

SAN HISTORY AND NON-SAN HISTORIANS

by

John Wright

Introduction

The recorded history of the San, or "Bushmen" as they are called in most of the literature, begins in the mid-17th century with the first contacts between hunter-gatherers and literate Europeans in the south-west Cape. The later Stone Age cultures associated with the ancestors of the San have been the subject of archaeological research for fifty years, but the impossibility at present of establishing satisfactory continuities between "prehistoric" and historical groups means that for all practical purposes the study of the San past must focus on the last 300 years. The outstanding fact of their history during this period has been the progressive collapse of their societies in the face of a variety of pressures exerted on them by intrusive European, Khoi, and Bantu-speaking pastoral and agricultural communities, and their consequent disappearance as a distinct population from most of southern Africa. It is likely that this process had its roots in the first few centuries AD, when farming peoples from the north, almost certainly ancestral to the historical Bantu-speakers, began settling across the Zambezi and Limpopo rivers, but it received its greatest impetus from the movement of European settlers into the sub-continent from the 1650s onward. Within two centuries of the Europeans' arrival the San had vanished from wide areas that they had formerly inhabited, and the survivors had nearly all been reduced to varying degrees of dependence on European-descended or Bantu-speaking communities. The history of the San must, therefore, be set primarily against the background of European expansionism and colonial underdevelopment.

The sources for research into San history are more numerous than is commonly supposed, but the fate of the San at the hands of alien peoples has been paralleled by the disregard which historians have by and large shown them. Though systematic study of southern African history began with Theal's work in the last two decades of the 19th century, only a handful of books and articles, of widely varying scope and quality, have devoted more than passing attention to the history of the San. By contrast, the same period has seen the production of a large body of ethnographic, linguistic, and medical studies of the surviving San, while archaeologists have been at work on the later Stone Age cultures of their forebears since the 1920s. The reasons for the neglect shown by historians can be summarized under two heads. First is that the San played a less and less important role in southern African affairs from the early 19th century onward, until, by the end of the century, they had become of marginal concern to the much more numerous white and Bantu-speaking populations. Second is the related fact that the great majority of historians writing on southern Africa has consisted of individuals themselves of European descent and cultural affiliation, whose main focus has been on the activities of European settlers and European colonial powers. Western historians in general have until very recently been concerned more with the study of what they see as "successful" than of "unsuccessful" groups, and the historiography of

colonized as against colonizing peoples, and of subordinate as against dominant classes, has suffered accordingly. Anthropology and its related disciplines have, on the other hand, always been concerned with the study of non-western peoples, whether as "curiosities", as subjects of colonial rule, or as allies or victims of the imperial powers. (1)

The two salient features of San historiography are, then, that it is scanty and that it has been and continues to be in the hands of outsiders. A third important feature is that the sources on San history are themselves the products of outsiders. As hunters and gatherers the San had no system of written communication and record-keeping, nor, as far as can be judged, did they produce any substantial body of oral traditions (2) - quite apart from the issue of whether or not contemporary literate observers would have been able, or concerned enough, to collect such traditions. Knowledge of their history depends primarily on records left by (mostly) white administrators, frontier farmers, missionaries, traders, and hunters who were in varying degrees of contact with San affairs, either directly or through intermediaries. As very few of them were expressly concerned with documenting the San point of view, or had any insight into San ways of living, the researcher today is left to try to formulate the patterns of San history from a body of observations even less reliable than the sources on the history of other African societies. The odd official document or travel account may record San views and statements in passing, and snippets of verbal testimony were collected in the 19th century from surviving San by workers such as Stow (3), but, in all, these add up to no more than a few scraps of information as produced by the San themselves. In sum, the sources on the history are partial, both in the sense that they usually reflect a cultural bias against the San, and in the sense that they treat mainly of only one aspect of the San experience, that is, their "external" relations with literate non-San. On their "internal" history there is almost nothing said.

The history of the San is thus predominantly the history of their contacts with other peoples. In so far as these contacts were between people who were primarily hunter-gatherers, on the one hand, and pastoralists and cultivators, on the other, their history can be seen as that of the frontier between societies based on two irreconcilable systems of producing the basic necessities of life, with its main theme the gradual disappearance of discrete hunter-gatherer societies, either through fragmentation and the consequent collapse of their ability to reproduce themselves, or through incorporation into the societies of their competitors, or, less commonly, through transformation into pastoral communities. Though in parts of the Kalahari desert the protection afforded to some San groups by an environment unfavourable for pastoralism or cultivation has enabled them to maintain a separate geographical base for hunting and gathering activities into the mid-20th century, over the rest of southern Africa the frontier has long since broken down and the San have disappeared as identifiable groups. In the remainder of this paper I try to outline the manner in which the study of this process has been handled by historians.

The San as Expendable Savages

The San occupied a place in the minds of white settlers and administrators at the Cape from the 1650s onward, but, unlike the Khoi, who were more easily visible to European commentators touching at or resident in the Cape, and who became the subjects of a long series of derogatory literary descriptions after 1500 (4), they did not become well known in European intellectual circles until after travel writers had begun penetrating the interior of southern Africa in the 1770s. Though these observers were by no means uniform in their attitudes to the San whom they encountered, the descriptions which they published in the substantial travel literature that appeared over the next century or so served to disseminate and to entrench an image of the San and their culture which in some respects has persisted in the minds of most westerners to the present day. In essence, by the second half of the 19th century the San had generally come to be seen in Europe as it seems they had long been seen by white settlers in southern Africa. Physically they were regarded as degenerates who were fated to give way to the "stronger" races, and culturally they were regarded as being in the lowest possible state of savagery, incapable of evolving to a "higher" level,

and therefore having no place in the march towards "civilization".

Unlike other African societies, the San had virtually nothing to offer to Europeans which could have led to the formation of groups with a vested interest in preserving their existence. They possessed no property and produced no commodities to attract traders; missionaries had tried and had failed to evangelize them; their numerical weakness and nomadic habits made them of little use as political allies; and their availability as a source of labour depended in fact on the break-up of their independent societies. There were thus very few voices raised in their defence, and there was little to prevent the growth of attitudes that excused and even encouraged their destruction. Hence, by way of example, after a visit to Natal in 1850-1 Oxford-educated Charles Barter could with equanimity recommend as an administrative measure the extermination of the San who were then raiding the colony. (5)

An analysis of the evolution of the unfavourable image of the San belongs to the history of western ideas about race and culture rather than to the subject of this paper; the importance of this image in a study of San historiography lies in the effects which it had on the first generation of southern African historians, both English- and Afrikaans-speaking, that was emerging in the later 19th century and, through them, on historians for the next seventy or eighty years. (6) Particularly important was its influence on G. M. Theal, by far the most productive of these pioneer scholars and the first to make systematic use of archival resources. Between 1880 and 1920 Theal built up a large and formidably detailed corpus of works which is still consulted by "serious" historians and popularizers alike, and it was he more than any other single figure who set the pattern of writing - or, rather, of not writing - San history which survived until the 1960s. In common with most of his contemporaries, he had conceived a profound contempt for the San, which affected his whole approach to the history of their relations with what he saw as "superior" peoples. His views were given particular form by, on the one hand, his personal observations of San societies in the last stages of disintegration, and, on the other, the pseudo-scientific racism which by the mid-19th century was becoming deeply engrained in western sociological thought (7), but it was surely significant for the development of his ideas that the start of his career coincided with a period of major shifts in relations between white peoples and black throughout the African continent. The end of the 19th century was the era of "scramble", when more than 400 years of European expansionism culminated in the partition of Africa and the subordination of its peoples by the major powers, a process which confirmed the cultural supremacy felt by Europeans and intensified their arrogance towards people of colour. In southern Africa itself, these years saw the subjugation of the last independent African chiefdoms, and, more significantly, the beginnings of the mining revolution and the major dislocations and changes in the societies of both blacks and whites that accompanied it. Recent studies have suggested that it was essentially this period which saw the birth of modern South African racism as pre-existing white prejudices against blacks began hardening in response to the increasing economic competition between them. (8) It was at this time, too, that white South African thinking on "the native problem" and "race conflict" began to be articulated into an ideology which sought to justify and hence to perpetuate white political and economic domination of blacks. (9)

It was no mere coincidence that contemporary writers frequently expressed their views on the San, the lowest of the low, in crudely uncomplimentary terms, whereas this had by no means always been the case in the past. Thus Theal wrote in full accord with the views of his time when in 1902 he described them as people with a "low" order of society, language, and reasoning power, who were "vindictive, passionate and cruel in the extreme", and among whom "human life, even that of their nearest kindred, was sacrificed on very slight provocation". In contrast to Europeans, they lived a "wretched" life, with pleasures "hardly superior to those of dumb animals". (10) In his later works Theal considerably expanded his treatment of San culture, but his approach remained the same. Even Stow, collecting his material on the San before 1880 and chronicling their fate with a deeply felt pity, could not avoid being patronizing towards them. (11) Though ethnographic accounts of the San had begun to appear in the 1870s (12), their effect was probably further to entrench the image of the San as contemptible savages, and the careful work of the German philologist Wilhelm Bleek and his associates on San linguistics and mythology, which, in academic circles at least, might have helped correct the accepted stereotype, did not begin to appear in

print until 1911. (13)

It is hardly surprising, then, that Theal's treatment of San history was both tendentious and dismissive. In his first work of importance, Chronicles of Cape Commanders, the San are typecast as "robbers", "plunderers", "murderers", "outlaws", and "perfect pests" of "predatory habits" who "infested" the mountains and made life unsafe for the white frontier farmers (14), and the same terms and phraseology occur throughout his work. Though Theal could admire Stow's Native Races of South Africa, which he himself edited for publication in 1905, he did not share Stow's ability to see San cattle-raiding as something more than mere banditry, and in fact as a form of resistance to white encroachment. And, though he recognized that at the heart of the frontier conflict lay competition for basic resources (15), he attributed the extinction of the San to their being "disinclined" to take their only chance of survival and enter the service of the colonists.

They could not adapt themselves to the new environment; they tried to live as their ancestors had lived, and therefore they were fated to perish. The wave of European civilization was not to be stayed from rolling on by a few savages who stood in its course. (16)

Theal thus disregards the evidence, which was certainly available to him, for the ability of the San to respond to the disruption of their hunting and gathering life styles in a variety of ways, one of which was in fact to take service with the farmers. And as he perverts the whole issue of land appropriation, so he glosses over the question of labour appropriation inherent in the farmers' common practice of taking children captive on commando with the statement that it was done to save the children from starvation, or "in the vain hope of compelling them to live by industry". (17) Both explanations are no doubt partly true, but avoid the substantive issue. Similarly, the mass killing of San on the frontier is passed off with the comment that "without violence the country could not be held". (18)

In Theal's view, it was not only whites who were hostile to the San, but Khoi and Bantu-speakers as well. The San were "enemies of everyone else", "seldom spared" when they fell into the hands of the Khoi, and "had every man's hand against them" among the Xhosa "just as everywhere else in South Africa". (19) Khoi and Bantu-speakers waged "incessant war" against them, and it was only in the last few years of the 19th century that missionaries were able, with much difficulty, "to persuade the most intelligent Bantu that Bushmen had rights as human beings, which it behoved them to respect". (20) Though there is no doubt that in the historical period, at least, relations between San, Khoi, and Bantu-speakers were often violent, Theal's failure to adduce evidence in support of these statements, or to attempt any historical analysis of Khoi and Bantu-speakers' attitudes to the San, leads to the suspicion that he was simply ascribing to them the attitudes current in his own time among whites. He does not consider the argument that white settler hostility to the San might have been a factor in shaping the course of San relations with these other peoples in the historical period, and misses the significance of evidence which he himself brings forward as to the existence of peaceful "client-patron" relations between San and Khoi in the 17th century, and San and Tswana in his own times. (21) Thus he can sum up the role of the San in southern African history in the briefest of terms.

They were of no benefit to any other section of the human family, they were incapable of improvement, and as it was impossible for civilized men to live on the same soil with them, it was for the world's good that they should make room for a higher race. (22)

The San as a Frontier Problem

After World War I, the gradual if spasmodic rejection of racist modes of thinking by most western intellectuals combined with a growing output of information on the ethnography of the surviving San to produce a considerable shift of academic

opinion on the nature of their hunting and gathering way of life. The more balanced perspectives of the time are perhaps best indicated in Isaac Schapera's classic, The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa, a scholarly synthesis of the existing literature, published in 1930. Though his "static" picture of San life, drawn from sources that in fact depicted hunter-gatherer societies in widely varying conditions of change, can no longer be fully accepted, by supplanting Theal's Ethnography and Condition of South Africa before AD 1505 (23) as the standard work of ready reference on San culture, his book probably did more than any other one publication of the inter-war years to modify the 19th century image of the San. Though scholars of the day continued automatically to assume the supremacy of western value systems, and to write of the San in patronizing terms, the crudities of expression current in descriptions of the San in Theal's time were by now starting to disappear.

The more favourable treatment of the San by anthropologists was not, however, matched by any substantial change in their treatment by historians. The era of border raids and skirmishes, which was still very much alive in the memory when Theal began his work, had long since passed, but with one or two exceptions the post-World War I historians were content to follow much the same approach to San history as he and his contemporaries had mapped out. English- and Afrikaans-speaking historians continued to reflect in their work the major preoccupations of the white South African society they lived in, with the emergent generation of English liberal scholars focussing on the development of "race relations" (24), and the Afrikaners, as previously, on the evolution of their own identity as a distinct people. Though they wrote from widely divergent and often opposing standpoints, they were united in their disregard of the San, whom they continued to cast, even if in terms less emotive than those of Theal and his contemporaries, as cattle thieves who represented simply one of a number of environmental problems which the white frontiersmen had to face as they expanded into the interior of southern Africa.

"Of the unlucky Bushmen there is little for history to say", W. M. Macmillan wrote in 1927 (25), a comment which aptly summarizes the place of the San in history-writing for the next forty years. What history did have to say, in the view of Macmillan and those of his contemporaries and successors who wrote in the liberal tradition, mainly concerned the conflicts between Bantu-speakers, Afrikaners and British, which meant that these writers tended to bypass events before 1770, and events on the fringes of the main areas of settlement. (26) Thus only two surveys written in English during this period made more than passing mention of the San. In his Race Attitudes in South Africa (27), I. D. MacCrone saw them as having played a significant role in the evolution of white frontier society, and J. S. Marais devoted a chapter in The Cape Coloured People 1652-1937 (28) to an outline of San-white relations until the 1860s, in which he explicitly repudiated some of Theal's conclusions.

A clue as to why liberal historians, who were after all vitally concerned with issues of race relations, were generally unable to move beyond a Theal-type approach to San history is provided by a passage in Macmillan's Cape Colour Question.

Almost all the political complications in South African history have been the result of conflicting views on how to govern the native Bushmen, Hottentots, or Bantu,

he writes in the opening to his third chapter, but nowhere does he seek to explain in any depth how and why these views arose in the first place. Accordingly, it is on the political manifestations of conflict rather than its underlying causes that he and other liberal writers after him, with the important exception of De Kiewiet, tend to concentrate their attentions. And it is those conflicts - whites versus Bantu-speakers, Afrikaners versus British - which threw up much political dust that receive most notice, while those which did not - like those involving the San - are largely ignored. Little attempt is made at analysing the extent to which conflicts between groups were shaped by the nature of their underlying socio-economic structures, or how these structures themselves changed through time. Thus the decimation of the San in the 18th century is attributed by Macmillan simply to the "inadequate theory" held by the white farmers that they were animals to be shot on sight. (29) He and others with him fail to get to grips with the nature of white expansionism at this time, and so fail to place in context the destruction of the San that accompanied it.

Afrikaner historians have always been more concerned than their English-speaking colleagues with the frontier situation of the 17th and 18th centuries, for it was on the frontier that the Afrikaner people are commonly supposed to have evolved their distinctive identity. (30) But as liberal historians have seen the San as unimportant in the evolution of "race relations", so Afrikaner scholars have, by and large, regarded them as insignificant in the evolution of the "volk" and, with one exception, have spared them correspondingly little attention. Thus, to cite some recent examples of their work, in Van der Walt, Wiid, and Geyer's Geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika, the San are the "roofsugtige, ontombare en beweeglike Boesmans" who quickly played out a marginal role in the Afrikaner "volksplanting" and then conveniently either died out or fled to the Kalahari. (31) N. J. Rhodie and H. J. Venter recognize in their Apartheid that "the large-scale use of cheap non-White labour is one of the main characteristics of the history of race relations in South Africa" (32), but say nothing of its early development on the frontier. Again, they recognize that, owing to a shortage of white women at the Cape, miscegenation between white men and non-white women was frequent and continued, but attribute it specifically to sailors, soldiers, and officials, and thus avoid discussing to what extent unions between whites and non-whites, including San, took place in the frontier context. (33) The ousting of Khoi and San from their land is passed over with the assertion that territorial separation between white and non-white early became a "tradition". (34)

Like much recent Afrikaner historiography, this work is shot through with the assumption that 20th-century white South African race prejudices were already in full-blown existence in the 18th, if not the 17th, century. A similar approach characterizes G. D. Scholtz's Die Ontwikkeling van die Politieke Denke van die Afrikaner (35) and J. A. Coetzee's Nasieskap en Politieke Groepering in Suid-Afrika 1652-1968 (36), both of which give short shrift to the San. The composite work Five Hundred Years: a History of South Africa (37), edited by Professor C. F. J. Muller, takes a more balanced line, but, with its focus explicitly on the history of the whites, and its tendency to eschew analysis in favour of narrative, inevitably repeats the stereotypes of the San as marauders. The reader is told at one point "The Bushmen were always a problem on the border (see Appendix I)", and, in Appendix I, little more than that "All attempts to civilize them failed". (38) In his more incisive - and polemical - Van Van Riebeeck tot Verwoerd, Professor F. A. van Jaarsveld shows a greater awareness than Professor Muller and his colleagues of the role played by the Bantu-speaking peoples in southern African history, but has nothing new to say on the San. (39)

The only historian writing in Afrikaans to have taken any sustained interest in the San is Professor P. J. van der Merwe, whose dispassionate studies of the expansion of the white frontier are exceptional in their level of detail, even if not in the nature of their approach. Thus the focus of Die Noordwaartse Beweging van die Boere voor die Groot Trek (1770-1842) (40) is still on white frontier society, but its contacts with the San, peaceful as well as violent, are chronicled in sufficient detail for something of the San side of the story to show through. But van der Merwe's lack of an overall perspective on the processes at work on the frontier, and his misunderstanding of the nature of hunter-gatherer society, turn his explanations of white territorial expansion and the activities of the commandos into little more than exercises in apologetics. He sees the collapse of the San as due to an innate inefficiency in their subsistence practices which led them to welcome the farmers as providers, and does not consider the point that it was the very intrusion of the farmers which destroyed the delicately balanced economy of the hunter-gatherers - a classic case of "underdevelopment".

European continental historians of widely differing viewpoints have mirrored the conventional neglect of the San by their English- and Afrikaans-speaking counterparts. Thus L. C. D. Joos's Histoire de l'Afrique du Sud (41) and E. Sik's The History of Black Africa (42) merely mention the San in passing, though the latter makes an attempt to cast them as resisters as well as simply victims of white frontier expansion. The title of Victor Ellenberger's La Fin Tragique des Bushmen (43) promises much, but the book is in fact little more than a rehash of Stow and the travel literature. The most useful part is the appendix of statements made by a number of Sotho informants on San-Sotho relations.

The few black writers on southern African history so far to have emerged have also tended to bypass the San or ignore them altogether. This applies equally to early writers such as Molema and Fuze, whose work is strongly influenced by contemporary western ideas (44), to the later radical authors like Majeke, who take a strong African nationalist standpoint (45), and to the rising generation of African historians in other parts of the continent. (46) Like the Afrikaners, their preoccupations have been with the history of their own people rather than with that of what has long been an isolated minority group.

New Approaches

The end of the colonial era and the birth of several dozen new African states in the late 1950s and the 1960s gave a strong impetus to a study of African history, in the west and in the continent itself, in which the focus began to widen to include not only the activities of Europeans but those of the indigenous peoples as well. Coinciding with this has been an increase of interest among social scientists in the nature of the world's remaining hunter-gatherer societies, including the San, as evinced by the publication of a growing number of ethnographic surveys based on systematic field research, and also of theoretical syntheses. The same period has seen the appearance of numerous and increasingly scientific surveys of southern Africa's incomparable wealth of rock art. Together with popular works like those of Lawrence van der Post and Elizabeth Marshall Thomas (47), these publications have served to begin the process of rehabilitating the San in the eyes of the societies which all but destroyed them, and which can now, as in the case of the American Indian, afford to pity and even romanticize them.

For historians, these events add up to the development of an intellectual climate in which San history can for the first time be seen as a valid field of research. Given the extent of the topics awaiting investigation in the history of Africa, it is not surprising that present-day historians have been slow to turn their attention to the San, but from a handful of recent publications new themes are starting to emerge. In the small compass allotted to the San in the Oxford History of South Africa, Professor Monica Wilson - significantly, an anthropologist - breaks away from the old stereotypes and touches on some important points: the raiding by white settler commandos for San captives; the extent of San incorporation into Bantu-speaking, farming societies; the difficulties involved in the transition from a hunter-gatherer to a herding economy. (48) Her historian co-authors in the Oxford History unfortunately take her ideas no further. My own work deals with the contacts between the San and the inhabitants of Natal colony, mainly from an administration point of view, but also looks at the relationships that existed in the mid-19th century between the San and certain Bantu-speaking chiefs beyond the colony's borders, and the extent to which the San were adapting their hunting and gathering way of life to a raiding and trading economy. (49) Dr Shula Marks's article, "Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries", is the first work to deal specifically with Khoi and San reaction to white settler intrusion, and in suggesting the existence of continuities between the Cape peninsular wars of the 17th and the frontier conflicts of the 18th century, it also draws attention to the nature of Khoi-San relations in this period. (50) This latter theme is dealt with at some length by Richard Elphick in his doctoral thesis on Khoi-settler relations at the Cape. (51) Most recently, Margo Russell has described the development of a very different kind of frontier situation, involving San, whites, and Bantu-speakers in 20th-century Botswana. (52) Her sensitive handling of complex issues should serve as a model for studies of master-servant relationships involving the San in other contexts.

Focus in the past few years has thus been on the nature of San resistance to encroachment by other peoples into their territories, the nature of the strategies which they tried to follow in adapting to new conditions of existence, and the forms by which they were incorporated into the alien societies which came to dominate them. Implicit in this approach to their history is a view of the San not simply as victims of circumstances, as they have for so long been portrayed, but also as actors who were able to play a part in determining the course of their own lives in the face of the (to them) incomprehensible forces which were operating to overwhelm them. Future researchers will no doubt carry these themes further.

Notes

- (1) See the essays in T. Asad (ed), Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter (London, 1973); also J. Stauder, "The 'relevance' of anthropology to colonialism and imperialism", Race and Class, 16 (1974-5), pp. 29-51.
- (2) The reasons for this have to do with the nature of knowledge in hunter-gatherer societies. For discussion, see E. R. Service, The Hunters (Englewood Cliffs, 1966), ch. 5.
- (3) G. W. Stow, The Native Races of South Africa (London, 1905), pp. 183-231. These fifty-odd pages form the most valuable section of the book.
- (4) See R. Haven-Hart, Before Van Riebeeck (Cape Town, 1967), and Cape Good Hope, 2 vols (Cape Town, 1971).
- (5) C. Barter, Adventures of an Oxford Collegian (London, 1852), pp. 53-4.
- (6) For surveys of South African historiography, see L. M. Thompson, "Afrikaner nationalist historiography and the policy of apartheid", Journal of African History, 3 (1962), pp. 125-41; the same author's chapter, "South Africa", in R. Winks (ed), The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth (Durham, NC, 1966); F. A. van Jaarsveld, The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History (Cape Town, 1964).
- (7) On the history of racist thinking in Europe, and more particularly in Britain, see P. D. Curtin, The Image of Africa (Madison, 1964); M. Banton, Race Relations (London, 1967); P. Mason, Patterns of Dominance (London, 1970); E. D. Genovese, The World the Slaveholders Made (London, 1970); V. G. Kiernan, The Lords of Human Kind (Harmondsworth, 1972); M. D. Biddiss, "Gobineau and the origins of European racism", Race, 7 (1965-6), pp. 255-70; M. Nikolinakos, "Notes on an economic theory of racism", Race, 14 (1972-3), pp. 365-81.
- (8) See, for instance, M. Legassick, "The frontier tradition in South African historiography", CSP: The Societies of Southern Africa, Vol. II (ICS, London, 1971), p. 10; A. Atmore and N. Westlake, "A liberal dilemma: a critique of the Oxford History of South Africa", Race, 14 (1972-3), pp. 115-16; W. Freund, "Race in the social structure of South Africa, 1652-1836", Race and Class, 18, 1 (1976), pp. 63-5.
- (9) See, for instance, F. S. Tatham, The Race Conflict in South Africa (Pietermaritzburg, 1894); A. Davis, The Native Problem in South Africa (London, 1903).
- (10) The Beginnings of South African History (London, 1902), pp. 9-19.
- (11) Native Races, passim.
- (12) See the bibliography in I. Schapera's The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa (London, 1930), and the same author's Select Bibliography of Native Life and Problems (London, 1941). Twenty-odd books and articles on aspects of San life, more than half of them in German, had been published by 1900. The tempo increased considerably after that date.
- (13) With W. H. I. Bleek and L. C. Lloyd's Specimens of Bushmen Folklore (London, 1911).
- (14) Cape Town, 1882, pp. 76, 172, 193, 201, 256, 375.
- (15) History and Ethnography of Africa South of the Zambezi, Vol. 2 (London, 1909), p. 509.
- (16) Ibid.
- (17) Ibid., p. 56; History and Ethnography of Africa South of the Zambezi, Vol. 3 (London, 1910), p. 177. The study of labour relations on the South African frontier is still in its infancy, but useful analogies applicable to the Cape in the 18th century can be drawn from S. Trapido, "Aspects in the transition from slavery to serfdom: the South African Republic, 1842-1902", Collected Seminar Papers, No. 20, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 1976, pp. 24-31.
- (18) History and Ethnography, Vol. 2, p. 124.
- (19) Chronicles of Cape Commanders, pp. 76, 201-2, 256-7.

- (20) Beginning of SA History, pp. 10-11.
- (21) Chronicles of Cape Commanders, pp. 201-2.
- (22) History and Ethnography, Vol. 3, pp. 313-14. Comments on San history briefer than but broadly similar in approach to Theal's are to be found in A. Wilmot and J. C. Chase, History of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope (Cape Town, 1869), pp. 148-51, 188-95; A. Wilmot, The Story of the Expansion of Southern Africa (London, 1894), pp. 6-8; G. E. Cory, The Rise of South Africa, Vol. 1 (London, 1910), p. 14 f; Vol. 2 (London, 1913), pp. 220-6.
- (23) London, 1910.
- (24) W. M. Macmillan, one of the earliest and most influential of the liberal historians, makes this clear in the preface to his seminal work, The Cape Colour Question: a Historical Survey (London, 1927). For comments on the nature of liberal thought in this period, see M. Legassick, "Race, industrialization and social change in South Africa: the case of R. F. A. Hoernlé", African Affairs, 75 (1976), pp. 224-39.
- (25) Cape Colour Question, p. 26.
- (26) See E. A. Walker, History of South Africa (London, 1928); J. H. Hofmeyr, South Africa (London, 1931); C. W. de Kiewiet, A History of South Africa (London, 1941); S. T. van der Horst, Native Labour in South Africa (London, 1942); A. Keppel-Jones, South Africa: a Short History (London, 1949); L. Marquard, The Story of South Africa (London, 1955).
- (27) London, 1937.
- (28) London, 1939.
- (29) Cape Colour Question, p. 27.
- (30) Important modifications of this view have recently been put forward. See Legassick, "The frontier tradition", passim; Freund, "Race in the social structure of SA", passim.
- (31) A. J. H. van der Walt, J. A. Wiid and A. L. Geyer (eds), Geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika, Vol. 2 (Bloemfontein and Johannesburg, 1951), pp. 331-3, 607.
- (32) Cape Town and Pretoria, 1960, p. 45.
- (33) Ibid., pp. 47-8. On the issue of miscegenation in the Cape, see P. L. van den Bergh, "Miscegenation in South Africa", Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines, No. 4 (1960), pp. 68-84; L. J. Greenstein, "Slave and citizen: the South African case", Race, 15 (1973-4), pp. 25-46; R. Ross, "The 'white' population of the Cape colony in the eighteenth century", Collected Seminar Papers, No. 20, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 1976, pp. 15-22.
- (34) Apartheid, p. 46.
- (35) Vol. 1, Johannesburg, 1967.
- (36) Pretoria, 1969.
- (37) Pretoria and Cape Town, 1969, 2nd ed. 1975.
- (38) Ibid., pp. 91, 483.
- (39) Johannesburg, 1971, pp. 22-4.
- (40) The Hague, 1937.
- (41) Paris, 1965, pp. 62-3.
- (42) Vol. 1, Budapest, 1966, pp. 79, 177.
- (43) Paris, 1953.
- (44) S. M. Molema, The Bantu Past and Present (Edinburgh, 1920); M. Fuze, Abantu Abansundu Lapo Bavela Ngakona (Pietermaritzburg, 1922).
- (45) N. Majeke, The Role of Missionaries in Conquest (Johannesburg, 1952).
- (46) See, for example, G. Parker and P. Pfukani, History of Southern Africa (London, 1975).
- (47) L. van der Post, The Lost World of the Kalahari (London, 1958), and The Heart of the Hunter (London, 1961); E. M. Thomas, The Harmless People (London, 1959).

- (48) M. Wilson, "The hunters and herders", in M. Wilson and L. Thompson (eds), The Oxford History of South Africa, Vol. 1 (Oxford, 1969), pp. 63-4, 70-3.
- (49) Bushman Raiders of the Drakensberg 1840-1870 (Pietermaritzburg, 1971).
- (50) Journal of African History, 13 (1972), pp. 55-80.
- (51) "The Cape Khoi and the first phase of South African race relations", PhD thesis, Yale University, 1972, now published under the title Kraal and Castle. Khoikhoi and the founding of White South Africa (Yale, 1977).
- (52) "Slaves or workers? Relations between Bushmen, Tswana, and Boers in the Kalahari", Journal of Southern African Studies, 2, 2 (April 1976), pp. 178-197.