

History Without the Humbug

Countering the Re-writing of History

THE ENGLISH SOUTH AFRICAN: His History, Culture and Achievements

by Shaun Willcock

The purpose of these articles is to counter the deliberate re-writing of history with those stubborn things called facts, and that wonderful thing called truth. “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil” (Isaiah 5:20).

Introduction

I am an English South African. And I am constantly astounded by, and marvel at, the magnificent history, rich culture and astounding achievements of my people. What great things they have accomplished in their beloved country!

I say this without hesitation, and without apology. In today’s South Africa, and indeed in today’s world, the English South African, like his fellow “white” South African, the Afrikaner, is viewed in a very poor light, as a racist, an oppressor, someone who does not belong in Africa. Everywhere in South Africa today, the history, culture and achievements of these two great African “white tribes” are denigrated, ridiculed, suppressed, destroyed even. Once upon a time, not that long ago, they governed this great country, and for the most part governed it wisely and extremely well; but today in many ways they have been made second-class citizens in the land of their birth. And the present rulers of South Africa – “black” Marxist and Marxist-sympathising South Africans such as Zulus, Xhosas, and others – have disseminated such lies about English and Afrikaans South Africans, and so frequently and thoroughly, that many of them have very little understanding of, or appreciation for, their history or culture anymore, and indeed many of them have even become ashamed of it. They have fallen for the lies, propaganda and indoctrination of the Marxists and their fellow travellers who now hold the reins of government in this country. And this is a great tragedy.

In truth, the English South African’s history is a great one, and his contribution to the country has been immense. Truly, although the different people groups living within the borders of South Africa have all, to some extent, contributed to it, the English South African and the Afrikaner have contributed not only the most, but also that which is best, that which is most useful and beneficial, to this country. It is not “politically correct” to say such a thing today, but the overwhelming evidence is there for all to see, and so obvious that only those with an anti-“white” agenda would deny it. It can be seen in our great cities; in the organisation of our splendid game parks; in our First World infrastructure; in our scientific achievements; in whatever still remains of the rule of law, and the outstanding judicial system that in a better time lifted this land above the surrounding African states and enabled it to maintain its status as one of the leading countries on earth; in every tarred road, every high-rise building, every electricity cable or water pipe, every car or train or plane. The unpalatable truth is that the present undermining of this history and culture, the ridicule that is heaped upon the “white” South African’s presence in this part of the continent, is born of *envy*: envy at his achievements, his astonishing success, his phenomenal ability to take a wild land and transform it into a civilisation.

This is not written in order to exalt all English South Africans as good, and all other South Africans as bad. Far from it. Nor is it written out of any malice or hatred or bitterness towards others. But this is an

age when history is being re-written by Marxists, liberals, and others. Very rapidly, the truth about the past is being “revised”, and unless this wicked revisionism is resisted, coming generations will be thoroughly indoctrinated with lies and myths presented as “truth”. Already vast damage has been done, and even many adults who lived through more recent historical events have been so well indoctrinated, and conditioned to think along the “party” line, that they actually believe the lies and myths they have been fed. Very few people think critically anymore. They do not even know how to. They simply swallow whatever they are told by their Red, almost-Red, and religious-Red Masters.

Christians, above all others, must be concerned with the truth. A proper understanding of history is vital for every believer. To distort history is to lie, and to promote a lie is to lie oneself, and Christians are never to be liars. Furthermore, Christians *should* be involved in the study and teaching of true history, science, etc., so as to counter the lies of the ungodly, who would call evil good, and good evil, and would say that black is white, if it advanced their own agenda.

In the true Christian Church, “There is neither Jew nor Greek... for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:28); but in the world, in God’s sovereignty all men are all born into particular people groups and nations. This has been so ever since the tower of Babel. It is the will of God for various people groups and nations to exist, and nationalism and patriotism are natural to us as human beings, and not in themselves sinful, provided they are kept strictly within biblical limits. There are those who are, nationally, our “brethren, our kinsmen according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:2), and for them we have a particular regard. Paul the apostle spoke of “my nation” (Acts 28:18), “mine own nation” (Acts 26:4); and every human being on earth is part of one, and feels some affinity for it, sometimes a very strong affinity. Christians are indeed strangers and pilgrims on this earth, but even so they have certain feelings of affection for, not to mention certain obligations towards, their earthly nations, just as, even though Christians are part of the family of God, they have feelings of affection for, and obligations towards, their earthly families. There are also nations which are greater than others (Deut. 4:6; Jer. 50:41), nations which are more warlike than others (Deut. 28:49-51; Jer. 5:15), nations which are wealthier than others (Jer. 49:31), nations which are more foolish than others (Deut. 32:28), and nations which are more righteous than others, even externally (Prov. 14:34). In addition, particular sins may characterise particular nations, as a general rule: the people of Crete in biblical times were described by one of their own as “liars, evil beasts, slow bellies” – a true witness against them, according to Paul (Titus 1:12,13). But we can almost hear the howls of outrage from the “politically correct” today if we were to characterise any modern nation, or people group, in such a fashion! Facts, though, are stubborn things. It is true that all mankind descended from our first parents, and that *all* men and women are conceived and born in sin, without exception; but the fact is that there *are* nations which, speaking generally (to which there are always notable individual exceptions within them), are lazier, or more given to lying, or more violent, etc., than others; and there are nations which can be characterised as industrious, hard-working, generally honest, placid, peaceful, etc.

Christians must treat all men equally, regardless of race or colour or nationality; but this does *not* mean that we must ignore the facts, or fail to acknowledge that the Lord has given to certain peoples and nations qualities, skills, etc., which are superior to others, and which would benefit those others, also, if they would just make use of them with gratitude instead of being consumed with envy at the success or skill of those among whom such qualities and skills are present to a marked degree. Today, because of the liberal and Socialist preoccupation with racial equality, political correctness, etc., almost no one wants to state facts which may be unpalatable to others. We are so concerned with stepping on someone’s sensitive toes that we avoid stating the obvious, the plainly observable to those without blinkers on, and we sweep the truth under the carpet. Christians in biblical times had no such qualms, as shown by Paul’s comments about the Cretians; and Christians not that long ago had no such qualms either. And nor should we.

Despite the way in which they are being rubbished today by the Marxists and liberals, the fact is that South Africa’s two “white tribes”, the Afrikaners and the English, by their skill, industry and ingenuity built the country that is South Africa. They were, and are, great nations, in many ways. But today their histories, cultures and achievements are being deliberately “revised” by their enemies. Much has been,

and is being, written about the immense part played by the Afrikaners in South African history, and they are standing up and making their voices heard, seeking to resist the rising tide of anti-“white” racism engulfing South Africa under its Marxist and Marxist-sympathising rulers; but not much, comparatively, has been written in recent times about the immense contribution of the English South Africans, their culture, etc. This is a great pity. For the cold, hard reality is that both “white tribes” are under threat in the South Africa of today; and both must stand shoulder to shoulder, and proclaim to the country, and to the world, that they are true South Africans, and true Africans, and to show what the country would have been like without them, and what it will be like if ever they are driven out or annihilated. For there should be no doubt whatsoever about this fact: this is a battle for the very survival of Africans of European descent at the tip of the Dark Continent.

The English South African has every reason to have a strong sense of belonging, and of his absolute right, as a citizen, to be in this country; and he has every reason to hold his head up high, without feeling any need whatsoever to walk around with his proverbial tail between his legs, and look every other South African in the eye with confidence, without yielding an inch to those who would disparage him or seek to make him feel nothing but guilt and shame. For there would simply be no South Africa today without him. It is as plain and simple as that.

Before proceeding, a word, here, about pride.

As it is God who, in His sovereignty, made all the differences we see in people and in people groups, none of us has any grounds to be prejudiced against others. But we *can* take pride in accomplishments! The Bible certainly condemns sinful pride; but let us see the definition of pride:

“A high or overweening opinion of one’s own qualities, attainments, or estate; inordinate self-esteem.” And: “The exhibition of this quality in attitude, bearing, conduct, etc.; arrogance, haughtiness” (The Oxford Universal Dictionary). This is sinful pride. But here is another definition:

“A feeling of elation or high satisfaction derived from some action or possession; especially in *to take a pride in*.” This is something very different! To illustrate:

When a child does something very well, better than his peers, and he is praised for it, or people speak well of him and of his parent, the parent will feel this elation, this high satisfaction, that the child has done well, and even perhaps because the parent’s efforts have borne fruit. Colloquially, one might say, “I’m proud of you”; and if by this one means, “I’m elated; I’m satisfied; you have done well and it pleases me to see that you have” – this is not sinful pride. But if one says, arrogantly, haughtily, “My child is the best, the greatest, and I am a better parent than others because of it, etc., etc.,” this is sinful pride.

And what is true of one’s elation and satisfaction in one’s children’s achievements can also be true in the case of one’s people, or country. And when I examine the history and the achievements of the English South African people, I feel elated, it is pleasing, and I thank God for these things. All that we have is given to us by the sovereign Lord of all; but He does not give natural abilities equally to all; and wherever we see achievements that have been good and beneficial, we can feel elation because of them, and thank God for them and for the contribution they have made to society, the world, etc. We can rejoice in them, while as Christians blessing God for what he has given to men.

Let us, then, examine the English South African nation. It is as real, as solid, as distinctive, as that of any other people group living within the borders of this great multi-cultural country.

The English South African: A Distinct Nation Within South Africa

What is a nation? It is “a distinct race or people, characterized by common descent, language, or history, usually organized as a separate political state and occupying a definite territory”; “people of a particular nation”; “the whole people of a country” (The Oxford Universal Dictionary). Thus a nation can mean a distinct people group sharing certain things in common; and it can also mean all the people living within the borders of a country. A nation in this latter sense may consist of a number of nations in the former sense – distinct people groups – living within it (a multi-national state); or a nation may

consist of essentially one people group (a nation-state). South Africa is a multi-national state: that is to say, in the South African nation there are many distinct nations; and the English South African nation is one of them.

Not all belonging to a particular nation (in the sense of a distinct people group) would necessarily be of the same religion, or dress precisely the same way, or eat precisely the same food; but they would still be a part of that nation, because *most* of the distinctive traits, customs, characteristics, etc., of that particular nation could be found in them.

This can be illustrated by looking at the Indian South African nation. It is a good one to use as an example because it is perceived, by Indian South Africans and others, to be far more cohesive and unified than many others. And yet in reality there is still much diversity within the Indian South African people group. Consider the following, written by Indian South African journalist Gitanjali Pather:

“But what does being Indian mean? Is it about being born of Indian parents and if that is so what about children from mixed couples? Are they Indian but less Indian?... Is Indian-ness related to language and so if you speak Urdu, Hindi, Tamil or Telugu, then you automatically qualify for Indian status which would mean that 80% of Indians of South African descent cannot be Indian since they certainly don’t speak the language. Or is being Indian about culture and religion?

“Does eating curry... wearing saris and Punjabis or being a practising Hindu or Muslim, make one Indian? That would certainly make a number of Indians of Indian descent less Indian than others, since our lifestyles have been permeated and influenced by a global culture. In fact, a Marathi villager walking on the Durban Esplanade would have great problems identifying as Indians some of our mini-skirted, belly-button bearing Indian girls...

“Eish, it gets a little complicated this Indian thing especially because India is a land of true diversity, making South Africa’s 13 languages look like a backwoods little village.... Mumbai may be quite a shock [to Indian South Africans]... all those Indians who don’t even look like Indians... slanty-eyed Nepalese or Manipuri girls, tall rugged looking broad shouldered Punjabi women with gruff voices, small, dark wiry Koli women from the fishing village to light-skinned almost European featured Rajastanis? According to them, they are all Indian including the dark, African featured Naga tribeswomen on the upper East coast!”¹

The point is that not one of these supposedly “Indian” characteristics given in the quotation above, *taken in isolation*, defines one as an “Indian South African”. Rather it is when many of them come together in one person, that that person can be identified and defined as an Indian South African. And as Pather points out, a great many nations make up the nation of India itself! In India there are Punjabi Indians and Koli Indians and Nepalese Indians and many others. And in South Africa as well, there are a number of nations (Hindis, Tamils, etc.) which make up the Indian South African nation, which in turn is one of the many nations that make up the South African nation.

And the same is true of other people groups all over the world.

There are those who wonder: is there such a thing as a distinct *English* South African nation? If so, what is it? Where is it? The Afrikaners are a distinct nation; the Indian South Africans are a distinct nation; so are the Zulus, the Xhosas, etc. But the English South African nation? Does such a nation exist?

It most certainly does. It is a myth that has been perpetuated by other South Africans, even by some Afrikaners, that the English South African has no distinctive identity of his own, and thus no sense of nationhood. When the Afrikaners governed South Africa, there were some who claimed that the English South Africans did not really belong here, but to Britain; that they were not a distinct nation and not true South Africans. Such Afrikaners prided themselves (and still do) on being the only true “white tribe” in South Africa. But this is incorrect, for in truth there are two “white tribes”, the Afrikaners and the English. And now, in the Marxist-governed “New South Africa”, where only “black” Africans are made to feel really welcome, English South Africans are again hearing that they are not really South Africans, and should not be here. There are two differences this time around, however: the Afrikaners are now in the very same boat as the English – both are unwelcome in South Africa today; and the dislike, hatred in fact, of many blacks for the whites translates into violence against both “white tribes.”

This idea that the English South African is somehow less of a South African than his Afrikaner or Zulu

or Xhosa fellow-citizens is an outright lie. The English South African is *as much* a true South African as anyone else born and bred here.

Why then has this myth been propagated?

There are historical reasons. The Dutch (from whom the Afrikaners are primarily though not exclusively descended) arrived in this country long before the English did, for Jan van Riebeeck arrived in 1652, whereas the real beginnings of large-scale English emigration to South Africa began in 1820, although there were English South Africans long before this date. This is one reason for the myth. A second reason is that many Englishmen who came to South Africa during the time when the British Empire ruled the country had no intention of staying, and did not stay in fact. They regarded themselves as British, South Africa was a mere British colony, and once their term of office expired they either returned home or were sent on to other assignments in other parts of the far-flung empire. And a third reason is that there *were* British people who emigrated to South Africa and never left – this became their only home – and yet who always regarded themselves as British, and spoke of Britain as “home”.

But let us look at these three historical realities one by one.

It is true that the Dutch arrived long before the English did, at least in large numbers; but is this really a reason for claiming that the English South African is somehow less of a true South African than his Afrikaner neighbours? Certainly not! Whether one’s ancestors arrived three and a half centuries ago, or almost two centuries ago, makes absolutely no difference: generations have come and gone since then, and the descendants of both nations are equally South Africans today. The Zulu nation only came into existence in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth centuries, but it is one of the nations of South Africa today, no less than the Afrikaner nation. And the Indians arrived in South Africa only in the nineteenth century; yet their descendants are South African today as much as anyone else. In the stirring words of Sir James Rose Innes, the founder of what used to be (before the present Marxist-dominated government destroyed it) the marvellous educational system in South Africa that was equal with any other in the western world, and superior to many of them: “I have neither Voortrekker nor Huguenot blood in my veins... But I am proud to be a South African and I claim to stand on the same national footing as if my forbears had landed with van Riebeeck or followed Piet Retief over the Drakensberg.”²

It is also true that during the time of the British Empire, many Englishmen came but did not stay. But of course these never became South Africans, so their brief stay in this country is of no relevance to the matter at hand.

And yes, it must be conceded that there were many people from Britain who emigrated here and stayed the rest of their lives, with their children being born here, and yet who regarded themselves as British and regarded Britain as “home”, and thus never became *fully* South African; and even many of their children, born and bred in South Africa, were almost as guilty of this as their parents. But there are a few points to be made here:

Although there were those who had this attitude, there were a great many who did not, and who gave themselves fully and completely to their new country; and their children and children’s children were South Africans through and through. And even those who did have this attitude were, for the most part, devoted to South Africa and to making it the great country it became. It must also be borne in mind that when the Dutch (ancestors of the Afrikaners) first arrived at the Cape, they were as devoted to Holland as the early British emigrants were to Britain! It is perfectly natural, and has occurred all over the world. It still occurs today, whenever a man emigrates to a new country. Usually that man, no matter how dearly he comes to love his new country, and no matter how hard he works in it and for it, never fully, in heart or in practice, becomes a citizen *solely* of that country. He remains in many respects a citizen of two countries, of two worlds in fact. How can it be otherwise? He has lived in two worlds, and the attachments of youth to one’s mother country are usually very strong and last a lifetime.

His children, however, born in the new country, grow up to consider themselves citizens of the country far more than their father ever did. They know no other. But again, because of the many stories they hear from their father about the “old country”, the books in the house which come from there and speak well of that place, family ties with people still living there, etc., they may indeed still feel some kind of attachment to it, even if they have never been there.

By the third or fourth generation, however, these ties are either completely eliminated, or extremely

tenuous. By that time the man's descendants are fully integrated into the country to which he emigrated, and feel no attachment to the one he left so long before.

My own family serves to illustrate this. Some of my great-grandparents emigrated from England and Scotland to South Africa. In so many ways they remained English or Scottish till their deaths. Most of my grandparents, however, were born in South Africa. They were South Africans, and they considered themselves to be South Africans, but even so one could definitely notice the strong ties, in various ways, to Britain, a place none of them ever saw. My parents are South Africans, a fact that was made all too obvious when they visited England. And yet even so, they retain a certain "Englishness" in their outlook, habits, etc. It is faint, but it is there. Even I, a fourth-generation South African, feel, through my wonderful childhood memories of my grandparents and great-grandparents, through the story books of my childhood, etc., some strange familiarity with Britain even though I did not visit it until I was almost forty. It is my ancestral heritage, and I exult in it, for it is a wonderful heritage, a connection to a nation greatly blessed of God in the past, a great nation, which has contributed more to the world than any other nation on earth since Roman times. But am I British? No. I am a South African through and through. This is my home, and I do not in any sense regard Britain as "home".

A Distinctive Collective Name

Some have stated that English South Africans have no distinctive collective name for themselves, for their name is the same as that of the citizens of England, and they have equated this with a lack of distinct identity. They have argued that Afrikaners are called Afrikaners and Zulus are called Zulus, etc., but that South Africans of English descent have no distinctive name, and thus it is impossible for them to have a proper identity. At first, this may sound like a plausible argument, and sadly many English South Africans have believed it. But it is simply not true!

Firstly, English South Africans *do* have a collective name. It is this: "English South Africans." Or even simply: "the English". Granted, the first is somewhat clumsy, and the second is somewhat confusing, since the inhabitants of England have the same name; granted, it would have been better if English South Africans had come up with a better name for themselves. The Afrikaners are not called "Dutch South Africans"; the name "Afrikaner" came to be applied to them as they developed a distinctive identity and culture separate from that of Holland. But for better or for worse, this *is* the collective name for South Africans whose ancestors came from England. Perhaps, one day, a better one will come into usage; but for now, they are "English South Africans" or "the English."

Frequently the English South African is called, or calls himself, an "English-speaking South African." This has even been reduced, by some, to an acronym: ESSA. But this collective name should be discarded as worthless. For not only is this an even more clumsy name than "English South African", and not only does it identify him solely by his language, which in itself is not the sole identifying characteristic of a people, but also, there are a great many English-speaking South Africans who are *not English South Africans!* They belong to other people groups, other nations, in the country.

English South Africans are not merely English-speaking South Africans. They are a distinctive nation within the borders of South Africa.

Secondly, English South Africans are not unique in this matter of their collective name. One must think these things through logically. As stated previously, a country is very often comprised of various people groups. A nation-state is one reality; a state made up of many nations is another. South Africa is the latter, not the former. And in this it is far from unique.

Take Britain. Within that country there are a number of nations: the English, the Scots, the Welsh. At one time, long ago, each one of these nations had their own country: England, Scotland, Wales. These were nation-states. But the time came when they were forged together, comprising the nation of Britain.

Now what happens, say, when one meets a man from Scotland? When one asks him what he is, what would he answer? Well, if one asked him what country he came from, he might say "Britain". He would say he is British. But if one probed further, he might reply that he is a Scot. Is Scotland a separate state

today? No, it is a part of Britain. Why, then, would he say he is a Scot? He would say this because he is a descendant of people from Scotland.

There are thus “Scottish Britons”, “English Britons”, and “Welsh Britons”. The second name denotes the larger state of which they are citizens.

In like manner, Paul the apostle called himself a Roman citizen. He was a Jew by descent, birth, and heritage; but he was also a citizen of the city of Tarsus (Acts 21:39), and a freeborn Roman citizen (Acts 22:25-29). He was thus a “Jewish Roman”. The second name would denote the larger empire of which he was a citizen. For the Roman Empire was not a nation-state. It was a union of many different nations. There were “Egyptian Romans”, “Jewish Romans”, “Spanish Romans”, etc., etc.

Most nations of the world, in fact, are forged this way. Take the Zulus. Until the time of King Shaka, the Zulus were just one of many small Bantu tribes in their region. But Shaka, by military conquest, merged all those tribes into one, a larger nation, and thus the much-expanded Zulu nation was born. So Zululand under Shaka was not, strictly speaking, a nation-state; it was a conglomeration of nations (tribes if you will) which had been forged together and were known now collectively as Zulus. And then later still, the Zulu nation became part of a still larger nation, which called itself the South African nation. The Zulus today are just one of many “tribes” (nations) within what is called South Africa! Thus they are “Zulu South Africans.”

And so it has ever been, down through the centuries, all around the world. A nation may begin as a nation-state, having its own territorial boundary in which only one nation, essentially, lives. But then it is conquered by, or in some way is taken into, a greater conglomeration of nations, becoming just one nation (or tribe) among many, which together form a larger, new nation.

Take the United States of America. When the original settlers arrived from England, they came to call themselves Americans. This was the name that was adopted. But as people started to emigrate to America from other lands, they were of two types. There were those who were similar to the original Americans of English descent, who were able to assimilate into the American population fairly easily; these, too, just called themselves Americans. But then there were those emigrants who were in many ways very different from the original Americans, in language, customs, culture, religion, appearance, etc., and who did not easily assimilate and lose their former national identities by melting into the American nation. And because they were so different, and because they retained their differences, they began calling themselves, or began to be called by others, such things as “Irish Americans”, “African Americans”, “Mexican Americans”, etc.

Despite its “melting pot” boast, the United States of America is not a nation-state. Many people from different nations live within the borders of America, and not all of them have assimilated so as to lose their identities by becoming, simply, “Americans.” They do not feel one with those who think of themselves solely as Americans, nor do such Americans feel one with them. The differences are just too great.

Now if they had so wished, each nation living within the borders of America could have given itself an entirely new name, as the Afrikaner nation did in South Africa. But this did not happen. The only ones who did really have their own distinctive collective name, were the various tribes of “Indians” in America, such as the Apache, Cherokee, etc. But even they, today, usually refer to themselves as “Native Americans.” And that in itself is far from ideal, for *any* American who is born in America is, in truth, a “native” American.

Getting back, then, to South Africa: within its borders there are various nations. There is the Afrikaner nation, the Zulu nation, the Xhosa nation, etc. *And* – there is the English nation! And this nation is made up of people descended from English, but also Scottish, Irish and even other European peoples. Yes, the name is far from ideal, for the English are also a nation within the borders of another country – Britain. But for better or for worse, this for the time being is the collective name of this nation within South Africa. Perhaps one day there will be a better name. But for now, this is it and that is all there is to it. And to argue from this fact that the English South Africans lack a distinctive identity is absurd, foolish, and untrue.

There is another nation, living within the borders of South Africa, which (as far as its collective name is concerned) is in precisely the same boat as the English South African nation, and that is the Indian South

African nation (also known, simply, as the Indian nation). Actually there are others as well, but we will confine ourselves to this one, because of its size compared with smaller “tribes” within South Africa (such as Jewish South Africans, Italian South Africans, etc.). Unlike the Afrikaners but just like the English, the Indians retained the name of the land from which they originally hailed: India. And yet would anyone be so foolish as to deny that the Indians here have a distinctive identity? Surely not! Their longer collective name may not be ideal; their shorter one can be confusing; and what is worse, it makes ignorant people think they do not really belong in South Africa. But just as none would deny that Indian South Africans have a very distinctive culture and identity, despite their collective name (either in its longer or shorter versions), so none should deny that English South Africans do too, despite theirs.

The Indian South African *belongs* in South Africa. This was put very well by Nivashni Nair, an Indian South African, in a news article entitled “Indian Crisis”. She went to study for a while in India, proud of her Indian heritage, but swiftly learned that she did not fit in. Despite being a Hindu, and dressed in traditional Indian garb, she was constantly stared at; and her Indian friend said that although she did not realise it she still looked different, her mannerisms were different, etc. “It was then that it dawned on me,” she wrote, “that I was not Indian and now two months after returning from my four-month stay in India, I have finally accepted my true identity.”³

In India, when it was known that she was from South Africa, someone even asked her if she was black or white! “In a confused state,” she wrote, “I went through the first month in India wondering where I fitted in. All my life I had prided myself on being a South African Indian with links to India. However, the general response to me in India was that I did not have any links to the people in India.”

In a speech before she left India she said, “I came to India to follow in my great-grandfather’s footsteps but instead I forged my own path. It was a path that I took as a South African. I accept who I am and I will always be grateful for a fascinating link to Indian culture but while I look like an Indian, my heart will always be South African.”

Precisely. And the English South African can say the same thing. As an English South African, I will always be grateful for a fascinating link to the culture of Great Britain; I rejoice in that heritage, for I am descended from people of a great country; but while in some ways I look like an Englishman, my heart will always be South African – for *this* is what I truly am. I am not a European, I am not an Englishman; I am an African, I am an English South African. I belong here. I belong here as much as the Zulu, the Afrikaner, or the Indian South African.

A Distinctive Culture

What is culture? It is “the totality of socially transmitted behaviour patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought” (The American Heritage Dictionary). It is “the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group”, and “the characteristic features of everyday existence (as diversions or a way of life) shared by people in a place and time” (Merriem-Webster’s Online Dictionary). It is language; dress; food; music; art; history; architecture; manners; lifestyle; etc. In a word, it is one’s way of life, and the way of life of one’s community or people group.

We have seen that the collective name of the English South Africans does *not* in any sense equate to a lack of identity or nationhood. It is mere ignorance that would make such an absurd claim, as demonstrated above. But leaving aside the collective name, there are those, including some Afrikaners, who say that the English South Africans do not have a clearly discernible culture. They claim that in many ways the English culture is merely a “pale reflection or imitation of Afrikaner culture”(to quote one Afrikaner)⁴. Let us see if this is true. Does the English South African lack a distinctive culture?

Absolutely not! There *is* a distinctive English South African culture. As stated at the beginning, culture consists of the totality of such things as one’s language, dress, food, music, art, history, architecture, manners, and lifestyle. Let us consider just a few aspects of the English South African culture:

There is the English *language*.

The language of the English South African is of course English. And the fact that English is spoken by people all over the world, so that it is not unique to South Africa, is irrelevant. There are, after all, people who speak Afrikaans in Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and many other parts of the world, just as there are people who speak Hindi, or French, or so many other languages, in many parts of the world too; how then is this any different from the fact that there are people who speak English in many parts of the world as well, including South Africa? The English South African speaks English. This does *not* make him a foreigner, an *uitlander*, in South Africa, just as speaking Afrikaans in a land to which he has emigrated and become a citizen does not make an Afrikaner a foreigner there either.

With language, a nation has one of three choices: 1) to *hold on to the language* it spoke in the country from which it came; 2) to *develop a new language* in its new country; or 3) to *adopt a new one* in its new country.

The English South Africans *held on to the English language*; the Dutch South Africans *developed a new language* – Afrikaans; and the Indian South Africans *adopted a new language* – English. Are we to say that any of these three people groups are somehow “less” South African because of this?

There is English *music*.

Here I certainly do not refer to modern pop/rock “music” in any of its forms. Nor do I refer to folk music, for although Scottish music has been popular with those of Scottish descent, English South Africans have neither retained the folk music of England, by and large, nor developed a distinctly English South African folk music of their own. Afrikaners developed a rich, distinctly Afrikaans folk music, but the English did not. The musical heritage of English South Africans, however, is that of western Europe. It is not specifically English, but it is the music that has defined western Europe for centuries, the timeless, exalted music of the great western composers. In this, English South Africans are heirs to the same great, classical musical genius as are other nations with western European origins.

There is English *cuisine*.

The food of the English South Africans reflects their cultural origins in Britain, but also reflects the influence of various other cultures in South Africa. But this is no different from the Afrikaner, Zulu, Indian or other South Africans! *All* South Africans have traces of their place of origin in the things they eat, plus influences from other South African cultures.

The British Empire ensured that the British would be more cosmopolitan in their cuisine than many other nations. This in itself would explain the fact that English cuisine in South Africa is often difficult to define precisely today, as opposed to, say, Afrikaner or Indian cuisine.

But there is another reason: the world has, in so many ways, *become English!* And this is true in its eating habits as well. One just has to think of the good old sandwich, invented by Lord Sandwich and now eaten the world over; English scones, cakes and pastries, the tea-time foods of choice for multitudes of non-English people around the world; fried bacon at breakfast; fish and chips. All these things are English, and yet millions of those enjoying them every day would not know it. The world has become English in so many ways, not least in much of its cuisine.

English South African cuisine is in fact a very rich one, although many people would not even realise it today. Foods such as roast beef or lamb, bangers and mash, steak-and-kidney, toad-in-the-hole, shepherd’s pie, mutton pie, pork pie, apple pie, Yorkshire pudding, smoked haddock, smoked trout, Welsh rarebit, Cheshire cheese, Cheddar cheese, blue Stilton cheese, shortbread, a condiment like mustard, and the daily ritual of drinking tea at certain stated times reflect the origins of the nation in Britain; but other things, such as curries, boerewors, etc., show that the English, no less than all other South Africans, have borrowed extensively from the other peoples living within the country and calling it home, and have made these dishes their own, sometimes with some alterations and sometimes not. Cuisine around the world is never a static thing. The British, today, are eating more Indian curries than their old traditional favourite, fish and chips. Times change. Tastes change. This is true of the English South Africans as well. But even so, one can definitely discern an English cuisine.

There is English *dress*.

The dress of the English South African is still predominantly European: on formal occasions the men

still often wear suits, although this is changing and a more casual dress code is being adopted in many places; for casual purposes, they wear open-necked shirts or T-shirts, and jeans or shorts. In these things they are hardly distinguishable from people of European descent the world over.

But in this they are essentially no different from the Afrikaner, the other “white tribe” in South Africa. The Afrikaner prides himself on his distinctive dress of khaki clothes and *velskoens*. But how many Afrikaner men actually wear such clothes today? Very few. Such clothes are generally favoured only by Afrikaners in rural areas and occupations; farmers, for example, and game rangers. In the urban centres, Afrikaners generally wear suits, ties, etc., for formal occasions (although this is changing), and T-shirts, open-necked shirts, jeans and shorts for informal occasions, just like their English counterparts and indeed just like people of European descent all over the world. And besides, English, Zulus, and other South Africans at times wear the khaki which the Afrikaner considers his own. So as regards this aspect of culture, the Afrikaner is pretty much the same as the English South African. It is in fact very hard to tell them apart, for the most part.

Of course, there are adaptations. Both “white” South African “tribes” have adapted the traditional English attire (or, speaking more broadly, the European) and made it more South African. My wife and I, when we have travelled in America or Europe, have enjoyed playing a game: we play “Spot the South Africans” at airports. As South Africans, we are often able to guess correctly when we see a South African. And yet to the untrained eye, they would look pretty much like any other “white”. But what we cannot do as easily, is distinguish the English South African from the Afrikaner. They are virtually identical.

For in dress as well as in other matters, the world has become English. The British Empire covered a quarter of the globe, and set the standard which subject peoples the world over sought to emulate. Many peoples of the world even emulated the English military uniform: plumed helmets on cavalymen, swords and other trappings worn by officers. Some African countries loved to retain the English wigs worn by judges, even after independence.

English dress is now the dress of much of the world! Indian South Africans may wear their Indian saris to certain distinctively Indian functions, such as weddings, cultural events, etc., and they may be very proud of their traditional dress; but for casual day to day wear and for going to work, the majority of Indians today have adopted European dress. The same is true of millions upon millions of Zulu, Xhosa, Sotho and Venda South Africans, etc., who are not going about their everyday business in the animal skins which their ancestors wore! The vast majority of them only wear such attire on certain special occasions. Even the Afrikaners may wear their folk costumes to distinctively Afrikaner cultural events, but for day to day casual wear and for going to work, most wear precisely what the English wear.

Thus, although it is true that a distinctively *English* South African culture is somewhat more difficult to identify in South Africa today than the cultures of other South Africans, this is not because it does not exist. It certainly does, as we have seen. But there are at least two reasons why it is not as immediately apparent as various others within the borders of South Africa:

The first reason, as we have now seen (and it is a positive one), is the sheer *dominance* of the English way of life. The rest of the country has *adopted* so much of what was the more distinctively English South African way of life, that the distinctiveness of English culture has been diluted!

Think carefully about this. The English language is not unique to English South Africans. It is now the first language, the home language, of millions of other South Africans who are not English at all. The English language, then, is something that English South Africans have given to millions of their fellow-countrymen.

English cuisine is today the standard fare of millions of non-English South Africans. And English dress, which is essentially European dress with certain local adaptations, is the preferred dress of millions of South Africans who are not English. One does not see the English South African adopting the dress of his Indian or Zulu fellow-countrymen! But they most certainly have adopted his.

Thus, a distinctively English South African culture has been diluted, to a large extent, by the fact that so many other South Africans have, as it were, *become English* in so many ways! The English South African does not aspire to sound, look and act like a Zulu South African or an Indian South African; but these people groups most certainly aspire to sound, look and act English, in so many ways. Which

means, then, that far from the English South African having lost his cultural identity, he has in fact *shared* it with the whole country! Therefore it is not surprising that a distinctively English culture is not always easy to discern. When almost everyone else looks and sounds and even acts English, the English South African is not going to stand out. Nor is he going to feel the great need others feel, to emphasise his “tribe” the way they do. For his has been the dominant culture, and has thus not been threatened, whereas people of other cultures, not being dominant, felt that theirs was under threat and that they must protect it by emphasising whatever is unique and special about it.

This is actually a worldwide phenomenon, not a uniquely South African one. Worldwide, the English language and culture is the dominant one today. And this is not just for historical reasons, as some might think. The truth is that many diverse peoples *aspire* to that culture. They desire it, they work hard at adopting it; they view it, in fact (dare I say it), as superior in many ways to their own.

But things are different now. No longer are the English, along with the Afrikaners, dominant in South Africa. They are now just two of the minorities within the borders of the country. And they are under immense threat. And as this threat against them grows, the English, just like the Afrikaners, may start pulling the “tribe” together. They may start emphasising their “Englishness” in a way they have not felt the need to in the past.

Which brings me to my next point.

The second reason why a distinctively English South African culture is somewhat more difficult to identify in South Africa today than the cultures of other South Africans is of a more negative nature. The English South African culture and identity has been greatly damaged in recent years. The English are not, today, in certain respects, as socially cohesive as they once were. Massive guilt manipulation is responsible. They have been told, for so long, by the black Marxists and even by the rest of the world that they and the Afrikaners are the world’s worst racists, that many of them have become ashamed of their great heritage, their phenomenal achievements, and all the things that make their nation and culture something which so many millions from other cultures aspire to emulate. And so, while other nations in South Africa proudly celebrate their heritage and way of life, the English play theirs down, and even suppress it, in the “New South Africa”. There is less of a sense of community, of cohesion, than there used to be. It is there, but it is in the shadows. It is as if they do not want to raise their heads too high over the battlements, lest they get blown off.

Of course, what is in the shadows can easily come out into the bright light of day again. It will take a sense of purpose to be restored, and strong leadership, and a resurgence of interest in, and gratitude for, the English South African’s wonderful history and culture, the great English language, and all the other things that have gone to make up English identity.

The Afrikaner, also, in the aftermath of the black Marxist/ANC victory in 1994, was in the same boat as the English. His identity and culture were under attack, resulting in a loss of his sense of community and social cohesion. It is not as strong, today, as it once was. It is the old tactic of “divide and conquer” that has been used, to great effect, by the Marxists now running the country.

But for the Afrikaner, this has started to change in recent times. He has started to fight back! There is an Afrikaner political party, Afrikaner cultural events, etc. “Beginning in 2000 with the publication of Chris Louw’s so-called ‘Boteman letter’ written to FW de Klerk’s brother, Willem, there has been an unusual ferment in Afrikaans, a search for new meaning under black domination and possibly a way out of the political impasse constituted by a biological democracy where racial head counts determine most political outcomes. Afrikaner cultural response has been even stronger... in a massive privatisation of Afrikaans culture since 1994. Starting this year [2005], one may discern a new assertiveness among the large mass of Afrikaners who are openly referring to transformation as ‘reverse apartheid’, challenging the dogma of white guilt and subservience, the staple of the mainstream media since 1994.”⁵

It is a very good thing that the Afrikaners have started to fight back. And if things could change for the Afrikaners, they can also change for the English! All is not lost. The deliberate ideological war being waged against the Afrikaners and the English must be resisted! They cannot just sit back and do nothing. They cannot afford to!

The English South African does not perceive the threat as clearly, because, thanks to the fact that he

shares a common language, and something of a common history, with millions of people of English descent all over the world, he has to a large extent lulled himself into a false sense of security. There is no threat to the English South African's language, as there is to the Afrikaner's. English will not die out, neither in South Africa nor in the rest of the world. And despite the differences between English South Africans and people of English descent in other parts of the world (differences which often become readily apparent when English South Africans emigrate), it is still much easier for him to adjust and "fit in" elsewhere than it is for the Afrikaner, because of the common language and at least something of a common history, albeit a now-somewhat distant history. It is thus far easier for him to view himself as a "citizen of the world" than for many others, thanks to the worldwide influence of the British Empire and all it achieved. Nevertheless, he desperately needs to perceive the threat he faces, for English South Africans are, as a nation, under threat! Their history is under threat (name changes, rewriting the history books, etc.). Their South African way of life is threatened. Their place in the sun, their very existence is under threat, via affirmative action; being made second-class citizens; and in many other insidious ways.

It will take longer for the English to gather their forces as it were, to regroup, and to resist the destruction of their nation, way of life, history, etc. Yes, it is easier for many of them to emigrate to other parts of the once-British Empire than for Afrikaners to do so, and many have opted for this route as the country sinks into typical Communist chaos. But most will not be able to leave, and sooner or later they must pull together and realise that they do *not* need to be ashamed of their culture, heritage and way of life, and that it *is* worth defending and holding. For truly, the English South African is "heir to a greater tradition and a greater store of precious memories than he knows".⁶

Let us examine, albeit all too briefly, something of the English South Africans' massive contribution to their beloved country.

The Contribution of English South Africans to Their Country

"I have neither Voortrekker nor Huguenot blood in my veins," wrote Sir James Rose Innes in the nineteenth century, in his autobiography; "and the 'South African spirit', as understood by those who extol it, implies a view of the Native question which I cannot share. But I am proud to be a South African and I claim to stand on the same national footing as if my forebears had landed with van Riebeeck or followed Piet Retief over the Drakensberg."⁷

"An unknown people inhabit South Africa," wrote John Bond in 1956. "They are not the Afrikaners, about whom a great deal has been written, in several languages. They are not the Bushmen, the Hottentots, the Malays, the Cape Coloured, the amaXhosa, the Zulu, the Basuto – their histories are known, their customs described. They are not even the South African Indians, about whom the United Nations have heard so much.... These unknown people are the English-speaking South Africans [or rather, to use the distinctive name we prefer, the English South Africans – S.W.].... They are one of the smallest English-speaking peoples – smaller even than the New Zealanders, whose national history started half a century later, and far smaller than the Australians, whose beginnings came likewise at the close of the eighteenth century. Yet the English-speaking South Africans have exerted an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. They have never formed as much as ten per cent of the total population of their country. But with their arrival in the shank of Africa a creative stimulus stirred in one of the remotest and wildest countries in the world. The stranded nucleus of older settlers from western Europe [i.e. the Dutch South Africans, or Afrikaners] felt a powerful and disturbing reinforcement."⁸

Although people from Britain had settled in South Africa before the year 1820, it was in that year that the first large-scale immigration of British settlers to South Africa occurred, and thus the year 1820 marks the real origin of the English South Africans. And South Africa would never be the same again, and mostly for the better. Their sheer energy, creativeness, British iron will and orderliness did wonders for an untamed land. They transformed that land into the modern marvel it became. "Their immense contribution towards turning South Africa from a chaos and a wilderness into a thriving modern State [was] largely due to their tenacious links with the Christian, civilized West – in short, to their well-known 'dual allegiance' to Europe as well as South Africa."⁹

And yet, as pointed out elsewhere in this work, as time went by and new generations arose, they took on a distinctly South African identity. Yes, they maintained links with the west; but they ceased to be British and became fully South African, just as the Dutch settlers had done before them. They saw no reason to break off all ties with Britain, and in this they made the right choice, because those ties brought, and then kept, the civilised standards of Protestant Britain in this wild portion of the Dark Continent. They were truly *South Africans*, but they maintained so much that was good and great from Britain, at a time when Britain was indeed largely still deserving of the name “*Great Britain*”, that the country that would become South Africa was enriched by it to a degree that is incalculable. The Afrikaner nation itself, the other “white tribe” of South Africa, owes more than many of its members realise to the arrival of the English, a fact admitted by candid Afrikaner thinkers. “‘The fact that the Afrikaner has remained a civilized being, at so great a distance from the countries his forebears came from, must be attributed first and last’, according to Dr G.D. Scholtz, the well-known Afrikaner Nationalist thinker, ‘to the fact that he could rely on the products of civilization in Europe.’ Those products, from education to ammunition, from communications to political stimulus, did not reach the Karroo or the Highveld by magic. They were put there by his English-speaking fellow-countryman.”¹⁰

Put simply, the Afrikaner nation had made such a clean break with Europe, and was so isolated at the remote southern tip of Africa, that if the English settlers had not come to these shores there is the very real possibility that the civilised standards of Europe, with all its vast and rich culture, drive, genius, progress, etc., would in time have been largely forsaken and forgotten by the Afrikaners, and the Dark Continent would have absorbed them almost as surely as the African bush takes over any abandoned farmhouse that is left too long. This is not by any means to say that the Afrikaners would have “gone native” (to use an old colonial expression), abandoning their clothes and running naked or merging with the black tribes. Not at all. But certainly, such was the desire for isolation and independence of the Afrikaners from Europe, and so great was the distance between Europe and South Africa, that the progress, the great advances and developments, taking place in Europe in the nineteenth century could so easily have passed the Afrikaners by, were it not for the fact of the coming of the English in 1820 and subsequently.

As soon as the English settlers arrived in South Africa, their contribution to their new country began; and what a contribution it was! “They founded new towns and new harbours; they built roads and pioneered trails into the hinterland where none had before existed; they brought news of the outer world, its manners, customs and attitudes to an isolated interior where comfort and culture had been sacrificed to freedom from official interference. They exercised influence on a rising nation in a thousand overt and mysterious ways.”¹¹

They were the driving force behind the founding of a great many towns and cities throughout South Africa, including some of the greatest ones. Grahamstown (originally Graham’s Town) was one. “In the decade since their arrival, the settlers had... made of their ‘capital city’ Graham’s Town, a busy thriving place which, set among bare and forbidding hills, presented a pleasing appearance with its rows of neat white cottages and lovely gardens. Except for a few merchants, no one was rich, the majority being content to live quietly on moderate means, making their own amusements and remaining at peace with their neighbours.”¹²

Port Elizabeth was another “English settler” city. This was where the 1820 settlers had first disembarked, when it was known as Algoa Bay and there was no city there, not even a town or village. There were only four houses there when the 1820 settlers arrived. But within ten years there were 100, and by 1828 Port Elizabeth was a full magistracy. As shipping increased, Port Elizabeth developed and grew. Today it is one of South Africa’s great cities. It is a disgrace that the metropolitan area is now named the Nelson Mandela Metro, and the bay the Nelson Mandela Bay. Port Elizabeth was built by the genius and hard work of English settlers.

Then there is East London. Lieutenant John Bailie, a leader of a party of 1820 settlers, spent his time seeking out possible new harbours. It was he who showed the possibilities of the Buffalo River mouth as a harbour and in 1836, as the first brig was brought into the harbour, Bailie raised the Union Jack on shore. The harbour proved very useful and in 1847 Sir Harry Smith named the village which had begun to grow around the harbour, East London. Today East London is one of South Africa’s most picturesque

cities.

Bailie travelled to Natal and opened a trading post at Durban. He was drowned while helping to rescue passengers from a shipwreck.

Alexander Biggar, the leader of one of the parties of 1820 settlers and a military officer, went to Durban to begin trading. He organised the first volunteer corps in Natal province, the Port Natal Volunteers. When the Voortrekker, Piet Retief, and his men were murdered by the Zulu king, Dingane, it was Biggar who organised a small force of just eighteen men to go to the aid of the remaining members of Retief's party. Biggar fought alongside the Voortrekkers at the Battle of Blood River, that great defining battle in Afrikaner history. He survived, but was killed in a skirmish with the Zulus a few weeks later.

Another 1820 settler, William Robinson, who had arrived as a baby, travelled north to Potchefstroom in the Transvaal, and there he founded the first school. Later he became a big-game hunter, and then *landdrost* of Rustenburg and a colleague of Paul Kruger, the iconic Afrikaner leader. Robinson, in fact, although English, was appointed as chairman of the committee that drafted the constitution of the Boers' South African Republic. He died in 1912 at the age of 93, the last survivor of the original 1820 settlers.

Henry Hartley, who arrived with the 1820 settlers at the age of four, and despite being handicapped with club feet, became an expert horseman and elephant hunter. On the other side of the Limpopo River, in the land that would later become Rhodesia, he stumbled across ancient gold workings and he, along with the German, Karl Mauch, pioneered the great gold mining industry of Rhodesia.

Education has been dear to the heart of English South Africans ever since the arrival of the English in 1820, and the South African education system, which became one of the best in the world, was the product of the English South Africans more than anyone else. And contrary to the kind of propaganda we hear these days, schools were established which gave equal education to white *and* black children. For example, in Graham's Town not long after the arrival of the English settlers, a school was started; and, "Following the liberal tendencies of the times, there was ostensibly no distinction between white and black, the child of the Hottentot or the slave being entitled to sit next to the white child and to receive the same education."¹³

Contrary to the mistaken belief of so many black South Africans today, not to mention the world at large, the English settlers were *not* the black-hating racists they are so often made out to be. There were racists among them, of course, as there are among all people; but it is not honest to convey the impression that all whites, or even the majority of whites, hate blacks. Listening to black Marxists tell it, one would think that white South Africans have done nothing but harm to black South Africans. Nothing could be further from the truth, but this is the dangerous myth being deliberately propagated. Whites even came to the rescue of blacks at certain critical times. One such moment was when the English saved the Fingoes from annihilation:

The Abambo were the remnants of various Bantu tribes which had been decimated by the Zulus. They lived among the Xhosa and were known as Amamfengue – meaning "hungry people in search of work". The colonists corrupted this name to "Fingoes". Other black tribes employed them as cattle herders, builders of huts, and tillers of their fields. Chief Hintza had treated them very cruelly and referred to them as his "dogs".

The missionary, John Ayliff, worked among them and was very sympathetic to their plight. When in 1835 the Governor of the Cape, Sir Benjamin D'Urban (after whom the great city of Durban is named), came to the Transkei (homeland of the Xhosa nation) and encamped near Butterworth, the eight Fingo chiefs came to see him. They asked to be taken under British protection as subjects of the King of England, and to be allowed to settle in or near the colony. D'Urban knew they were terribly mistreated by the Xhosa and he agreed to allow them to settle between the Great Fish and the Keiskama Rivers. When Hintza got wind of this he ordered a massacre of the Fingoes, and in a few short hours many were indeed killed. But D'Urban threatened to hang Hintza from the tree he was standing under if he did not stop the massacre.

The great Fingo migration to their new homeland began on the 9th May 1835. They were guarded by a strong force of colonists on commando, under Colonel Somerset's direction. Ayliff and his family were in the front in their wagon. The column stretching behind them was a mile and a half in breadth and eight miles in length, and contained 2000 men, 5600 women and 9200 children, with some 15000 cattle.

Col. Somerset was extremely kind to the Fingoes on this epic journey. He stopped the column often so the people could rest. At night no fires were lit so as to avoid attracting attention from their black enemies. At the Kei River, as they were wading across, they were attacked in the rear by the Gcalekas. The Cape Mounted Rifles, who were part of the escort, galloped to the rear and fought off their attackers. Ayliff later wrote, "I could not refrain from cheering them, hat in hand, as they passed by the side of my wagon, hastening to the protection of the helpless."

Finally, reaching the Gonubie River, they were safe. On the 14th they crossed the Keiskama River into the area allocated to them. They had been protected by the English, and under a large milkwood tree where a national monument was later erected, they raised their hands and recited a pledge to be loyal to the British King, and to do all they could to support the English missionaries and to educate their children.¹⁴

Another historic moment when whites came to the rescue of blacks was after the tragic event known as the National Suicide of the Xhosas in 1857. "There are those today who will stop at nothing to convince the world that the coming of the white man to South Africa resulted in nothing but misery. The truth, however, is that the heathen darkness in which the black tribes lived was degrading and cruel; and the preaching of the Gospel by white missionaries was instrumental, under the sovereignty of God, in improving the lot of the black nations in general, in all aspects of life."¹⁵ A young Xhosa "prophetess" and her witchdoctor uncle convinced the Xhosa nation that all the white men would be driven into the sea if all the Xhosa cattle were slaughtered and all the corn was destroyed. Cape government officials and missionaries tried to dissuade the Xhosa from this suicidal act, but in vain. "The nation began to starve to death. Many resorted to cannibalism, even eating their own children. In the territory of British Kaffraria, the population dropped from 104 721 to 37 229. And if it were not for the fact that whites had gathered supplies of food to distribute among the blacks, the situation would have been even worse."¹⁶

As time went by, the descendants of those first 1820 settlers scattered across the length and breadth of South Africa, and beyond. So much more could be said of the English in South Africa. "The nature of their contribution is enshrined in oft-told tales: how they... fought for the freedom of the Press and for the right to associate, of their determination to achieve representative government for the people generally... of their patronage of the sciences and of the humanities and the great names that they added to the nation's roster of distinction, of great deeds wrought in South Africa itself and beyond the Limpopo.... Their achievements have been hymned in prose and verse and commemorated in every kind of edifice. Their names are proudly borne by Afrikaans- as well as English-speaking citizens of South Africa today."¹⁷

They gave the country great political figures and administrators, including prime ministers. There were great missionaries, scientists, authors, inventors, travellers and hunters among them.

Conclusion

How simple, and yet how moving and how true, the inscription on a granite memorial in Grahamstown:

To the
BRITISH SETTLERS
of
1820
to whom South Africa
owes so much

What is recorded here is just the tip of the iceberg. So much more could be told, and even after the telling of much more, so much more would yet remain to be told. The contribution of the English South African to the country he loves – loves as much as any other South African loves it – has been immense, and in a very real way, immeasurable. What would South Africa be without the English South Africans?

Where would South Africa be? That is not a difficult question to answer. English South Africans are *true South Africans*. This country belongs to them as much as it does to any other South Africans. South Africa would have been incalculably poorer if they had not come; and now, if they are driven out *en masse*, it will be incalculably impoverished without them. Together with the Afrikaners, the Zulus, the Indians, the Coloureds, the Xhosas and so many others, the English belong here. It will be a huge tragedy if murderous thugs spouting nonsense about Africa belonging only to black Africans succeed in forcing ever increasing numbers of English South Africans to leave, or Communist revisionists succeed in their sinister plot to load them with undeserved guilt and make them regret their presence here. It will also be tragic if some Afrikaans South Africans continue to promote the false notion about Afrikaners being the only legitimate “white” South Africans, thereby falling for the Communist tactic of “divide and conquer” by separating themselves from their natural allies against the Red tide. Let the English South African hold his head up high, resist the forces seeking his downfall, and claim his rightful place in the sun as a true South African! For that is what he is, and nothing less.

March 2010
Revised and expanded December 2010

Shaun Willcock is a minister of the Gospel, and lives in South Africa. He runs Bible Based Ministries. For other articles (which may be downloaded and printed), as well as details about his books, audio messages, pamphlets, etc., please visit the Bible Based Ministries website; or write to the address below. If you would like to be on Bible Based Ministries’ electronic mailing list, to receive all future articles, please send your details.

Bible Based Ministries

info@biblebasedministries.co.uk

www.biblebasedministries.co.uk

This article may be copied for free distribution if it is copied in full

WORLDWIDE CONTACT:

Contending for the Faith Ministries

42055 Crestland Drive
Lancaster, CA 93536
United States of America
BBMOrders@aol.com

ENDNOTES:

1. *Proudly Indian? Be Human Too!* By Gitanjali Pather, *The Post*, August 1-5, 2007.
2. *They Were South Africans*, by John Bond, pg. xiii. Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1960.
3. *Weekend Witness*, January 27, 2007.
4. Anton Barnard, www.praag.org/briewe11052005antonb.htm.
5. *A New Anglo-Boer Entente for the 21st Century*, by Dan Roodt, pg.5. www.praag.org/essay8d.htm.
6. *They Were South Africans*, quotation from Denis Hatfield (SABC), dust jacket of the book.
7. *They Were South Africans*, pg. xiii.
8. *The Were South Africans*, pg.1.
9. *They Were South Africans*, pg.2.

-
10. *They Were South Africans*, pgs.2,3.
 11. *Thus Came the English in 1820*, by Dorothy E. Rivett-Carnac, pg.125. Howard Timmins, Cape Town, 1961.
 12. *Thus Came the English in 1820*, pg.89.
 13. *Thus Came the English in 1820*, pg.83.
 14. *Thus Came the English in 1820*, pgs.100-1.
 15. *"Holy War" Against South Africa*, by Shaun Willcock, pg.56. First Century Ltd., Huddersfield, UK, 2003.
 16. *"Holy War" Against South Africa*, pg.57.
 17. *Thus Came the English in 1820*, pg.126.