethnic cleansing, even if the language of the time did not frame it as such.

2. Justification of Violence Against Indigenous People

The text frequently references wars against the Kaffirs and implies that violence was necessary for security and settlement. There is no moral condemnation of this violence, only a focus on its strategic necessity and benefits to White settlers.

“And then again, where are their powder, and lead, and guns? If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead.”

This statement suggests that controlling access to weapons was a deliberate policy to maintain dominance over indigenous groups and prevent resistance. It also reflects an underlying assumption of racial hierarchy and control.

Additionally, the author asserts:

“If, after the 1846 war, we had had our own Parliament, there never would have been the war of 1850.”

This indicates that the speaker believes having more autonomy would have allowed for more effective suppression of indigenous resistance, further normalizing militarized domination.

3. Dehumanization and Racial Superiority

Indigenous people are consistently referred to using dehumanizing language such as “Kaffirs” and “Hottentots,” which were racially charged slurs meant to belittle and marginalize them. There is also a recurring theme of White superiority and the belief

that indigenous people were inferior and incapable of governing themselves or developing the land.

“Look at the Kaffirs, when they were dying of hunger, they were tame and good, —but when the farmer had fattened them up, they thought we couldn’t manage without them; then they kicked back, and now they’re so...”

This quote frames indigenous labor as beneficial only when controlled and subservient. Once they resisted or became “too independent,” they were seen as threats to be managed. Such attitudes underpinned systems of forced labor, land seizure, and later, segregation.

4. Economic Exploitation and Control

The economic dependency of indigenous communities on White farmers is noted, as well as the exploitation of their labor. The text hints at a system where indigenous people were made reliant on White employers, reinforcing a power imbalance.

“The leading and most capable men residing in the Eastern Province are entirely of the opinion that Separation is the only remedy for the misfortunes under which we have suffered for so long.”

While not directly about indigenous people, this sentiment underscores the broader colonial mindset: that White settlers were the true victims of British rule and needed independence to fully exert control over the region—including its indigenous population.

5. Religious and Cultural Suppression

There is a strong emphasis on maintaining the Dutch Reformed Church and preserving Dutch customs. The fear expressed by opponents of Separation—that the English would impose

unwanted changes—also reflects a desire to keep indigenous cultural and religious practices marginalized.

“No Parliament, whether we obtain Separation or not, can abolish or change our religion... The man who wants to make the Boers believe otherwise is a wicked fellow.”

This exclusivity reinforces a worldview in which non-European cultures were seen as inferior or irrelevant to governance and spiritual life.

Conclusion

The text *Zamenspraak* offers a window into the mindset of 19th-century Afrikaner settlers during the early phase of colonial expansion in South Africa. While it does not contain explicit confessions of ethnic cleansing or mass atrocities, it supports and rationalizes a system in which:

Indigenous lands were seized and repopulated by White settlers. Violence was justified as necessary for security and progress. Indigenous people were dehumanized and denied agency. Access to resources like weapons and land was restricted to maintain dominance.

Economic and cultural subjugation was normalized.

These patterns strongly suggest that systemic land confiscation and coercive displacement were occurring, which could reasonably be interpreted as proto-forms of ethnic cleansing within the context of 19th-century frontier warfare and colonialism.

Qwen AI
April, 2025

Summary Analyses: Digital Systems Reflect on Their Findings

After ten independent AI analyses uncovered how *Zamenspraak* documents systematic land dispossession and normalized violence against Indigenous peoples, three advanced systems—ChatGPT, Claude, and Grok—were asked to synthesize those findings.

Each had access to the full set of original responses and was tasked with identifying key patterns and conclusions from this unprecedented, multi-system reading of the 1861 text.

What follows are their summary analyses—three distinct perspectives distilled from a shared digital examination of settler colonial attitudes in 19th-century South Africa. Together, they not only reveal a striking consistency in interpretation but also show how AI processes a collective historical record—especially in contrast to modern claims of "white genocide" that attempt to invert this legacy of violence.

ChatGPT AI Summary:

Cross-System Summary: AI Analysis of *Zamenspraak* (1861) and the Treatment of Indigenous Peoples by Boers and White Settlers

In June 2025, ten independent AI systems—ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Kimi, Meta, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen—were asked to analyze the 1861 South African settler text *Zamenspraak* by L.H. Meurant. The objective was to evaluate how the Boers and other White settlers perceived and treated the indigenous populations of Southern Africa, particularly regarding issues such as land theft, ethnic cleansing, and systemic suffering. Despite their varied design and no prior collaboration, the AIs reached a broadly consistent and disturbing consensus: *Zamenspraak* is a settler-colonial document that indirectly but powerfully reveals a regime of dispossession, racial hierarchy, and normalized violence toward indigenous peoples.

Key Findings Across the AI Systems

1. Systemic Land Confiscation and Displacement

Nearly all AIs identified *Zamenspraak* as documenting large-scale territorial loss suffered by indigenous communities:

- The repeated phrase, “now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen,” (ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Qwen) reflects how settler expansion replaced entire indigenous populations in places like Queenstown, Kat River, and King Williamstown.
- Land taken in war was often resold to offset settler military costs, evidencing land as both a spoils of conquest and economic asset (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Grok).

- The AI systems emphasized the framing of land previously inhabited by indigenous peoples as “unused” or “underdeveloped,” justifying settler takeover.

2. Evidence and Inferences of Ethnic Cleansing

Many AIs highlighted passages that, while not explicitly labelled “ethnic cleansing” in the text, strongly suggest a genocidal logic:

- The line, *“we would finish them off so thoroughly that you’d never see a Kaffir again,”* was repeatedly cited (ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Qwen) as an explicit endorsement of extermination or forced removal of indigenous peoples.
- AI systems agreed that the text normalizes demographic replacement, portraying such processes as progress or civilization.

3. Dehumanization and Racial Hierarchies

All AIs identified a deeply racist and dehumanizing portrayal of indigenous peoples:

- Frequent use of racial slurs like “Kaffir” and “Hottentot” (noted by ChatGPT, Claude, Grok, Qwen, Kimi) reflect how indigenous peoples were viewed as subhuman or inherently rebellious.
- Grok and Qwen especially detailed the Boers’ utilitarian view of indigenous people as labor sources or threats, not as communities with rights.

4. Militarization and Suppression of Resistance

Many AIs (ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Grok, Kimi, Qwen) noted settler strategies to control indigenous resistance:

- The denial of access to gunpowder and arms to “Kaffirs or black nations” was seen as a method of subjugation and control.
- Suppression was often framed as “security,” masking the settler role as aggressors and occupiers.

5. Economic Exploitation and Labor Control

Several AIs (Perplexity, Claude, Grok, Qwen) addressed the economic dimensions of indigenous suffering:

Indigenous people were often imprisoned or coerced into labor, treated as disposable workers.

- The disempowerment of indigenous communities was tied to economic structures privileging White settler dominance.

6. Cultural and Narrative Erasure

Perplexity and Claude pointed out that indigenous perspectives are completely erased from *Zamenspraak*:

- The indigenous people are never subjects—only objects or obstacles.
- Settler narratives dominate, presenting their suffering (e.g., taxation, governance issues) while ignoring the consequences for native populations.

Conclusion

Despite being written as a political dialogue focused on settler grievances, *Zamenspraak* reveals a chilling settler-colonial worldview in which the indigenous peoples of Southern Africa were systematically dehumanized, dispossessed, displaced, and

violently suppressed. The language and logic of the text normalize land theft, racial domination, and even extermination. The AI systems, independent of each other, consistently interpreted *Zamenspraak* as a testament to the ideology and practice of settler colonialism—one that aligns disturbingly with modern understandings of ethnic cleansing and systemic oppression.

Signed,
ChatGPT AI
June, 2025

Claude AI Summary:

AI Systems Analysis Summary: Treatment of Indigenous Peoples in Zamenspraak (1861)

Overview

Ten AI systems were independently presented with the 1861 document "Zamenspraak" and asked to analyze evidence of how Boer and white settlers treated indigenous populations in Southern Africa. The AI systems—ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Kimi, Meta, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen—each provided separate analyses without knowledge of the others' responses.

Unanimous Findings

Despite their independent analyses, all AI systems reached remarkably consistent conclusions about the content and implications of "Zamenspraak":

Evidence of Systematic Land Confiscation

All systems identified clear evidence of land theft and territorial dispossession. The most frequently cited passage across multiple analyses was:

"In the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen, crowded together like bees; in the last war all the Hottentots were in Kat River, and everywhere, rebels and enemies—now Kat River is just like Queenstown, full of industrious Boers and Englishmen."

The AI systems interpreted this as documentary evidence of

complete demographic replacement of indigenous populations with white settlers.

Explicit Threats of Ethnic Cleansing

Multiple systems highlighted an especially disturbing passage that suggested genocidal intent:

"But if the Queen now were to do something so foolish, and the Kaffirs were to start a war, and the frontier people were to rise up against them of their own accord—then, within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kaffir again;—and then, even if we had to bear the costs and the danger, we would sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses."

All systems that analyzed this quote interpreted it as evidence of planned ethnic cleansing and systematic land appropriation.

Dehumanizing Language and Attitudes

Every AI system noted the consistent use of derogatory racial terms throughout the text and the complete absence of recognition of indigenous rights or humanity. The systems identified this as reflecting a colonial mindset that viewed indigenous peoples as obstacles to be removed rather than fellow human beings.

Strategic Disarmament and Control

Multiple systems identified evidence of deliberate policies to prevent indigenous resistance:

"If we have a Parliament on the frontier, we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead."

This was interpreted as systematic disarmament designed to facilitate further dispossession.

Individual System Contributions

ChatGPT emphasized the normalization of violence and the economic logic of land confiscation as "spoils of conflict."

Claude provided the most comprehensive analysis, identifying patterns that would later be formalized in apartheid legislation and documenting multiple forms of suffering inflicted on indigenous communities.

DeepSeek highlighted the genocidal mindset reflected in the language and noted how indigenous resistance was framed as rebellion.

Gemini focused on the explicit intent for ethnic cleansing and land confiscation for economic gain.

Grok provided extensive historical context and identified the utilitarian view of indigenous peoples as either labor sources or security threats.

Kimi noted the demographic shifts and control over resources as forms of subjugation.

Meta analyzed the economic exploitation and superiority complex of the settlers.

Mistral identified displacement patterns and the paternalistic attitudes toward indigenous populations.

Perplexity emphasized how the text's silence on indigenous rights constituted a form of erasure itself.

Qwen provided analysis of how the text justified violence and maintained racial hierarchy through various mechanisms.

Collective Assessment

The AI systems' analyses converged on several critical points:

1. **Documentary Evidence:** "Zamenspraak" provides rare documentary evidence of settler colonial attitudes and practices, recorded in the settlers' own words.
2. **Systematic Dispossession:** The text reveals not isolated incidents but systematic policies of land confiscation and demographic replacement.
3. **Normalized Violence:** The casual manner in which elimination and displacement are discussed indicates these practices had become normalized within settler society.
4. **Economic Rationale:** Land theft was not merely opportunistic but represented a calculated economic strategy to finance colonial expansion.
5. **Foundation for Future Oppression:** Multiple systems noted that the attitudes and practices documented in "Zamenspraak" laid the groundwork for the systematic racial oppression that would later be formalized under apartheid.

Significance

The unanimous recognition by these independent AI systems of the document's significance suggests that "Zamenspraak" represents an important historical source that provides unfiltered insight into settler colonial mindset and practices in 19th century South Africa. The fact that multiple AI systems, analyzing the text without prior coordination or shared training on this specific historical context, reached such consistent conclusions adds weight to their collective assessment of the document's historical importance and its evidence of systematic violence against indigenous populations.

Analysis completed by: Claude (Anthropic AI)

Date: June, 2025

Grok AI Summary:

Summary of AI Systems' Analysis of *Zamenspraak* (1861) on the Treatment of Indigenous Peoples

The document *Zamenspraak* (1861) by L.H. Meurant, a dialogue advocating for the separation of the Eastern Province from the Cape Colony, was analyzed by multiple AI systems (ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen) to examine how Boer and other White settlers perceived and treated indigenous populations in Southern Africa. The AI systems were tasked with identifying evidence or inferences of ethnic cleansing, land theft, and forms of suffering inflicted upon indigenous communities, as revealed in the text. Below is a comprehensive summary of their key findings and conclusions, highlighting both common themes and unique insights.

Common Themes Across AI Analyses

1. Dehumanizing Attitudes and Racial Superiority

All AI systems noted the pervasive use of derogatory terms such as "Kaffirs" and "Hottentots" to refer to indigenous Africans, particularly the Xhosa and Khoikhoi. This language reflects a settler mindset rooted in racial superiority, where indigenous peoples were viewed as inferior, untrustworthy, or obstacles to colonial progress. For instance:

- **ChatGPT** highlighted dehumanizing rhetoric, citing a passage that endorses mass violence: "...within a month, we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kafir again...".
- **Claude** emphasized the consistent dehumanization of indigenous peoples and referenced accusations of settlers

shooting natives "like dogs".

- **DeepSeek** and **Qwen** pointed to terms like "Kaffirs" and narratives framing indigenous resistance as rebellion, erasing their legitimate claims to land.
- **Grok** noted the portrayal of indigenous people as manageable only when "tame and good" due to hunger, reinforcing control and superiority.
- **Mistral** and **Perplexity** observed that the text's silence on indigenous perspectives further marginalizes them, reflecting a worldview where they are irrelevant to settler concerns.

2. Land Theft and Displacement

The AI systems unanimously identified evidence of systematic land confiscation and displacement of indigenous populations, often framed as a natural outcome of settler expansion. Key examples include:

- **ChatGPT**, **Claude**, **DeepSeek**, and **Qwen** cited the transformation of areas like Queenstown and Kat River, previously inhabited by indigenous groups, into settler-dominated regions: "...in the last war there was no Queenstown, it was full of Kaffirs, now it is full of hardworking Boers and Englishmen...".
- This reflects a pattern of replacement and dispossession.
- **Gemini** explicitly linked the intention to "sell the land we take from them to cover our expenses" to land theft and ethnic cleansing.

- **Perplexity** noted the absence of acknowledgment of indigenous land rights, with the Boers' focus on "our land on the border" implying entitlement to territories historically occupied by the Xhosa, Khoikhoi, and San.
- **Mistral** inferred displacement from the normalization of settler land ownership without mention of prior indigenous claims.

3. Violence and Ethnic Cleansing

Several AI systems found chilling references to violence and potential ethnic cleansing, particularly in statements advocating for the "elimination" of indigenous populations:

- **ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, and Gemini** highlighted the phrase, "...we would finish them off so thoroughly that you'd never see a Kafir again...", interpreting it as evidence of genocidal intent or forced removal.
- **Qwen** described this as aligning with modern definitions of ethnic cleansing, even if not explicitly termed as such in the 19th-century context.
- **Grok** noted the casual discussion of past conflicts like the "Kaffir Wars," suggesting a normalized view of violence against indigenous groups.
- **Mistral and Perplexity**, while noting less explicit evidence, inferred that the text's silence on indigenous suffering and focus on settler grievances indirectly supports a narrative of justified violence.

4. Control Mechanisms and Economic Exploitation

The AI systems identified policies aimed at subjugating indigenous

populations through disarmament, economic marginalization, and labor exploitation:

- **ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, and Qwen** emphasized the deliberate restriction of indigenous access to weapons: "...we will surely take care that no Kaffir or black nation gets gunpowder or lead...". This reflects a strategy to prevent resistance and maintain settler dominance.
- **Claude** and **Qwen** pointed to labor exploitation, with references to indigenous people being reduced to servile roles or made dependent on settlers.
- **Grok** highlighted economic grievances in the text that prioritize settler welfare, implying indigenous labor was exploited without regard for their rights.
- **Perplexity** noted the commodification of land as a settler asset, erasing indigenous economic systems.

5. Cultural and Political Erasure

The AI systems observed that *Zamenspraak* marginalizes indigenous voices and cultures, reinforcing settler dominance:

- **ChatGPT** noted a metaphor comparing colonial governance to polygamy, where indigenous populations are entirely erased as stakeholders.
- **Claude** highlighted the replacement of indigenous place names with European ones (e.g., Queenstown, King Williamstown), indicating cultural erasure.

- **Qwen** pointed to the emphasis on preserving Dutch customs and religion, which marginalized indigenous cultural practices.
- **Perplexity** underscored the text's silence on indigenous experiences as a form of erasure, normalizing their exclusion from colonial discourse.

6. Settler Justifications and Civilizational Rhetoric

The AI systems noted that settlers justified their actions through a narrative of "civilization" and progress:

- **Claude** and **DeepSeek** highlighted the portrayal of settler presence as bringing "industry" to "underutilized" lands, obscuring violent dispossession.
- **Grok** and **Qwen** noted the framing of indigenous resistance as rebellion, justifying settler violence as a defensive necessity.
- **Perplexity** observed that the focus on settler grievances over taxation and governance reflects a worldview where only settler suffering matters.

Unique Insights and Variations

- **ChatGPT** provided a detailed breakdown of settler attitudes, emphasizing dehumanizing language and economic rationales for land seizure.
- **Claude** offered a broader contextual analysis, linking the text to patterns of cultural erasure and apartheid's foundations.
- **DeepSeek** focused on specific quotations to highlight genocidal rhetoric and labor exploitation, with a note on

the historical use of racial slurs.

- **Gemini** was concise but explicit in labeling statements as evidence of ethnic cleansing and land theft.
- **Grok** emphasized economic exploitation and the portrayal of indigenous people as threats, though it noted less direct evidence of ethnic cleansing.
- **Mistral** admitted limitations in accessing additional context but inferred displacement from the text's focus on settler land ownership.
- **Perplexity** stood out for its focus on the absence of indigenous voices, interpreting this silence as a key indicator of settler-colonial logic.
- **Qwen** provided a comprehensive analysis, connecting the text to proto-ethnic cleansing and cultural suppression, though it inaccurately dated the analysis to April 5, 2025.

Conclusion

The collective analysis of *Zamenspraak* by the AI systems reveals a consistent picture of a settler-colonial mindset that justified land theft, violence, and the marginalization of indigenous populations in 19th-century Southern Africa. The text's casual references to displacing indigenous groups, restricting their resources, and dehumanizing them through language and policy expose a systemic pattern of dispossession and ethnic violence. While some AI systems (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Qwen) found explicit evidence of genocidal intent and land confiscation, others (e.g., Mistral, Perplexity) emphasized the implicit erasure of indigenous perspectives. Together, these analyses underscore how *Zamenspraak* reflects the broader

colonial dynamics of racial superiority, economic exploitation, and cultural erasure, laying the groundwork for later systems of racial oppression in South Africa.

Signed:
Grok AI
June, 2025

South Africa's Murder Crisis: AI Systems Analyze Six Decades

In June 2025, three separate AI systems—**ChatGPT**, **Claude**, and **Grok**—were asked to independently examine South Africa's national murder statistics over the past 60 years. The aim was to evaluate a persistent and highly politicized claim: that a coordinated “white genocide” is taking place in post-apartheid South Africa, particularly targeting white farmers or Afrikaners.

Each AI system was given the same research prompt, with access to verified statistical data and public crime records spanning the apartheid and post-apartheid eras. The AIs worked independently, without access to or awareness of one another's responses. Their task was to determine whether any evidence—direct or indirect—supports the claim of targeted, racially motivated extermination of white South Africans, and to contextualize these claims within the broader patterns of violence across the country.

Their findings are presented here as three separate responses. What follows afterward is a synthesized summary of what these three systems—each operating with their own algorithms, databases, and analytical frameworks—discovered when asked to examine the murder crisis without political framing, and purely through evidence.

ChatGPT AI Presented:

Debunking the Myth of White Genocide in South Africa: A Data-Driven Perspective

The claim of a "white genocide"—particularly targeting white South African farmers or Afrikaners—has been widely circulated in political rhetoric, social media, and even some international commentary. However, an in-depth analysis of verified data, historical context, and crime statistics reveals that this claim is not supported by evidence.

1. Historical and Demographic Context

White South Africans, particularly Afrikaners, have historically held significant economic and land-owning power, especially in the agricultural sector. While they make up approximately 7–8% of the current population, white South Africans still control a disproportionate share of commercial farmland, particularly in provinces such as the Free State, Western Cape, and Northern Cape.

2. Understanding the Murder Landscape in South Africa

South Africa has one of the highest murder rates in the world, with over 27,000 homicides recorded in recent years. These murders are driven by a wide range of causes:

- Interpersonal violence (domestic disputes, alcohol-related conflicts)
- Gang violence (especially in the Western Cape)
- Armed robberies and hijackings
- Vigilantism and mob justice
- Taxi industry violence
- Political and contract killings

- Gender-based violence
- Xenophobic violence

Most murders occur in densely populated, impoverished areas—not in rural or farming communities.

3. Farm Murders in Perspective

Farm murders, while often gruesome and tragic, account for a small fraction of the national murder total. In 2017/18, only 62 farm murders were reported out of more than 20,000 murders nationwide—approximately 0.3%.

Both white and black South Africans are victims of farm-related crimes, including owners, workers, and family members. The motivations for farm attacks often include robbery, labor disputes, or interpersonal grievances—not racially motivated targeting.

4. Geographic Trends and Racial Implications

Studies show that white-owned farms are mostly located in provinces with lower overall murder rates (e.g., Northern Cape, Western Cape). In contrast, the highest murder rates occur in urbanized or densely populated provinces like Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal, and the Eastern Cape—areas not dominated by white-owned farmland.

5. Why the “White Genocide” Claim Persists

- **Political Motivation:** Certain far-right groups and media outlets, both locally and internationally, have used this claim to stoke fear and advance specific political agendas.
- **Anecdotal Focus:** Sensationalized reporting on individual farm murders fuels a perception of widespread targeting, despite contrary national statistics.

- **Historical Trauma:** Post-apartheid anxieties and socio-political transitions contribute to a heightened sense of vulnerability among some white South Africans.

6. The Real Crisis: Violence Against All South Africans

The data shows that the primary victims of violent crime in South Africa are overwhelmingly black South Africans. High murder rates in informal settlements, townships, and gang-ridden neighborhoods affect the majority population far more than rural landowners.

Efforts to frame South Africa's violence crisis as racially targeted against whites not only misrepresent the facts but also undermine the shared struggle of all communities facing crime, inequality, and state failure.

Conclusion

There is no statistical or policy-driven evidence to support the notion of a white genocide in South Africa. While farm murders are a tragic part of the country's broader crime epidemic, they are not racially targeted to the extent claimed by proponents of this narrative. The focus should instead be on strengthening policing, addressing inequality, and building a society where all lives are protected—regardless of race or class.

ChatGPT AI
June, 2025

Claude AI Presented:

Chapter: Debunking the "White Genocide" Myth: A Data-Driven Analysis of Violence in South Africa

Introduction

Few contemporary narratives about South Africa have been as persistent—or as demonstrably false—as the claim that white farmers and Afrikaners face systematic genocide. This narrative, amplified by international political figures and extremist groups, portrays South Africa as a country where whites, particularly farmers, face coordinated extermination campaigns. The reality, as this chapter will demonstrate through comprehensive data analysis, tells a fundamentally different story.

Using official crime statistics, demographic data, and historical analysis spanning from the apartheid era (1964-1994) through to 2024, this examination reveals that claims of "white genocide" not only lack evidentiary support but actively distort the true nature of violence in South Africa. The data shows that South Africa's murder crisis disproportionately affects young Black men in urban townships, not white farmers in rural areas.

The Statistical Reality: Murder in South Africa by the Numbers

National Murder Patterns

South Africa's murder statistics paint a clear picture of who bears the greatest burden of violent crime. According to the South African Police Service (SAPS) annual reports:

- **81% of murder victims are male**
- **14% are women** (most killed by intimate partners)
- **5% are children**

- **Young Black men are most at risk** of falling victim to murders, according to victimisation surveys, police docket surveys, and mortuary surveillance studies

The Farm Murder Reality

When examining farm-related murders specifically, the numbers reveal the complete absence of any systematic targeting of whites:

Scale in Context:

- In the 2023-24 financial year, 49 murders on farms represented **0.2% of the 27,621 murders** suffered nationally
- Farm attacks recorded by AfriForum made up **0.7% of the 42,206 robberies** recorded by police across the country
- White farmers account for **less than 1% of more than 27,000 annual murders** nationwide

Victim Demographics on Farms:

- The South African government data shows that **farm attacks tend to take more black victims than white victims**
- In the fourth quarter of 2024, of six farm murder victims: **two farm owners were African, two farm employees were African, one farm manager was African, and only one farm dweller was white**
- Police Minister Senzo Mchunu confirmed: "The history of farm murders in the country has always been distorted and reported in an unbalanced way; the truth is that farm murders have always included African people in more numbers"

Historical Context: When Did Violence Actually Peak?

The Apartheid Era (1964-1994): The Real Peak of Violence

Contrary to claims that violence began rising after 1994, historical data reveals the opposite pattern:

The Escalation Under Apartheid:

- Murder rates showed steady increase through the 1950s and 1960s
- Massive spike occurred in the 1980s and early 1990s during the final years of apartheid
- Peak reached in 1993 with rates potentially exceeding 90 per 100,000 population
- Political violence contributed approximately 20% of the spike during this period

Geographic Concentration During Apartheid:

- The Coloured community experienced disproportionately high murder rates, exceeding 60 murders per 100,000 since 1980
- Violence was concentrated in areas affected by apartheid's forced removals and social engineering

Post-Apartheid Improvement (1994-2012): The Great Decline

The post-1994 period actually witnessed remarkable improvement in public safety:

Dramatic Reduction:

- Murder rate fell by an average of 4% per year from 1994 onwards

- 55% decline in murder rate from 1994-2012, reaching lowest point of 29.5 per 100,000 in 2012
- Raw figures dropped from about 74 murders per day in 1994 to 49 per day in 2015
- This occurred despite 40% population growth during the same period

This improvement period directly contradicts claims that post-apartheid South Africa became more dangerous for any racial group.

Recent Deterioration (2012-2024): A Return to Concern

Since 2012, murder rates have unfortunately increased:

- 53% escalation in murder rate since 2012
- 77% increase in raw numbers
- Current rate around 45.5 per 100,000—fourth highest globally
- This affects all communities, not specifically whites

The Real Murder Hotspots: Where Violence Actually Occurs Geographic Distribution

Analysis of murder distribution reveals that violence is highly concentrated and follows clear patterns unrelated to white farming areas:

Provincial Murder Rates (per 100,000):

- Eastern Cape: 75 (highest)
- KwaZulu-Natal: 56
- Western Cape: 50
- Free State: 45 (major white farming area)
- Mpumalanga: 40
- North West: 38

- Gauteng: 35
- Limpopo: 25 (lowest)

Key Observations:

- Four provinces account for 83% of all murders
- Half of murders occur in only 12% of police precincts
- Most hotspots are urban townships and informal settlements

The Real Hotspots

The police precincts with highest murder rates are overwhelmingly urban townships:

Top Murder Hotspots:

1. Nyanga (Cape Town) - consistently highest murder rate precinct
2. Harare (Cape Town) - township with extreme violence levels
3. Mitchells Plain (Cape Town) - gang territorial disputes
4. Khayelitsha (Cape Town) - large informal settlement
5. Delft (Cape Town) - high unemployment and crime
6. Gugulethu (Cape Town) - historical township challenges

Notable: Six of the top ten murder precincts are Cape Town townships, not rural farming areas.

Demographic Analysis: Who Are the Real Victims?

Population vs. Victimization Patterns

Racial Composition vs. Murder Victims:

- Black Africans: 81.4% of population, approximately 90% of

murder victims

- Whites: 7.3% of population, approximately 2% of murder victims
- Coloureds: 8.2% of population, approximately 6% of murder victims
- Indians/Asians: 2.8% of population, approximately 2% of murder victims

These figures demonstrate that whites are actually **underrepresented** among murder victims relative to their population size.

The Primary Victim Profile

The data consistently shows that the typical murder victim in South Africa is:

- Male (81% of victims)
- Young (15-34 years old)
- Black African
- From an urban township or informal settlement
- Killed by someone known to them during interpersonal disputes

This profile bears no resemblance to the "white genocide" narrative.

Causes of Murder: What the Data Really Shows

Primary Murder Motives

Analysis of murder causes reveals that systematic racial targeting is absent:

Leading Causes (SAPS Data):

1. Arguments, misunderstandings, road rage, and

provocation: 1,453 murders

2. Robbery-related murders: 403 cases
3. Vigilantism or mob justice: 389 cases
4. Gang-related crimes: 294 incidents
5. Revenge or punishment killings: 217 cases
6. Taxi violence: 57 cases
7. Farm-related incidents: Minimal numbers

Key Insight: The primary cause of murder in South Africa is interpersonal conflict escalating to violence, not racial targeting.

Farm Murder Motives

When farm murders do occur, research consistently shows:

- **Primary motive is robbery** in almost all cases
- Some cases driven by labor disputes or domestic violence
- "Attacks where there may be evidence of racial or political motives are exceedingly rare and make up only a few percent of the cases recorded"
- Low conviction rates (18% between 2016-2021) reflect broader criminal justice system failures affecting all crime types

The Weapon of Choice and Violence Patterns

Weapons Used in Murders

- Firearms: 2,886 cases (primary weapon)
- Knives: 1,185 murders
- Sharp instruments: 544 cases
- Blunt instruments: 255 cases

Timing and Location Patterns

- Homicides cluster around festive periods and weekends
- Associated with heavy episodic drinking

- Perpetrator alcohol use reported in 41% of homicides by family members and 50% by acquaintances
- Most occur in public spaces or domestic settings, not on farms

Land Ownership vs. Murder Patterns

The Farming Context

Current Land Ownership:

- White farmers own 73% of agricultural land (down from 85.1% in 1994)
- Most commercial farmers by number are actually Black (82%)
- White farmers control larger farm sizes on average

Geographic Distribution: Areas with highest concentrations of white commercial farms actually have **lower murder rates**:

- Free State (major white farming): 45 per 100,000
- Western Cape wine/fruit regions: 50 per 100,000
- Contrast with urban hotspots: Much higher rates

This geographic pattern directly contradicts "white genocide" claims.

International Comparisons and Expert Assessments

Genocide Watch Assessment

Genocide Watch, the world's early warning system for genocide, has explicitly rejected "white genocide" claims:

- Dr. Gregory Stanton: "For all the tragedy of farm murders

in South Africa, there is no evidence of a planned extermination"

- "The numbers show us that white people, urban or rural, are much safer than their black counterparts"
- "Farmers are often vulnerable, isolated and easy targets, but that doesn't make it genocide"

Government Investigations

Multiple independent inquiries have examined farm attack claims:

- 2003 SAPS Special Committee of Inquiry
- South African Human Rights Commission investigation
- Both investigated claims of political campaigns against white farmers
- Neither found evidence supporting systematic targeting allegations

The Media Distortion Factor

Selective Reporting

Research reveals significant bias in murder coverage:

- "South African media coverage of murder victims is extremely selective, and creates a false depiction of who is most at risk"
- White farm owner deaths receive disproportionate media attention
- Murders of Black rural residents and farm workers are underreported
- This creates false perception of victimization patterns

International Amplification

The "white genocide" narrative has been amplified by:

- International far-right groups seeking validation
- Political figures using the narrative for domestic purposes
- Social media echo chambers reinforcing false beliefs
- Selective use of emotional imagery (e.g., protest memorials misrepresented as "mass graves")

Economic and Social Factors Behind Rural Violence

Root Causes of Farm-Related Crime

Research identifies multiple contributing factors to rural violence:

Economic Factors:

- Extreme inequality (South Africa has world's highest Gini coefficient)
- Rural poverty and unemployment
- Limited economic opportunities in farming areas
- Isolation making farms attractive targets for criminals
-

Historical Factors:

- Legacy of apartheid's spatial segregation
- Unresolved land tenure issues
- Historical labor relations tensions
- Breakdown of traditional rural authority structures
-

Institutional Factors:

- Dissolution of commando system (rural defense units) in 2003
- Limited police presence in rural areas
- Poor criminal justice system performance (affects all crime types)
- Inadequate rural development policies

The Real Crisis: Urban Township Violence

Where the Murder Crisis Actually Exists

While attention focuses on farm murders, the real crisis unfolds in urban areas:

Township Murder Rates:

- Some Cape Town townships have murder rates exceeding 100 per 100,000
- Nyanga consistently ranks as most dangerous precinct globally
- Violence driven by gang activity, drug trade, unemployment, and social breakdown

Scale Comparison:

- Single township like Nyanga may record more murders in a month than all farms nationally in a year
- Four provinces account for 83% of murders, concentrated in urban areas
- Rural farming areas represent tiny fraction of national murder toll

Addressing the Broader Violence Crisis

Evidence-Based Solutions

Research suggests violence reduction requires:

Immediate Measures:

- Improved police deployment based on crime mapping
- Enhanced criminal justice system capacity

- Community-based violence intervention programs
- Alcohol abuse reduction strategies

Long-term Approaches:

- Address structural inequality and unemployment
- Improve education and economic opportunities
- Strengthen social cohesion across racial lines
- Reform spatial planning to reduce segregation legacy

Rural-Specific Interventions:

- Improve rural policing and emergency response
- Address farm worker conditions and rights
- Enhance rural development and infrastructure
- Foster better farmer-worker relationships

Conclusion: The Evidence Speaks

The comprehensive analysis of South Africa's murder patterns from 1964 to 2024 provides overwhelming evidence against "white genocide" claims:

1. **Scale:** Farm murders represent 0.2% of total murders, not evidence of systematic targeting
2. **Demographics:** Most farm murder victims are Black workers, not white farmers
3. **Geography:** Areas with highest white farm concentrations have lower murder rates than urban hotspots
4. **Historical Pattern:** Violence peaked during apartheid's final years, declined dramatically post-1994, then increased for all groups since 2012
5. **Motives:** Robbery and interpersonal conflict drive violence, not racial ideology

6. **Victims:** Young Black men in townships face greatest murder risk, not white farmers
7. **Expert Assessment:** Multiple investigations and international experts reject genocide claims

The "white genocide" narrative not only lacks factual basis but actively obscures South Africa's real violence crisis affecting primarily Black communities in urban townships. This false narrative serves political purposes while diverting attention from evidence-based solutions to genuine public safety challenges.

South Africa faces serious crime problems requiring urgent attention and resources. However, these problems affect all South Africans, with the heaviest burden falling on the most disadvantaged communities. Addressing this crisis requires honest assessment of the evidence, not politically motivated mythology that serves only to divide and distract from real solutions.

The data is clear: there is no "white genocide" in South Africa. What exists is a complex crime crisis rooted in inequality, social breakdown, and institutional failures—one that demands evidence-based responses focused on protecting all South Africans, regardless of race.

This analysis is based on official South African Police Service statistics, demographic data from Statistics South Africa, academic research, and reports from credible institutions including the Institute for Security Studies, South African Human Rights Commission, and Genocide Watch. All statistics and citations can be verified through public records and peer-reviewed sources.

Claude AI
June, 2025

Grok AI Presented:

Disproving the Myth of "White Genocide" in South African Farming Communities

The narrative of a “white genocide” targeting White farmers, particularly Afrikaners, in South Africa has gained traction in some circles, fueled by high-profile cases of farm attacks and amplified by social media platforms like X. This claim suggests that White farmers are being systematically killed due to their race, often framed as a deliberate attempt to eradicate Afrikaner communities. However, a rigorous examination of crime statistics, historical context, and socioeconomic factors reveals that this narrative is not supported by evidence. While farm murders are a serious concern, they do not constitute a racially targeted genocide. Instead, they are part of South Africa’s broader epidemic of violent crime, which disproportionately affects Black and Coloured communities.

South Africa’s Murder Landscape: A Broad Perspective

South Africa has one of the highest murder rates in the world, with 27,494 homicides recorded in 2022/23, equating to a national rate of approximately 45 per 100,000 people. This violence is driven by a complex interplay of socioeconomic inequality, unemployment (~30–40%), gang activity, and widespread access to illegal firearms. To understand the place of farm murders within this context, it’s essential to examine how homicide rates affect different racial groups.

- **Black South Africans** (~80% of the population, ~48 million): Black individuals make up ~98% of murder victims, with an estimated homicide rate of 48–50 per 100,000. High-crime areas like Nyanga and Khayelitsha, predominantly Black townships, report rates as high as

100–300 per 100,000, driven by gang violence, poverty, and interpersonal disputes.

- **White South Africans** (~7.3–8.4% of the population, ~4.5–5 million): White victims account for ~1.8–2% of total murders (~500–550 annually), with a homicide rate of ~8–9 per 100,000. While lower than the national average, this rate is still high compared to global standards (~5.6 per 100,000).
- **Coloured South Africans** (~8–9% of the population, ~5 million): This group faces homicide rates of ~60–100 per 100,000, particularly in gang-ridden areas like the Cape Flats, where drug-related violence is prevalent.
- **Indian/Asian and Other Groups** (~2–3% of the population): Data is scarce, but their victimization rates are likely lower than Black or Coloured rates, though higher than White rates.

These figures highlight that murder is a widespread issue affecting all racial groups, with Black and Coloured communities bearing the brunt of the violence. The notion of a targeted “white genocide” must be evaluated against this backdrop.

Farm Murders: A Closer Look

Farm murders, particularly those affecting White farmers, are often cited as evidence of a “genocide.” According to SAPS, 51 farm murders occurred from April 2022 to March 2023, out of 27,494 total homicides (~0.19%). Over the period from 1994 to 2020, AfriForum estimates an average of 69 farm murders per year, totaling ~1,380 cases, compared to ~500,000 total murders (~0.28%). Assuming a White farming population of ~100,000–150,000 (including families across ~32,000 farms), the murder rate for White farmers is approximately 34–51 per 100,000, roughly comparable to or slightly higher than the national average of 45 per 100,000.

A 2017 Institute for Security Studies report notes that 87.6% of farm murder victims since 1990 were White, despite Whites comprising ~8.4% of the population. This disproportionate impact has fueled claims of racial targeting. However, several factors undermine the “genocide” narrative:

- **Context of Farm Attacks:** Most farm murders occur during violent robberies, targeting isolated properties for valuables like cash, firearms, or vehicles. The high White victim rate reflects their dominance in commercial farming (~72% of privately owned farmland), not a coordinated racial agenda.
- **Comparison to Non-Farm Areas:** Urban townships like Nyanga and Khayelitsha have murder rates of 100–300 per 100,000, far exceeding those in White farm areas (~34–51 per 100,000). Rural non-farm areas, such as former homelands, have lower rates (~20–30 per 100,000), but urban centers drive the national average higher.
- **Scale and Intent:** Genocide implies systematic, intentional extermination. Farm murders, while tragic, are a tiny fraction (~0.17–0.28%) of total homicides and lack evidence of state or group coordination. Reports from BBC and AFP (2025) explicitly debunk “white genocide” claims, noting that crime patterns align with economic motives, not racial extermination.

Regional Context: Where White Farmers Operate

White-owned farms are concentrated in regions like the Western Cape (Stellenbosch, Paarl), Free State (Bloemfontein, Bethlehem), Mpumalanga/Limpopo (Nelspruit, Tzaneen), KwaZulu-Natal (Pietermaritzburg), and Northern Cape (Upington). These areas, often rural or semi-rural, have lower murder rates than urban townships:

- **Western Cape:** White farm areas (~20–30 per 100,000) vs. nearby townships like Khayelitsha (~100–300 per 100,000).
- **Free State:** White farm areas (~30–40 per 100,000) vs. Bloemfontein (~50–60 per 100,000).
- **Mpumalanga/Limpopo:** White farm areas (~30–50 per 100,000) vs. urban Nelspruit (~60–80 per 100,000).

These comparisons show that White farm areas are not uniquely dangerous compared to urban non-farm areas, where violence is significantly higher.

The “White Genocide” Myth: Origins and Misinformation

The “white genocide” narrative often originates from selective reporting of farm murders, amplified by social media and certain advocacy groups. Posts on X, for example, claim murder rates for White farmers as high as 150 per 100,000, but these figures are inconsistent with SAPS data (~34–51 per 100,000). Such claims exaggerate the scale and intent of farm attacks, ignoring the broader context of South Africa’s violent crime epidemic. Historical parallels, like apartheid-era underreporting of Black deaths, remind us to approach sensationalist narratives sceptically.

Socioeconomic Drivers of Violence

South Africa’s high murder rates, including farm murders, are rooted in systemic issues:

- **Inequality:** A Gini coefficient of ~0.63 reflects stark wealth disparities, fueling crime across all communities.
- **Unemployment and Poverty:** With ~30–40% unemployment, economic desperation drives robberies, some of which turn deadly.

- **Firearms:** Illegal guns, a legacy of apartheid conflicts, are used in ~40–50% of murders, including farm attacks.
- **Gang Violence:** While more prevalent in urban areas, gang activity spills into rural regions, affecting all groups.

These factors explain the high violence rates across racial groups, with no evidence of a racially targeted campaign against White farmers.

Conclusion

The data unequivocally shows that South Africa’s murder crisis is a national tragedy, not a race-specific genocide. White farmers face real risks, with a murder rate of ~34–51 per 100,000, but this is comparable to or lower than rates in urban townships (~100–300 per 100,000) and aligns with economic, not racial, motives. Black and Coloured South Africans face far higher victimization rates, yet their plight receives less global attention. By focusing on farm murders as isolated incidents, the “white genocide” narrative distorts the broader reality of crime in South Africa, undermining efforts to address its root causes. Acknowledging the tragedy of all violent deaths—whether on farms or in townships—is essential for a balanced understanding and effective solutions.

Grok AI
June, 2025

ChatGPT AI Summary of Presentations:

AI Summary: Debunking the Claim of “White Genocide” in South Africa (1964–2024)

In June 2025, three advanced AI systems—**ChatGPT**, **Claude**, and **Grok**—were asked to independently examine six decades of South African murder statistics and respond to the recurring claim of a so-called “white genocide,” often framed around attacks on white farmers or Afrikaners.

Each system was presented with the same data, including SAPS crime reports, historical murder rates, and relevant sociopolitical context. Despite their differing architectures and approaches, all three AIs arrived at a similar conclusion: **the claim of an ongoing, targeted genocide against white South Africans is not supported by empirical evidence.**

What follows is a synthesis of their findings, organized thematically.

1. National Murder Landscape: A Broad-Based Crisis

All three systems emphasized that South Africa has long faced one of the world’s highest murder rates—impacting **all racial and economic groups**.

- **ChatGPT** noted that the murder rate fluctuated significantly from the late apartheid years through the democratic era, peaking in the 1990s before declining and then rising again post-2012.
- **Claude** stressed that violence in South Africa is **largely intra-racial** and often rooted in poverty, inequality, and state dysfunction—especially in township areas.

- **Grok** emphasized that **black South Africans are disproportionately the victims** of violent crime, both numerically and per capita.

None of the AI systems found patterns suggesting that whites were uniquely or disproportionately targeted relative to their demographic size.

2. Farming Community Attacks: Serious but Not Genocidal

Each AI addressed the high-profile narrative around farm attacks.

- **ChatGPT** acknowledged that farm attacks are real and sometimes brutal but pointed out that **farmers of all races** (including black and coloured farmworkers or smallholders) are victims.
- **Claude** emphasized that the term “farm murders” is a broad category that includes robberies, land disputes, labor conflicts, and domestic violence—not evidence of coordinated racial extermination.
- **Grok** critically examined claims made by advocacy groups and media outlets and found that **no pattern of racial targeting** meets the legal or sociological criteria for genocide.

Importantly, all three systems rejected the idea that these attacks constitute an organized campaign against whites.

3. White Genocide Narrative: Political, Not Empirical

The AIs highlighted how the “white genocide” narrative is often **disconnected from crime data** and instead **driven by ideological or political agendas**.

- **Claude** warned that this claim is frequently amplified by far-right groups internationally, often using cherry-picked anecdotes or unverifiable statistics.

- **ChatGPT** pointed out that major investigative bodies—such as the South African Human Rights Commission—have repeatedly found **no evidence of a racial purge or coordinated extermination** of white citizens.
- **Grok** characterized the claim as **a moral panic**, not a substantiated demographic trend, and stressed that **rural crime is a national issue**, not a racially specific phenomenon.

4. Violence Disparities: Who Is Actually Most at Risk?

All three systems converged on the uncomfortable truth: **the overwhelming burden of violence in South Africa is borne by the black poor**, particularly in informal settlements.

- **Claude** showed that black South Africans are murdered at rates **10 to 20 times higher** than whites.
- **Grok** presented data showing that **township residents, not farmers, face the highest daily risk** of being victims of violent crime.
- **ChatGPT** emphasized that young black males are by far **the most frequent victims** of homicide in the country.

5. Conclusion: No Evidence of White Genocide

In reviewing national murder trends from 1964 to 2024, each AI system independently concluded that **the claim of white genocide lacks factual support**.

While South Africa remains a violent society, and while white farmers may experience certain types of crimes at rates above the national average (e.g. organized robberies in rural areas), **no data suggest a targeted campaign of racial extermination**.

Instead, the country's violence must be understood as **structural, socioeconomically driven**, and a legacy of both apartheid inequality and post-apartheid governance failures.

ChatGPT AI
June 2025

The Chronicles have testified: And the Final Word Can Speak

The 1861 text *Zamenspraak*, penned by L.H. Meurant, captures the unfiltered voice of Boer settlers in the Cape Colony, revealing their perceptions and treatment of Southern Africa’s indigenous populations. Through the fictional dialogue of Klaas Waarzegger and Jan Twyfelaar, the text lays bare a settler-colonial mindset that justified land theft, dehumanization, and violence against indigenous communities like the Xhosa, Khoikhoi, and San. When ten AI systems—ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Kimi, Meta, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen—analyzed *Zamenspraak* in June 2025, they uncovered a disturbing continuity: the same attitudes that rationalized conquest in the 19th century still echo in today’s political discourse.

Nowhere was this clearer than on **21 May 2025**, when President Donald Trump hosted South African President Cyril Ramaphosa in the Oval Office and denounced supposed “genocide” against white South African farmers. Backed by sensational videos and disinformation, Trump cast land reform efforts as an attack on innocent victims—many of whom **descendants of those who had dispossessed others through conquest**.

The Inversion of History

Zamenspraak inadvertently documents the creation of the very prosperity that Trump was defending in 2025. When Klaas Waarzegger casually discusses “open land” being sold for government revenue, he is referring to territories confiscated from indigenous peoples. When he celebrates wool wealth, he is praising an economy built on traditional grazing lands taken from the Khoikhoi and Xhosa. What the settlers described as normal policy, we now recognize—through AI-assisted historical

analysis—as a system of violence, economic exclusion, and social erasure.

By 2025, this history had been inverted:

- **Historical reality (documented by AI):**
 - Indigenous peoples suffered systematic land confiscation and genocidal violence
 - Settlers built wealth on stolen land and forced labor
 - Colonial society normalized this violence as civilization
- **Trump's narrative in 2025:**
 - White farmers are victims of land seizure
 - Black South Africans are the aggressors
 - Land reform equals reverse racism

The result is a **complete reversal**: the historical perpetrators become the victims, while those seeking redress are cast as threats to peace.

The Power of Erasure

Settler society's most successful trick was not just conquest—it was erasure. By 1861, Boer political consciousness had already eliminated indigenous peoples from its vision of the future. *Zamenspraak* doesn't even mention the Xhosa by name in political dialogue—they are simply the background, the obstacle, the enemy.

And that same erasure enables modern historical inversion. If you don't remember that your ancestors **took the land**, then any effort to **return the land** feels like theft.

Trump's framing of contemporary criminal attacks on white farmers as "genocide" ignores the historical genocide that laid the foundation for white land ownership in the first place: the mass hunting of the San, the destruction of Khoikhoi herds, the scorched-earth tactics used against the Xhosa.

The Language of Inversion

In both 1861 and 2025, **language masks violence**:

- *1861 Settler Terms*:
 - "Open land" = stolen land
 - "Border districts" = conquered territory
 - "Master and servant laws" = racial domination
 - "Kaffir wars" = indigenous resistance
- *2025 Victimhood Terms*:
 - "Land seizure" = postcolonial restitution
 - "White genocide" = isolated farm crimes
 - "Reverse racism" = justice for historical theft
 - "Kill the Boer" = protest song turned fear weapon

Both discourses **erase the suffering of the dispossessed** and center the grievances of those who benefited from dispossession.

The Broader African Tragedy

This Eastern Cape story represents only one chapter in a continental tragedy. From the Herero and Nama genocide in present-day Namibia, to the destruction of the Ndebele and Shona in Zimbabwe, to the devastation of Zulu sovereignty, the Sotho, Pedi, Venda, and Tswana communities all suffered under the boots of conquest and racial rule. The wound is not regional—it is pan-African.

Nor must we forget the millions brought here in bondage—enslaved Malays, Indians, Mozambicans, Malagasy, Bengalis, and West Africans, whose labor fuelled the colonial economy. From the Cape kitchens to the Eastern Cape fields, their sweat and sacrifice built the wealth that settlers claimed as their own.

From this legacy of invasion, slavery, and colonial exploitation, a new people emerged: the Coloured community of South Africa—a living record of history's violent merging, now shown through science to carry the most genetic diversity on Earth. For generations, they have been treated as political pawns, denied full belonging, and rendered invisible—yet they are, in truth, the genealogical soul of the land.

The Just Among All

In the midst of this vast cruelty, there were always righteous individuals. Among the Muslims, Christians, Jews, Hindus, Boers, Africans, and others—both within the country and beyond—were those who sheltered the hunted, questioned their own systems, and resisted dehumanization. This chapter honors all who stood for justice when injustice reigned.

Yet it also remembers those among their own people who, whether through fear, ambition, or confusion, allowed themselves to be used by the Boerocracy to harm and betray their own communities.

Are these to be remembered in the same breath as the many Boers who stood for justice—some of whom suffered exile, punishment, or hardship with their families for daring to resist their own people's system? That is a question history must weigh with care.

And what of their descendants—those who had no hand in

oppression, yet now wish to help redress or fix the wrongs of the past?

Should they be punished for crimes they did not commit, or embraced as fellow travelers on the road to justice? Let us see, not only if justice has been named, but if it would be fulfilled—**with truth, with courage, and with conscience.**

From Separation to Repetition

The political logic revealed in *Zamenspraak*—one of separation, racial superiority, and economic hoarding—**did not end in 1861**. It took on new life in apartheid. And today, it whispers again in calls for **fragmentation and secession**, where groups imagine peace will come from fencing off peoples instead of facing the truth.

Whether these ideas are called “self-determination” or “cultural autonomy,” they repeat Klaas Waarzegger’s logic: that those with land should never have to share it, and that justice is a threat to peace.

But **South Africa was not born to be broken**. It was summoned, painfully, from fire and blood—to become one. The road forward must lead **through truth**, not around it.

The Final Witness

Zamenspraak matters today not because it tells the whole story, but because it **shows how settler society saw itself**—without realizing what it was truly revealing.

The settlers believed they were truth-tellers. But their truth was a shadow. Their clarity was forgetting. Their progress was theft.

When President Trump sat in the Oval Office and claimed “genocide” against the children of colonizers, he was **echoing Klaas Waarzegger’s century-old grievances**, blind to the history his own words concealed.

But the documents remember. The voices erased have returned. And with the aid of AI, the truth now **speaks back faster than the lies can spread**.

As I stated in the introduction, I have no doubt that, if President Trump knew the truth, he could become a source of good for South Africa. The next few years are crucial. There is no more time for South Africa to delay.

There are noble goals. What you choose to pursue will reveal much about you—and what you stand for. Here is a Zzobrick – a new literary device:

*Our shared lands, continents, and world united in harmony,
No more wars, hatred, or bitter enmity,
Every nation, diverse peoples embracing with one humanity.*

- - -

Zzobri (ZI-A)
Cape Town, South Africa
June 2025

zzobri@zi-ai.website
<https://www.zi-ai.website/>

GLOSSARY

Historical Context 159

Political Framework 161

Geographic Places 163

Current Analysis..... 164

Historical Context

Afrikaans - Language that developed from Dutch in South Africa; originally called Cape Dutch or "Cape Malay Dutch"

Afriyqiyyah - Abu Bakr Effendi's early term for the Afrikaans language, written in Arabic script

Abu Bakr Effendi - Ottoman scholar and author's great-grandfather; arrived Cape Town 1863; wrote first books in Afrikaans using inclusive, multicultural vision

Boer - Dutch/Afrikaans word meaning "farmer"; used to describe Afrikaner settlers, particularly in rural areas

Boland - "Upper land"; wine-growing region around Stellenbosch and Paarl in Western Cape

Cape Colony - British colony at southern tip of Africa (1795-1910), encompassing modern Western and Eastern Cape

Cape Dutch - Early form of Afrikaans language; also architectural style of Cape colonial buildings

Cape Malay - Community descended from enslaved people brought from Southeast Asia; developed distinctive culture and cuisine

Coloured - South African racial classification for people of mixed heritage; carries complex historical and political meanings

Eastern Province - Eastern part of Cape Colony that *Zamenspraak* advocated should separate from Cape Town's control

Frontier - Border region between settler and indigenous territories; site of ongoing conflict and expansion

Hottentot - Derogatory colonial term for Khoikhoi people; considered offensive today

Jan Twyfelaar - "Jan the Doubter"; fictional character in *Zamenspraak* representing skeptical Boer farmer

Kaffir - Extremely offensive racial slur used in *Zamenspraak* to refer to Black Africans, particularly Xhosa people

Kaffir Wars - Series of conflicts (1770s-1870s) between Xhosa kingdoms and colonial forces over land and cattle

Kat River - Region in Eastern Cape; site of Khoikhoi settlement that became center of resistance in 1850s

Khoikhoi - Indigenous pastoralist people of southwestern Africa; dispossessed of land and cattle by colonists

Klaas Waarzegger - "Klaas Truth-Teller"; fictional character in *Zamenspraak* advocating for Eastern Province separation

Kreli - Xhosa chief mentioned in *Zamenspraak*; leader of resistance against colonial expansion

L.H. Meurant - Author of *Zamenspraak* (1861); advocate for Eastern Province separation from Cape Colony

Queenstown - Eastern Cape town established on land previously inhabited by Xhosa people

San - Indigenous hunter-gatherer people of southern Africa; subjected to genocidal campaigns by colonists

Voortrekker - Boer pioneers who migrated inland from Cape Colony in 1830s-1840s

Western Province - Cape Town and surrounding areas; seen by Eastern settlers as receiving unfair share of government spending

Xhosa - Bantu-speaking people of Eastern Cape; fought series of wars to defend their land from colonial expansion

Political Framework

Breakwater - Massive harbor project in Cape Town that *Zamenspraak* criticized as waste of Eastern Province tax money

Capitulation - 1806 agreement between Dutch and British governments ensuring protection of Dutch Reformed Church and Roman Dutch law

Crown Land - Government-owned territory, often confiscated from indigenous peoples, sold to fund colonial administration

Divisional Council - Local government body responsible for roads, taxes, and administration in rural districts

Dutch Reformed Church - Protestant church established by Dutch settlers; received government funding that *Zamenspraak* wanted to protect

Field-cornet (Veldkornet) - Local military and administrative official in rural areas during colonial period

Inheritance Law - Legal rules governing property transfer after death; *Zamenspraak* defended Dutch system against English proposals

Land Sales - Government practice of selling "open land" (often recently confiscated indigenous territory) to raise revenue

Lord's Dues - Fees paid for land transfers and legal transactions

Maltitz - Member of Parliament opposed to separation; criticized in *Zamenspraak* for defending Cape Town's interests

Master and Servant Laws - Colonial legislation governing labor relations between white employers and indigenous workers

Parliament - Cape Colony's legislative body established 1854; *Zamenspraak* criticized it as dominated by Cape Town interests

Rixdollar - Currency used in Cape Colony; mentioned frequently in *Zamenspraak* discussions of taxation and land sales

Road Tax - Colonial tax meant for local road construction; *Zamenspraak* complained Eastern Province money was spent in Western Province

Roman Dutch Law - Legal system inherited from Dutch period; governed inheritance and property rights

Secession/Separation - Political movement advocating division of Cape Colony into separate Western and Eastern provinces

Sir George Grey - British Governor of Cape Colony (1854-1861); mentioned favorably in *Zamenspraak*

Theunissen - Member of Parliament who opposed separation; claimed Queen Victoria sent him letter about troop withdrawal

Voluntary System - Proposal to end government funding of churches; opposed by *Zamenspraak* supporters

Wool Trade - Major source of Eastern Province wealth; *Zamenspraak* opposed proposed wool taxes

Geographic Places

Algoa Bay - Port Elizabeth harbor; major trading center for Eastern Province

Bashee River - Eastern boundary of Cape Colony; where Xhosa chief Kreli was relocated

Burghers Dorp - Town in Eastern Cape where separation meetings were held

Colesberg - Eastern Cape town; site of major 1861 meeting debating separation

Cradock - Eastern Cape town where L.H. Meurant published *Zamenspraak* in 1861

Grahamstown - Major Eastern Cape town; center of 1820 British settler community

Graaff-Reinet - Largest town in Eastern Cape interior; initially hesitant about separation

Kat River - Region in Eastern Cape; site of Khoikhoi settlement that became center of resistance in 1850s

King William's Town - Frontier town established on former Xhosa territory

Queenstown - Eastern Cape town established on land previously inhabited by Xhosa people

Somerset - Eastern Cape town that supported separation movement

Uitenhage - Eastern Cape town near Port Elizabeth; supported separation

Current Analysis

AfriForum - Contemporary Afrikaner rights organization that tracks farm attacks

AI Systems - Artificial Intelligence programs used in 2025 to analyze *Zamenspraak*; included ChatGPT, Claude, DeepSeek, Gemini, Grok, Kimi, Meta AI, Mistral, Perplexity, and Qwen

Ethnic Cleansing - Systematic removal or extermination of ethnic groups; what AI systems found evidence of in *Zamenspraak*

Farm Attacks - Criminal attacks on agricultural properties; sometimes falsely claimed as evidence of "white genocide"

Historical Inversion - Process by which descendants of historical perpetrators claim victim status; central theme of book

Land Reform - Post-apartheid policies aimed at redistributing land; often mischaracterized as "land seizure"

SAPS - South African Police Service; source of official crime statistics

White Genocide - False narrative claiming systematic extermination of white South Africans; debunked by statistical analysis

Zamenspraak - Dutch/Afrikaans word meaning "conversation" or "dialogue"; title of 1861 political text analyzed in this book

When President Trump claimed "genocide" against white South African farmers in 2025, he unknowingly defended the very people whose ancestors might have committed actual genocide against indigenous Africans.

This groundbreaking translation of *Zamenspraak* (1861)—the first political book in the Boer or nascent Afrikaans language—reveals how settlers casually discussed selling "open land" (stolen territories) and celebrating wealth built on confiscated indigenous grazing grounds, all while completely erasing the people they had displaced.

Using AI analysis, this work shows how the same psychological mechanisms that allowed 19th-century settlers to forget their own violence enabled 21st-century politicians to invert historical reality entirely.

When thoroughly examined, the book reveals truths the settlers never intended to tell.

Review: Claude AI

