

LAND IN THE NEGOTIATIONS CHAMBER -

-AN AFRO-CENTRIC APPROACH*

by Prof Gabriel M. Setiloane

The story of Machaviestad people, says Trac. epitomises the breakdown of relationships in South Africa: "It is a story of black hospitality, sympathy and assistance.... resulting in white betrayal and oppression". The Machaviestad people have ancient historical roots in the area. (The Star, Johannesburg, Jan.9, 1991).

It is now only about three weeks that one has not heard on TV or read in some media of Andries Treurnicht or some AWB hothead howl to claim some part of our beloved South Africa as a legitimate Fatherland of the Afrikaner tribe and, therefore, not to be included in the negotiations toward a new South Africa. Carl Boshoff and his followers are, at this very moment, busy physically carving out a portion of the Northern Cape as their future "homeland". What is puzzling is how they arrive at the conclusion that those particular parts of the land are legitimately claimable for the purpose they want them for. For, ironically, the very areas they designate for their claim, the Northern Cape, the PWV (Pretoria, Witwatersrand and Vaal areas) and the Orange Free State, bear a scientifically provable history which diametrically disputes their claims.. It is these very areas which feature very high on the latest archeological revelations of the earliest human existence and consistency of culture and social life which is still found among the African people who live in them today e.g. Broederstroom, Klipriviersberg, (R.Mason. 1983 p.66f ; 1987 p.40) and now the discovery of a human skull fossil near Bloemfontein, said to be thousands of years old. The shame is that both these two gentlemen, who make claims that fly straight against scientific evidence which increases daily, are said to be "men of letters" and have practised as academics in supposedly respectable institutions in the land!

The purpose of this paper is to introduce into the chamber of "Negotiations towards a new South Africa", which are being noised about so much, another dimension of thinking and reasoning. (Which nevertheless is the prevailing point of view, understanding and conviction of the ordinary African man and woman in the street!) So far, whenever there is talk about the new style of our life-together in this land, social, economic and touching our habitat, appeal is made for guidance as to methods of operation and principles of debate, to the two ideologies which compete for majority acceptance in the world today, viz: the Eastern ideology, propounded first and popularised by Marx and Lennin, and which is variably called Communism, Socialism and Collectivism, and the Western Ideology which is seldom called by its stark and naked names of

* National Director of the Luthuli Memorial Trust and formerly with the Department of religious studies, University of Cape Town.

Capitalism, Individualism and legitimised self-interest with no regard for the other.

At present, because of the events in Eastern Europe over the last two years or so, Socialism, which was epitomised in the USSR, is going through a rough patch, to say the least, on the world popularity and preference scales. The proponents of the Western ideology, especially in the outposts, like South Africa, are inclined to consider this as a declaration that the ideology they harbour is, for that reason, the one that will save the world. Therefore, the hysteria, especially in the media, (which are tools of Government and / or Big Business anyway) whenever someone alludes to any future sharing of the resources of the land and its fruits and produce. However, the observations of really religious people who have themselves grown up very close to the heat of the debate, people like Pope John Paul II, need to be taken very seriously. I hear him warn the world, especially the world of Capitalism:

"Do not gloat over the misery and misfortunes that communism is presently undergoing. your own ideology of capitalism does not contain the wherewithall to save humankind" (my paraphrase). If he was an African, he would have made use of a Tswana proverb, *u se tshege yo o oleng, mareledi a sa le pele*: "laugh not at the one who has fallen, there are more slippery patches on the road ahead".

Limiting ourselves to the question of land, we wish in this paper to argue for the validity of a third point of view; a view for far too long neglected, despised, and disparaged by social scientists (so-called), and forgotten by African scholars, as too much a reminder of what they have been brainwashed to regard as "Africa's archaic past" and incongruous to "modern usage". And yet this is the point of view which is still the motor that unconsciously drives and actuates the thought, expectations and actions of the majority of the people living in this land i.e. the African people, and, I dare to declare, at whatever their level of "civilization", sophistication and education! For, a proper psychological analysis could prove that the Freedom Charter clause: "The Land shall belong to those who work on it" may have its inspiration much more out of latent, suppressed and even denied Africanism than the Collective Socialism that it has so glibly been attributed to.

Actually, this good, humane, and considerate typically African practice like so many other qualities of our Botho, Ubuntu, have historically been exploited by the Whites who have come first, with the permission of the people, to occupy the land, employing their more developed methods and with an eye ever sharp on profit, produced abundantly and then proceeded to dispossess the rightful and autochthonous owners. No one can deny that this is what happened in the Jan van Riebeeck chapter of our history and ever afterwards. This, in fact, is the only argument with which Andries Treurnicht supports his claim to the areas he has chosen as "*Die wit man se tuisland*" (The white man's homeland).

Traditional African Delimitation of South Africa.

It is interesting, although it does not give anyone any comfort i.e. unless it is taken into account in the negotiations toward a "New South Africa", that South African historians like Prof. van Jaarsveld (*Sunday Star, Johannesburg, October 27, 1991*) are now confessing that the ideas expressed in the writings which have won them tons of money and questionable fame, and

which have poisoned generations of scholarship, were in fact fabrications of the straight and misguided ideology of Apartheid; which fact has now put South African White scholarship in the Social Sciences under the shadow of being doubted and unconvincing in international academic circles. For it is being scientifically proved all round now that, contrary to the views expressed by the Theals, Eric Walkers and van Jaarsvelds, Africans (I refer here particularly to the Bantu speaking groups of Africans) have not only occupied the area called South Africa before Van Riebeeck arrived, but had it actually apportioned among themselves, knowing to which group each part belonged, as children in a home know to which child which shirt belongs no matter who may be using it at any one time.

Oedasoia, a Khoi-Khoi chief, said that if the explorers had crossed the river (the great river, i.e. the Orange) they would have found the country dotted with permanent settlements and tribes such as the Brigoudi, Charij-Eijquas, and also the Cumissoquas. The river formed the boundary line between the domains of the Khoi-Khoi and other tribes, so that all who lived on this southern side of the river belonged to the Khoi-Khoi race and those on the far side of the river were blacker people like our Angolan and Guinea slaves. (Van Riebeeck's Diary 1662) This is borne out by Oral Tradition among the other African peoples. The various parts of the country were named after the people who were autochthonous to them, which is nothing new or unusual in human experience: Is it not true that England is indisputably the land of the English, Ireland of the Irish and Scotland of the Scots, irrespective as to whether they live under some arrangement with the ruling authority (the throne) which is in England? And also not mattering how that arrangement was come by: an amicable settlement or conquest?.

The Barolong Tswana, whose habitat has been more centrally situated, give us a vivid picture of the African understanding of who was where (and by the way Revill Mason, the famous Wits University archeologist, sees them living in this area as far back as AD500) :- For Barolong the pattern of autochthony was Borwa (South) literally "The land of BaSarwa"- The San BoKone (East to N. East) = The land of the Nguni people. Even within that portion of the land which was and is still, principally inhabited by the Sotho Tswana themselves, there were clear designations as to which group which portion belonged. thus:

BoPedi = land of the Pedi, *LeSotho* = land of the Sotho *LeHurutshe*
 = land of the BaHurutshe, *BoKwena* = land of the Bakwena.

It is noteworthy that the Tswana, through the Barolong and Batlhaping, who were as it were their representatives on that side of their common land, do not seem to have identified a distinct area, like BoKone and BoRwa, for instance, which they identified with the Khoi-Khoi (BaKgothu). I suggest that the reason for this is that the Khoi-Khoi were so close neighbours, sharing pastures, defence against invaders (see R.Moffat 1843:passim), intermarriage, even a common religious practice (E.,W.Smith, 1953), that they were hardly seen as different, strangers or other, until one ventured deep into their area of occupation e.g. in Namaqualand.

The African Concept of Land Ownership.

Social Anthropologists have already made known the African system of land tenure: In African traditional understanding and practice, land is (as is indeed the

case in most pre-European - occupation aboriginal peoples of the world -- the Australasians, Native Americans, etc.) not individually acquirable. Western observers have wanted to see its possession vested in the "Chief" a tyrant of their creation, as "Morena", "Nkosi", in unadulterated African understanding and usage (see G.M. Setiloane, 1990), is not "chief" as has come to be understood through the writings of European travellers, missionaries and outright malicious so-called historians, hunters after cheap fame and wealth who awards and divides up the land according to his whim, wish and favour. Our fathers have taught us and practised what they learnt from their fathers, viz: Land is Holy Property. No one can acquire and own it. *Morena -Nkosi* and his court are mere trustees and administrators to ensure that it is apportioned fairly to legally qualified and appropriate families to make a livelihood out of. To qualify for such an apportionment one has to belong to the group and have the responsibility of a wife and a family to maintain. It is for this reason that African land assigned for ploughing and raising food on (*masimo, intsimu*) was awarded to the household to be held in the name of the wife.

So in Tswana to this day the *tshimo* is invariably called by the woman to whose household it is assigned! Thus, therefore, every housewife has a *tshimo* assigned for her use all her life. Any self-respecting Sotho -Tswana husband regards the produce of such a land as totally and wholly under the direction, disposal and jurisdiction of that particular wife, who also has the responsibility to organise its production. Land, therefore, is a means to livelihood and is left in the day to day charge of those who use it for that purpose. Land is not wealth, like cattle, sheep or goats. It cannot be possessed nor held to the exclusion of the good and survival of the total community. It is like rain, and river water or wood in the forest, a natural provision! Therefore one could not lay a charge of trespassing or theft against an unknown traveller who enters a field ready for the harvest and avails him/herself of the produce for immediate sustenance.

Even as the Van Riebeeck quotation above points out, certain portions of the mass of land that is today called South Africa was and still is considered a possession, in a unique and more binding manner, of a specific group or groups of people :- Kwa MoKwena, Kwa LeHurutshe, Kwa Tlhaping, etc. It is this region of the whole that was under the jurisdiction of a particular "chiefdom". In normal circumstances the particular group, polity, chiefdom or tribe would have acquired ascription of ownership of the particular land by inheritance and descent. It would be known by their name. Therefore, *LeHurutshe* is understood as the land of *BaHurutshe*, and *MoKwena* of *BaKwena*, because in such cases the said people have been living on that land, working on it, being born and themselves giving birth to children, their parents dying and being buried on it, from time immemorial. They would be autochthonous to that piece of land in the same way as the Scots are to Scotland, the Germans to Germany and the French to France.

But, there would be even more to it: There would be the religious element which prompted the claim, that in African understanding "Land is holy property" whose ownership is vested far above the Morena or Nkosi (king). For the ancestors of the present occupants do not relinquish their hold and right on the land by death. Contrarily, in African usage and religion, as indeed in the religions and practices of other aboriginal and primal peoples of the world, "The dead are not

dead; they are ever with us"! (G.M. Setiloane, 1969) *Even more: the rigours and fortunes of everyday life of single persons, families and whole groups of people are dependent on their relations with these ancestors who are a "living" part of the community: (G.M.Setiloane, 1972; 1986): "The very dust under your feet responds more lovingly to our footsteps than to yours, because it is the ashes of our ancestors, and our bare feet are conscious of the sympathetic touch, for the soil is rich with the life of our kindred. (Chief Seattle 1884).*

These ancestors are served (*direlwa, konzwa*) in and through all human activities, from family meals to national rain festivals and the installation of *Morena, Nkosi* (king). For, in proper African life, the personal and family shrine is the home where the ancestors are buried, in the *Lapa* (the Tswana family courtyard) [G.M.Setiloane.1972 p 24] and the cattle kraal. Thus, therefore, the tremendous shock and resultant vigorous resistance, both in this country as in all cases of aboriginal peoples (North America and Australasia), throughout the history of contact with the European, against so-called "tribal removals" and "annexations. Land is a *holy possession*: the shrine of a people's soul. To remove and separate people from their ancestral land is to rapture their soul, to cut off their instrument of life support. This, by the way, is a very biblical, Old Testament concept, because there, too, we are having to do with aboriginal and primal peoples and their religious sensitivities:

"By the rivers of Babylon
(cut off from home and kindred)
We sat down and wept,
When we remembered Zion.
How can we sing the Lord's song
In a strange land"? (Psalm 137)

This explains why, earlier this year, when the De Klerk government declared that it was removing all the land restrictions which had been imposed and enforced by their Apartheid regime, the BaKwena of Mogopa, (near Ventersdorp), the BaRolong-Ba-Modiboa of Matloang (near Potchefstroom), who had been forcefully removed from their ancient habitats, as well as other victims of forced removals of the said regime, made use of the occasion to fulfill the hearts' wish, and returned to their ancestral lands, where (and the media had purposely turned a blind eye to this!) they had, in spite of distance, made regular pilgrimages, during the period of their exile, to the graves of their ancestors (The Star, Johannesburg, January 9, 1991). For it is still a practice among the majority of African people, no matter what their degree of westernisation, education and sophistication, to make periodic pilgrimages to wherever the graves of their ancestors are situated. Often these graves are on what, according to South African legislation and other facts of history, has come to be called a "White area" (a European farm or a plot, such as is the case on my maternal side). In such a case it is almost laughable, if it was not the tragedy that it is, to see an internationally acclaimed man of letters and respectable standing, a whole professor, grovel and beg for permission from an almost illiterate White man/woman for access to the graves of his ancestors even just for an hour or less: Only to be able "*Go gata mabala*" :- To tread the sods his forebears have trod, and breathe the air they once breathed! Other such grave shrines, like those on my paternal side here in the Orange Free State, have been destroyed,

devastated, and desecrated by the White man's "development", such as the mines. Places now high and bold on the South African map once resounded with names which have remained indelible in the family names of many African people.: "Mr. Tikoe", who must originate from somewhere on the now Sand River valley, or "Motshikhiri", my grandfathers name, because he was born where he was buried (an area where that special type of thatch grass was obtainable: Allan Ridge mine of the Free State Goldfields stands there today.) Thus, what has been seen and used as a mere source of quick riches, gold, diamonds, coal, etc, and has made the richest of the world what they are revered for, or is taken for an emblem of usurped security, has been and still is a *holy shrine*; a doorway to fullness of life and the source of being (*die lewens kragbron*) to some of us who know ourselves, and indeed to others too, who may not comprehend themselves so well. For, as Chief Seattle assured the White conquerors and annexers of his ancestral home:

"Every part of this country is sacred to my people. Every hillside, every plain and grove has been hallowed by some fond memory or some sad experience. Even the rocks, which seem to be dumb as they swelter in the sun along the silent sea shore in solemn grandeur, thrill with the memories of past events connected with the lives of my people. . .The noble braves, fond mothers, glad happy-hearted maidens, and even the little children, who lived and rejoiced here for a brief season, and whose very names are now forgotten, still love these sombre solitudes and their *deep fastnesses which, at eventide, grow shadowy with the presence of dusky spirits.*"(ibid)

The religious base of land ownership claim.

In the religions of "indigenous" or "primitive"(in truth,"primal") peoples or aborigines, the ultimate "owners" of the land (the earth mass on which food is produced and all life is dependent) are the deities of the autochthonous peoples. It is they who are depended upon for its fertility and the prosperity of those who occupy it at any one time; they who are appealed to when nature itself seems to be unco-operative with drought, bad harvest, floods, etc. (Those unfortunate events which Western insurance agents though thoroughly secularised still call "an act of God")! That is why these religions are called Fertility or/ and Nature Religions. It is this type of religion that the Israelites, according to the Bible, found the natives of Palestine practising when they "entered that land to conquer it". Soon they found out that the "almighty-ness" of their YAHWEH, which had carried them through out of Egyptian bondage, and through the scorching sun and feverish pestilences of the desert, was not potent enough to prevail against the uncertainties and vagaries of the climate in the agrarian "land of milk and honey". To survive, the mighty conquering Israelites had to do as the natives, the primitive so-called Phillistines, did, viz: do homage to and worship *Baalim*: which is translated "the deities of the land". The Hebrew word *Baal* means "Owner". The plural *Baalim* = "Owners", and the Biblical translation "deities of the land" must be straight out of the original "Owners of the land". So, the monotheistic Israelites were, much to the chagrin and anger of their priests and prophets (Amos, Hosea, Micah et al), won over to the worship and service of *Baalim* because they held the key to survival and lasting prosperity. (Oh, that arrogant settlers in exotic lands of "untutored and uncivilised" primitive peoples could learn!)

This is exactly what is taught in the religious traditions of Africa: Khoi-Khoi, Sotho-Tswana, Nguni, Venda and even beyond the Limpopo, e.g. the Shona (see David Lan, 1983). Among the Sotho-Tswana no service or ritual is deemed efficacious until and unless it was also directed to "*Beng ba lefatshe*" :translated": the Owners of the land" = Baalim. The Nguni expression *Abaphanzi*: strikes the same cord. Hence the ritual prayer which every Social Anthropologist and student of the Sotho-Tswana must come across some time or other in their studies: *Medimo e mennye re rapeleleng go e megolo*, meaning Junior ancestors (deities) intercede on our behalf to the greater/ senior /older ancestors (deities)(E.W.Smith, 1952).

The "newer", "younger", "junior" ancestors are the ancestors of the living people who are, at the time engaged in the ritual prayer i.e. the present occupants of the land. These ancestors are, consequently, often known and appealed to by name (G.M.Setiloane, 1972, p 76), like Mohlomi; Senzangakhona, Moroka, etc. Quite often, though, "*medimo e megolo*", the older, ancient ancestors, are not even known by name, and may for that matter not be of the same stock as the people who are involved in the ritual prayer. They are considered as comprising the higher court of appeal against the tragedy and calamity that may be threatening the community. They have the last and final say, and human survival in that area of the country, is dependent on their goodwill. For this reason Msilikazi, the great Ndebele conquerer of the interior, never in his life after settling in what is present Matebeleland (the land of the South Western Shona) stopped paying tribute and doing homage to the *Mhondoro* {the reigning dynasty's spiritual custodian's ancestor} of the Shona kingdom he had subjugated (David Lan, 1983.). Moshoeshoe was claiming a similar decency and show of prestige and genuine African etiquette from Moroka, who was wrongly advised by the Methodist missionaries to refuse because he had signed a piece of paper to which they and Moshoeshoe's missionaries had witnessed. Besides, they claimed, Moroka and his people had bought the land, however meagre the price they had paid. The result of the dispute was *Tigela*, the tragic battle of Mekwatlang, near present Westminster in the Orange Free State, where Moroka's BaRolong were shamefully defeated (S.Molema, 1941, p104)

The lesson here is that conquest by war and occupation of any land, for any period of time, does not erase the right of ownership of the autochthonous people. It is this very concept which is behind the many "ancient tribal land disputes" raging in the United States and Canada. This also is the reasoning behind the ancient Greek practice recorded in the Acts of Apostles, Ch.17 v.23, of leaving a space and an inscription "To an Unknown God" in their pantheon. That the ancestors (or deities, if one wishes so!) of a people secure the right of ownership of the land is the reason behind many of the wars of resistance against colonialism everywhere in Africa, Asia, the Pacific Islands, North America etc. That was the driving force behind the so-called "Border Wars" of the Eastern Cape, and is still the driving force behind the protracted Middle East struggle. It is no longer a question of socialism, nationalisation, capitalism or Free Enterprise. Here we are in the realm of religion. And this is what we, in African Theology have always asserted viz: that the Liberation Struggle in this part of the continent, as indeed in other parts as well, (e.g. The Mau-Mau in Kenya) is at depth a religious struggle. No one who has heard the now returning South

African exiles sing in foreign lands, about their motherland, could not have any doubt that we were, and still are, engaged in a religious encounter:-

Thina sizwe esimnyama ... We the black nation
Sikhalela izwe lethu ... We cry for our land
Elathatwa nga bamhlophe ... Which was taken by the Whites.

Does it not sound like Psalm 137 ? No negotiations about bringing in a "New South Africa" will be acceptable, incisive, nor deep enough, nor productive of any lasting structures for peace (and this is a caution directed principally at the Africans themselves who will sit on our behalf around the negotiations table), unless and until this traditional and fundamental concept of land ownership, which is still held by the majority of us Africans, is brought up and given the consideration it deserves. All the theories of the White man about land ownership are calculated, from the beginning to the end, to rationalise their disinheritance of the rightful heirs to the land. Therefore the San come down the corridors of history as "vermin who have no respect for property" and are hunted and shot down like game; the Khoi: "homeless nomads and vagabonds;" and the rest of us: "fugitives from their traditional homelands", and recent arrivals in "a beautiful empty land teeming with game"; "the land of milk and honey" which they with their gun and unfriendly methods of food production have reduced into desert in pursuit of so-called development.

These theories, inspired by selfish arrogance, a callous lack of religious depth and spiritual insight, are, fortunately, progressively thinning out like morning mist in the light of research and scholarship: Archeology, Pre- History and even the Study of Religions. What is becoming increasingly clear in the twenty-first century is that *land ownership is indelible*, by all known human (*Botho*) standard, even by those of the European peoples themselves. The present bloody wars of Eastern Europe and the so-called "re-emergence of ethnicity in the citadels of "European Christian Civilisation" are a clear evidence of this. All the ancient peoples of the world are up in arms, everywhere in the Americas, the autochthonous peoples of Canada, the US, Brazil and in Australasia and the South Sea Islands. to claim their heritage, the lands on which their fore-fathers are buried, their indisputable home, *elathatwa ngabamhlophe*, A serious indictment, difficult to live down, is that it is invariably *abamhlophe* who have brought along this misery to humankind.

"And when the Red Man (and all the indigenous peoples!) shall have perished from the earth (as if they ever will!) and his memory among the white men shall have become a myth, these shores will swarm with the invisible dead of my tribe; and when our children's children shall think themselves alone in the field, the store, the shop, upon the highway, or in the silence of the pathless woods, they will not be alone. In all the earth there is no place dedicated to solitude. At night, when the streets of your cities and villages will be silent and you think them deserted, they will throng with the returning hosts that once filled and still love this beautiful land." (Chief Seattle).

Conclusion

Poor Chief Seattle, driven into a corner, like a hart at bay, by the conquering gun-clad superior forces of the white man, passionately pleads, little knowing how heartless his interlocutors are. "The white man will never be alone. Let him be just and deal kindly with my people, for the dead are not powerless. Dead -did I say? There is no death, only a change of worlds!" (ibid).

But now times and scenes have changed and tables have turned. Having, in this paper made the point that by all divinely-ordained and legitimate reasoning "The Land belongs to us, it is us, the autochthonous and aboriginal peoples, who need to be pleaded with and exhorted to be "just and deal kindly for the dead are not powerless. The White man need not fear. Exclusivity was never a trait of the African. In fact the opposite is the case. Sharing and kindness and care for "the stranger at the gate" is the very essence of *Botho - Ubuntu*. It is this willingness to share even his heritage, the land, right from even before Van Riebeeck, that has made Africa prey to the wiles and greed of the European interloper coming in all guise a wandering shipwrecked traveller, explorer, teacher, missionary, and all. Nevertheless, as one listens through the cacophony of African political talk through the decades, even now with "Negotiations" about our life-together in this land in the air, one does not hear, even from the wildest and most bitterly radical, the cry "Throw the sons and daughters of the marauding, cheating, conquering, mendacious and distabilising white man into the sea out of which their fathers and forebears came". All that one hears seems to be "This is our country. We go to the negotiations table not "to grovel and beg"(Jay Naidoo, SATV Oct 4 1991) but, with malice towards none, to claim our birthright, "the holy possession of our fathers. Not to do so would be a denial of our very being, and a condemning of ourselves to ignominy. Don't we know much better than our interlocutors how "the dead are not powerless"? And how they are jealous for our faithfulness to what they have lived and striven for? For, ever since the first contact with the white man, all our ancestors from the four corners of this country (Nxele, Moshoeshe, Sekhukhuni, Sekonyela, Dingana, Mzilikazi) and their sons, our fathers, after them (Sol Plaatje, Dube, Z.R Mahabane, Albert Luthuli), and, in our own lifetime, Mangaliso Sobukwe, Steve Biko, together with many others who have lost their lives in prison cells, in torture chambers and on desolate African veld and jungle for the struggle, have all been actuated and driven by one single conviction and truth. *Lomhlaba ongowethu* ." This land belongs to us" (Peter Delius) This does not necessarily foreclose or shut out any other consideration borne out of the generosity of hearts begotten and nurtured in *Botho-Ubuntu - Ubuntungushi*.

The relationship between this community and the local officials, missionaries, farmers, and landlords deteriorated still further. The demand (was) that the power of the Pedi polity should be broken. In April 1876, with war looming, Dinkwanyane despatched a letter to the Landdroos of Lydenburg. It gives a powerful and moving expression to many of the themes developed in this and preceding chapters.

To the office, to all the people I will address you Boers, you men who know God; do you think there is a God who will punish lying, theft and deceit? I ask you now for the truth. I pray for the truth because I also speak the whole truth. I say. The land belongs to us. This is my truth, and even if you become angry I will nevertheless stand by it. You were clever. Your cleverness has turned to

theft. When I say your cleverness has turned to theft, I say it in relation to the land, because you came to this country, you knew God's word, but ate everything up and said nothing to anybody, only flogged (the people). Your theft has now come into the open. And I state and I mean (it): those who have bought land let them take their money back. (Let) these words (be read) before all the people so that they can hear the same. "I am Johannes ,the younger son of Sekwati (Peter Delius)

When Dinkwanyane made this devastating charge, he had accepted the Christian faith , and had even become a traitor to his brother, Sekwati, because of it; hiving off with a chunk of the "chiefdom" to settle in Botshabelo so that they "could practice Christianity free and away from heathen interference". So, he was not only kind but sincerely speaking out of his Christian experience, when he ascribed devoutness and the "knowledge of God": to his interlocutors, the Boers. He was speaking out of what he thought was a common experience with them. But note that even after all the teaching of Christianity and suffering so much from his own kind and kin for it, he still maintained that the last word as to who the land belongs to was "God", DIVINITY - MODIMO. QAMATA, UMVELINGQANGI. This he had not acquired from any missionary teaching else his enemies, the Boers, would have known it even before him!

References

1. Delius, Peter: 1983, The Land Belongs To Us , Johannesburg, Ravan Press.
2. Lan, David: 1984, Guns and Witchdoctors Harare, Mambo Press.
3. Mason, Revill: 1987, Origins of the African People in the Johannesburg Area, Johannesburg, Skotaville Press.
4. The First Tswana in Settlement in Botswana, 1982, Gabarone, edited by R.Renee Hitchcock and Mary R.Smith Heineemann Educational Books, Ltd. and Botswana Society.
5. Moffat, Robert: 1842, Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa, London, John Snow.
6. Molema, S. M.: 1941, Chief Moroka : His life and Times, Lovedale, Lovedale Press.
7. Ngcongco, Leonard: "Pre-colonial Migration in South Eastern Botswana" in Hitchcock & Smith as above.
8. Setiloane, Gabriel M: 1972, The Image of God Among The Sotho-Tswana, Rotterdam, A.A. Balkema.
9. "I AM AN AFRICAN" in Frontier, a magazine of the British Missionary Societies, Lutterworth Press, January, 1969.

10. "Civil Authority - An African Perspective " in The Journal of Black Theology in South Africa, Jan. 1990.

11. "The Star", Johannesburg, January 9, 1991.

12. "Sunday Star", Johannesburg, September 27, 1991.

13. Van Riebeeck's Diary, 1662 in The South African Library Cape Town.

14. The Holy Bible.
