CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION:
“‘NO RESEMBLANCE TO SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY’ — MOLEMA’S HISTORIOGRAPHICAL CRITIQUE”¹

[I]t is no injustice to those who wrote the history of South Africa in the early days to say they wrote it with an object in view. Their primary object seems to have been to impress the world with the wickedness and cruelty of the African race, and to enhance the prestige of the white race.²

Historiographical ambivalence: it is the condition of a technique and the denial of an absence; its role is, successively, as the discourse of a law (calling it historic opens up a present to be fashioned) or as alibi, the realist illusion (the effect of the real creates the fiction of another history). It varies between “making history” and “telling stories”, without being reducible to either one or the other. Doubtless one may recognise the same division in another form, which realises an historical operation that is both critical and effective: it alternates between blasphemy and curiosity, between what it eliminates from its constitution of the past, and what it organises in the present, between the privation or dispossession that it postulates and the social norms that it imposes on the reader without his knowledge. Through all these aspects combined in the literary production, it symbolises the desire that constitutes relation to the other. It is the identifying mark of this law.³

Matthews’ words and the two longer passages bear significantly on Molema’s historical and ethnographic intentions. Matthews and Thema alluded, in varying tones of anger, to what had been eliminated (de Certeau’s term) from mainstream history. They disputed what it meant to be “South African” and then what really constituted “South African history”. Both eminent, yet marginalised writers suggested that most existing histories either omitted the real lives black communities had lived or recounted them prejudicial ways. Before Thema (1935) and Matthews (1958) exposed the travesties of mainstream history, Molema asserted in 1920 that the writer’s race was vital to representing the past. White writers had not represented South Africans’ lives faithfully, he held.⁴ However, as this thesis has shown, the problem of writing a history with few primary sources, and based almost entirely on secondary works, limited the extent to which he could achieve his aims: creating an unbiased history and ethnography of black South Africans.

“Reality”, the question all three South African writers raise, is always moot, as de Certeau suggests in defining the role that historical writing plays in dealing with the absences created by the passage of time, oblivion and death — in other words, the Past. His definition of historiography plays on the semantics of the term *histoire*; in French, it signifies both “history”, a factual account of the past, and “story”, a fictional narrative. This *double entendre* led him to examine the ambiguous narrative and ideological choices implicit in reconstructing the past. Re-telling history also involves the “desire” to communicate this past to an Other. Molema carefully defined this Other, *The Bantu*’s anticipated readership, in the Preface. This helped to define his project. He desired to narrate the past in a voice as yet unheard in South African historical writing: that of black people who had been described, but not heard for themselves; he wrote, he affirmed, “as a member of the race”.⁵ This thesis’ introduction has

¹ Matthews, 1958 & 1981: 58. The full quotation is: “[o]ur history as we had absorbed it bore no resemblance to South African history as it had been written by European scholars, or as it is taught in South African schools, and as it was taught to us at Fort Hare. The European insisted that we accept his version of the past and what is more, if we wanted to get ahead educationally, even to pass examinations in the subject as he presents it”.

² Thema (1935: 4): the earlier section of the quotation reads: “[I] discovered that the history of the African race [was] often prejudiced. Whenever they defended themselves against whites, [their actions] were condemned as wars which were waged solely for the purpose of plundering lonely farmers...”.


⁴ Molema (1920: vii) suggested that his work would not only enter the historical debate, but would inform “members of the governing race”, to whom “some knowledge of the governed race, their mind and manners, seems necessary”. To imply, in 1920, after several centuries of colonial rule, that whites barely understood the people they ruled, was brave if not audacious.

explored the first-person statement in which he declared his intention of writing as the representative of a race much mis-represented in existing history and ethnography. As he stated of the enduring effects of Slavery, “[t]he balance has been lost, and must take time to be recovered”. He felt it his duty as a writer, to bring to life and preserve that which might otherwise have been lost, and relate it to several sets of people:

- To colonial writers responsible for distorting African history and culture,
- To a larger British readership, some of whom he encountered in Scotland, who represented the Empire, yet knew little of its subject people,
- To white settlers in South Africa, British and Boer, many of whom lived out the distorted perceptions of Africans that historical texts perpetuated in their everyday lives, and
- To Africans desiring to know more about the past of this newly-unified country, and about the cultures of other ethnic groups

De Certeau observed that historiography resembled a “tomb” for the dead, that is, for the past. To Molema and Plaatje, members of the colonised race, historical writing offered possibilities beyond the tomb: redemption and resurrection of the past. Molema’s history and ethnography and Plaatje’s Proverb collections, sought to save the vanishing African past from oblivion. Molema knew the difficulty of performing that resurrection, particularly when virtually trapped in Scotland, far from London, home and primary sources, and in the midst of a World War. Relying on the “all the relevant literature I could find”, he alerted readers to these sources’ inherent problems, and explained his methodology:

[w]here opinions vary I have, so far as possible, freely stated each and fortified mine. I have endeavoured to eliminate all conscious bias in one way or another, and to tell the story as faithfully as I know it.

The Bantu’s Preface, its most overtly personal section, provides its most autoethnographic, statement. In it, he states that The Bantu has “given [him] the advantage, as it were, of telling the story of my own life, relying much on my personal observation and experience, and most correctly interpreting the psychological touches which must be unfathomable to a foreigner. This revelation of intent implies an underlying notion of “Subject” and “Other”; it was in part a racialised statement, constructing many readers as “non-Africans” learning about Africa from an African. Yet, Molema did not consider whites the only readers for whom the African past might be strange. In the light of colonisation, urbanisation and the country’s industrialisation, he and Plaatje feared that all Africans might lose touch with their past. Molema also wrote as a nationalist, a cultural broker, mediating between the country’s multiple ethnicities to explain the history and culture of one group to another, for example, Nguni to Tswana-Sotho, and vice versa.

8 One is assuming that Molema would have been able to find at least some pertinent documents in the Colonial Offices Archive in the Public Records Office, London. See supra, p.233, on the state of the South African Archives at this time.
10 Molema, 1920: viii.
Ever one to corroborate his point with a quotation, he emphasised his faithfulness to the truth with two lines from Victorian poet, Robert Browning’s “Saul”:12

```
“I spoke as I saw,
I report as a man of God’s work — all’s Love yet all’s Law”.
```

Molema quotes Robert Browning’s “Saul”

Responding to the poem’s Christian elements, Molema revealed to readers that he came (like Browning) from a profoundly evangelical tradition.13 These lines should have alerted readers to the complexity of his being “a member of the race” — which the *Glasgow Herald* only partly grasped.14 He wrote as one of a then rare minority: not only Christian, but highly educated, owing partly to the chain of missionary connections throughout the subcontinent, and to his prescient father’s labours and belief in education.

The short Preface indicates the difficulty of reading *The Bantu* without biographical knowledge. Though its author declared it “the story of my own life”, it is neither autobiography nor intimate self-revelation.15 Chapters Three and Four have attempted to represent Molema as assertive, when need be, but also humble. Like his father and grandfather, he put community before personal triumph. While he had good reason to thank Silas for “the excellent and rare education you have given me — education which makes me today one of the foremost men of my race and one of the best educated among black and white in South Africa”, he also stated that, on returning, he would aim to improve health care in the Mafikeng Stadt.16 Once home, he realised that far greater change was necessary to improve black South Africans’ lives. Thus, he divided his time between medical, political and educational activities, of which writing formed just one part.

**On “exemplary lives”: biography, autoethnography and the representation of the past:**

This thesis is subtitled “The Making of an Historian” [my emphasis], and for this reason concentrates on Molema’s reasons for becoming an historian and ethnographer, although he had really gone to Glasgow to study medicine. His studies made him a scientist, the Preface implied, and he strove to apply empirical reasoning throughout *The Bantu*.18 He returned home in 1921 with a triple achievement: his medical degrees, Licentiate from Dublin University, and a labour of mind and heart: *The Bantu Past and Present*. This period away from home was highly significant to Molema, as it marked a phase of self-definition, cultural exploration and political awakening. Chapter Four argues that this intellectual and emotional journey gave rise to his desire to write, thus providing another reason for presenting this study in two ways, firstly, as biography, and secondly, as historical analysis, as the Introduction sets out.

The Introduction initially mentioned the thin boundaries between the life genres, which Boldrini remarked, “raises therefore further questions concerning the nature and status of the subject in and of
writing”.19 This thesis devoted considerable space to defining the particular ways in which Molema wrote aspects of his own life and his family’s past into The Bantu. While he may not have named this technique, late-twentieth-century theorists and researchers termed the kind of literary and social position that he constructed for his writing self “autoethnographical”. To date, South African historical and literary researchers seem to have overlooked autoethnography as means of understanding South African writing about the self. Yet, it seems that so many of the “personal” texts that Africans have written may be autoethnographic, rather than autobiographical, or may alternately between the two. By contrast, elsewhere, studies of autoethnography abound in the Humanities, though are scarcer in the literary and historical fields.20

As research towards this thesis progressed, identifying the autoethnographic position in Molema’s work became important to understanding his covert inscription of self into the narrative voice. It explains why he wrote The Bantu, his choice of contents, and the conclusions he drew at the end of it. In addition, the thesis has argued that one of the reasons Molema and others writing history in similar ways have been much misread has been critics’ failure to recognise the autoethnographic stance, the liminal self which writes both from outside and inside a community, and who may not always encode “self” as an “I”-voice in the text.

Biographical Reconstructions and what they offer the Historian:

This thesis presents a more coherent, extended biographical account of Chief Molema Tawana, Chief Silas Thelesho Molema and Dr Modiri Molema than has previously existed. Dr Molema’s autoethnographic texts indicated the extent to which he believed that the lives of his grandfather and father interlocked with his own. Yet, a combination of personal humility and a sense that his immediate family were not leading figures in the history he recounted, made him represent them in supporting roles in The Bantu, Moroka and Montshiwa. In these works, his grandfather embodied Christianity’s role in promoting progressive communities in southern Africa. Chief Molema was “the corner-stone of the Rolong”, he stated in The Bantu, but almost apologised for this personal revelation, ascribing it to “the feelings of loyalty and love due to one’s forebears”.21 In Montshiwa, he underlined the discourse of difference that Molema personified in Rolong country: “[i]n Montshiwa and Molema…we have an instance of the separation which the gospel makes in heathen lands, the one believing in Paganism and the other in Christ”.22 To Dr Molema, recounting his family’s religious and political roles within Tshidi history was more important than providing sustained accounts of their life-stories. In The Bantu, Chief Molema was instrumental in spreading Christianisation, which Dr Molema regarded as the primary difference between Past and Present. While his family had helped to effect that change, he saw it as his role to narrate the history of that change.

His vision of the three Molema generations’ incidental importance to the main themes of Rolong history suggested the topic of this thesis. However, his approach was tantalisingly suggestive, emphasising their thematic significance within his three published texts, only to veil their characters. This thesis responded to the temptations that Dr Molema wrote into The Bantu and the later books, by

19 Boldrini, 2004: 245. Cf. supra, p.6 fn.27.
21 Molema, 1920: 43. See supra, p.53.
creating a chain of biographical studies that attempt to give due weight to his own life and those of his father and grandfather and explain their impact on the history and ethnography that he wrote.

Another reason for conceptualising the thesis in two linked sections (biographical and analytical) was the magnificent primary material housed chiefly in the Molema-Plaatje Papers at the University of the Witwatersrand and in the Molema Archive at UNISA. This material is so rich in historical and ethnographic significance that it needs to see light of day. Telling in its own ways important aspects of Molema history, it helped to pose and answer many questions about *The Bantu*, which seemed to me, initially as an Honours student, so enigmatic. Reading and re-reading the many Molema and Plaatje letters, I came to understand the people who had written them more. They taught me more about *The Bantu*’s young writer, and his reasons for creating this enormous expository and theoretical work. Dr Molema’s many unpublished manuscripts offering added insight into his intellectual make-up, decided me on thus dual approach.

One of the major difficulties of writing a biography, I learned, is one’s frustratingly partial knowledge of one’s subject, as interviewing members of his family made clear. These interviews, though immensely helpful, took me only a certain distance towards knowing Dr Molema. During these generous interviews in Mafikeng and Gaborone, they uncovered something of Dr Molema’s daily lives. Only then did I learn how prodigiously talented and hard-working he was in several spheres: medical, political, educational and historical. His daughter, his brother, and his two brothers’ children also remembered his strict religious outlook, his love and kindness. Warada was daunted by her father’s vast book collection and constant stream of literary production.23 Leloba recalled his moralism: if he could teach one a lesson by not driving one to school, he would.24 He was kind, but he was never indulgent.

Those who worked for him also attested to his steadfast character. Attorney, Spencer Minchin, movingly described Molema’s devout prayers before each surgical operation. His steward at Motsosa, Rre Piriepa Thwane, recalled people’s respect for Modiri’s cultural knowledge: local chiefs insisted that he install them, and he confronted officials when traditional Rolong rights were undermined.25 Victor Mapanya, Dr Molema’s clerk from the 1950s until his death in 1965, noted the younger generations’ difficulties in reading Molema’s books.26 He also related horrifying details of Molema’s abduction by Afrikaner farmers just before his death. Molema’s status as an eminent black doctor seemingly unsettled some of Mafikeng’s Afrikaner neighbours.27 As Chapter Two shows, widespread political and economic tension had long existed between the Mafikeng Tshidi and Western Transvaal “Boers”. The reconstruction of several episodes in this lengthy land war has amplified its history and the several periods in which it occurred.28

Biographies are often meeting points of many historical and cultural processes and events. Lewsen’s *Merriman* and Willan’s *Plaatje* illustrate this best, as they convey the vast canvas of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth century political and intellectual South African life. Both biographers illuminate the emergence and decline of Cape Liberalism, a political practice and morality both Merriman and Plaatje espoused, and in which Dr Molema was schooled, though his later politics became more radical.

---

23 On his book collection, see supra, pp.16, 171 fn.52 & 294.
24 For this incident, see supra, p.184. Sefetoge Molema Interview, 1992: Leloba noted that strictness was a family trait which her father, Sefetoge shared with Modiri.
25 *Piriepa Thwane Interview*, 1992: Rre Piriepa, the son of Silas’ steward, called Chief Silas as “Thelesho” throughout our lengthy interview. See supra, p.295 fn.10, for Modiri Molema’s visit to Pretoria with Chief Lotlamoreng.
27 My interviews yielded two still unverified accounts of Dr Molema’s severe harassment by farmers, once (*Thwane Interview, 1992*) in the 1930s and another just before his death (*Victor Mapanya Interview, 1992*). Warada Molema also mentioned some security police harassment in the 1950s and 1960s at their Mafikeng and Motsosa homes, and on a family holiday in East London.
28 See Chapters One and Two.
Biography opens windows to many worlds through the life of an individual subject. Multiply this by three and one expands the frames of reference accordingly. In a three-generational biography of one family, this thesis has been able to shed light on many historical processes: capital accumulation in the Molopo region, education, missionary penetration of the country’s interior (aided by the Molemas), conflict over land resources between several Rolong groups that has hitherto eluded detection.

A Hundred Years of Molema History: The Empire’s Indigenous Missionaries

This three-generational biography traces the lives of three members of the remarkable Molema clan, and examines the strong contribution that each of them made to establishing Christianity in the subcontinent’s interior. At the same time, each became a strong, yet subtle, political force. Chief Molema commenced this work during a period before colonists had coined a name for the Country of the Rolong.29 His conversion began a process through which Wesleyan Methodist ideas, so linked to Anti-Slavery ideology, met, mingled and conflicted with indigenous Serolong religious practices. The resultant tension established the Molemas as, at various times, a powerful semi-independent “state within a state” and, under Silas and Joshua, a dissenting faction within the chiefdom.30 Modiri’s intellectual capital and, later, his standing in regional and national ANC politics gave him great eminence within the mid-twentieth-century Tshidi chiefdom.

Molema Tawana also espoused the Methodist ideology of work, and made his fledgling Mafikeng chiefdom a strong participant in Kimberley’s market economy. Despite an uneasy relationship with Montshiwa (a major character in this unfolding biographical sequence), Chief Molema acted as his brother’s diplomat. When Montshiwa fled the Boers’ demands for Tshidi labour and sought refuge for two decades at Moshaneng, he sent Molema to settle Mafikeng, ensuring that Tshidi country’s eastern reaches did not fall into Boer hands. Moreover, Montshiwa twice detailed his well-connected brother to secure him the services of a personal missionary; Ludorf, in particular, became the Tshidi’s agent, even later interceding at the crucial Bloemhof Arbitration (at which Molema also gave evidence).31 In old age, Molema reconciled with Montshiwa, offering him refuge from the Boers at Mafikeng; thereafter, the seat of the Tshidi chiefdom transferred to Mafikeng, and has been there ever since.

Silas Molema’s education at Healdtown cemented the family’s Methodist associations. He and his brothers crossed other cultural boundaries, introducing western dress, architecture and education to Mafikeng. During those three years away, he also made important trans-ethnic connections with fellow students, like JT Jabavu, who would play important roles in national politics. Silas continued his father’s entry into commercial cattle farming, becoming a relatively wealthy man by the outbreak of the South African War. In addition, he wielded great regional influence, having been Montshiwa’s secretary and councillor. His literacy and suavity made him one of the three men usually chosen to perform Montshiwa’s diplomatic errands. Silas also played more traditional roles effectively: he was Montshiwa’s headman at Bodibe and Lotlhakana from the 1890s and, like his brothers, served as a soldier when the Boers besieged Mafikeng.32

29 See supra, p.112.
31 Cf. supra, pp.71, 74, 76-77, 90-91.
32 The two others to receive an Eastern Cape education were Silas’ elder brother Israel, and Stephen Lefenya, an earlier secretary to Montshiwa, his councillor, and Chief Molema’s successor as preacher at Mafikeng. On Jabavu, see supra, p.108. On Silas’ finances in 1903, see Cf. supra, p.134 & 260. On his role as Montshiwa’s secretary, see supra, pp.102, 107, 117-18, 120-21, 125, 141. On being headman at Bodibe and Lotlhakana, see supra, pp.131, 142ff. On helping to raise the Siege, see supra, p.137ff.
In addition fatherly duties preoccupied Silas; Modiri’s correspondence to him provides a decade of insights into the changing nature of parent-child interaction. Silas wished to give all his children, male and female, the best education he could afford, not just for their own sakes, but to bring skilled professionals into the community. Two of his sons eventually qualified as doctors and a third became a veterinary surgeon. Two of his daughters are known to have qualified as teachers. He believed that discipline was his prerogative, and did not hesitate to take Modiri to task, whether he was a Lovedale scholar or a qualified medical doctor.

From 1910, he set an example of how to be a South African; before the country was officially unified, Silas and colleagues from its constitutive regions attempted to influence the Union Constitution. Rejecting the exclusion of blacks from the body politic, he met with these colleagues on 8 January 1912 to form the South Africa Natives National Congress, and became one of its permanent Vice Presidents. He and his friend Plaatje not only founded the first Setswana-English newspaper, but grew expert at framing petitions to protest the wrongs that Africans were forced to endure. The prospect of delivering these personally to Colonial Secretary Chamberlain in 1903, or the Prime Minister, Hertzog, in 1927, did not overawe him.

The missionary culture that Chief Molema transported to the Molopo and Silas’ dedication to religion, education, farming and commerce formed part of the colonisation process. As Hobsbawm observed, “the success of the Lord was a function of imperialist advance”. What did imperialism mean in Tshidi Country, which resisted formal colonisation for nearly 32 years, if measured from 1848, the date of the Tshidi’s return from exile, until the concerted Boer attacks from 1880-84? It meant the creation of Mafikeng, an outpost of the Tshidi polity, and the introduction of a new religious culture among the Ba Wesele. It also meant a gradual redefinition of the town’s economic base, as Rolong farmers were drawn into Kimberley’s ambit, and growing numbers of white settlers founded a controversial trading post near the Tshidi town. Under Molema, Mafikeng came to feature on missionary and travellers’ maps. In the 1880s, it emerged as a crossroads for imperial traders, explorers and missionaries; Rhodes’s presence as chief of these increased the stakes for the whole region, for the Tshidi polity and for Silas himself before the 1895 Jameson Raid.

Silas and his surviving brothers’ attitude to imperialism was apparently ambivalent: they would have liked to remain independent, yet under pressure from Western Transvaal Boers, Montshiwa and his advisers tried to negotiate British colonisation on their own terms. Silas and Lefenya played key roles in this process, first in 1884, in British Bechuanaland’s creation and again in 1895, when the Cape annexed the Crown Colony. The Empire’s salvation of the Tshidi from the Boers later influenced Dr Molema’s thinking in The Bantu. It may be difficult, nearly a century after the book’s publication, to understand his repeated declarations of loyalty to the Empire. However, the Tshidi polity had had two options in 1884: to submit to imperial rule, with limited freedom, or to face their virtual enslavement to the new Boer state, Goshen. “[T]he Boers systematically forget people’s rights and flatly deny them liberty,” wrote Dr Molema in 1920.

The Molemas were hardly alone in supporting imperial ideals long after Britain began deserting them politically in 1910. The SANNC sent two deputations to London to assert their loyalty and request British intervention to re-establish black South Africans’ rights. These brave and sincere delegates might have had a just cause, but were politically naïve. Dr Molema’s belief that imperial rule was the

33 Cf. supra, pp.90-104, 124 fn.146.
34 The Bantu was published in 1920.
35 Molema, 1920: 242. On Tshidi resistance to the Boers in the 1880s, see supra, pp.88ff. On the Molema brothers’ positive yet pragmatic attitude towards imperial culture, see supra, pp.54, 96-99.
36 Cf. supra, pp.345-47.
37 See, for example, supra, p.356.
best way to create a society in which black and white people enjoyed equal rights was ambiguous. He lauded the opposition of “philanthropists, imperialists, [and] missionaries” to the Natives Land Act, and praised the British public’s reception of the 1914 deputation representing “His Majesty’s black subjects”, but added that World War I had delayed negotiations. Yet, he let the imperial government’s indifference to its former black subjects’ plight pass uncriticised. Instead, he held the new, mostly Afrikaner, government almost wholly responsible for denying blacks political representation: “[h]enceforward, they must appeal, and that not personally, to those against whom they are aggrieved; if persecuted, they must appeal to their persecutors”.

On 20 September 1909, the British parliament had signed the South Africa Act into law, thereby sanctioning the white National Convention’s “compromise”, the previous May, on the issue of black representation. Under the compromise, the former Republics and Natal retained their exclusionist “native” policies, while the Cape preserved its liberal, but qualified, franchise. Many African politicians favoured the extension of the Cape Franchise to all provinces, as Molema argued in *The Bantu*: “[e]qual rights for all civilised men, irrespective of race and colour”. Admirable as these words might sound, they echoed the sentiment of the qualified franchise. By contrast, AK Soga, socialist editor of *Izwi Labantu* had in 1909 promoted a more egalitarian version of “Molema’s” principle. Despite the Draft Act of Union’s exclusionary clauses, he threatened, “‘Equal rights for all South of the Zambesi’ is the motto that will yet float at the masthead of this new ship of state which has been launched under the Union…”. “All” proposed an unqualified franchise, unlike Molema’s “all civilised men”. At this time (c.1920), Molema’s notion of equality was limited and class-based, as reflected in the chapter “Black and White in South Africa”.

His class-based analysis of African society had missionary, not socialist roots. Molema exposed the origins of his thinking by citing John Mackenzie, the missionary statesman who had engineered Rolong Country’s annexation to Britain: “….religion and civilisation have always gone hand in hand in African missions”. Like Mackenzie, he believed that Christianity had been the transformative element in African communities in the past half-century, as the Mafikeng example illustrated. He regarded these changes as wholly positive, and did not draw the conclusions that Bundy would in the 1970s. Bundy, and later the Comaroffs, stressed the missionaries’ conscious intention to create class differentiation in African communities. He contended that in “savage’ lands”, the missionaries set out to “‘tame’, to alter such societies to a degree whereby their members would be receptive to the Gospel as well as to the benefits of western civilization”. Molema did not quite see missionisation’s sinister side. As noted, he held “the British Empire’s capitalists” responsible for exploiting the country’s natural and human resources. Yet, he did not see the missionaries’ part in creating a willing consumer market for the

---

38 As part of a series of praises, Molema (1920: 246) eulogised the Empire as “[t]hat administration which, based on liberality and justice, had hitherto in Cape Colony, no less than in India, New Zealand, Canada, the West Indies, and other parts of the British Empire, produced records unequalled, much less surpassed, in the history of the administration of subject races of any nation;…” Also cf. supra, pp.355-56.
41 Molema (1920: 244): this was a variant on Rhodes’s “[e]qual rights for all civilised men south of the Zambesi”, which Molema cited on p.241.
42 Cf. supra, p.236 & fn.45.
43 Odendaal (1984: 152-53) cited the fiery Soga (*Izwi Labantu*, 16 Feb 1909) on the Act’s betrayal of Africans (*my italics*). He called the Act: “…treachery!…for the Act has virtually disenfranchised the black man already even before the meeting of the Union Parliament….This is a replica of the treaty of Vereeniging”.
44 Cf. supra, p.347ff.
45 Molema (1920: 222) cited Mackenzie [1871: 342]. The full quotation is given supra, p.334.
47 Cf. supra, p.340 & fn.311.
Empire’s goods — the “benefits of western civilization”. Bundy argued that the missionary initiative created a chain of British-controlled transformations that harnessed Africans into the imperial sphere: “consumption of British goods, the increase of commerce, of civilization and of learning, the spread of Christianity and the defeat of heathenism, polygamy, and barbarism”.

Molema’s deep religious convictions were among his most attractive personal qualities (of which there were many), but they limited the extent to which he could achieve his intention of writing an historical and ethnographic work that represented African people’s experience. Indeed, this aim was problematic. Had he perhaps removed his personal concerns from his history and ethnography of Africans, he might have managed to write an impartial work about the societies and systems that were creating modern African communities. As this thesis has shown, the aims he declared in The Bantu’s Preface made it much more than “history and ethnography”. The “high first-person count” detected in his “member of the race” statement indicated that The Bantu was written as one of the life genres, autoethnography.

Reading The Bantu in this way has enabled this thesis to unlock the doors to old Molema homesteads: to Chief Molema’s round Setswana-style home at the centre of the town he built, and to Silas’ square, brick home, known as the place of the lovers, Maratwa, in Modiri’s time. These are not solid “doors” (mabati), but entrances (botsëno) that have permitted partial access to the lives of three generations of a pivotal and fascinating clan. The access is partial, because documents, photographs and interviews give, even at best, only an impression of these Molema lives: a sense, rather than the actuality of the real.

**Dr Molema’s Use of Sources:**

Biography is not this thesis sole purpose; its second part is devoted to determining what made Dr Molema’s “simple portrayal of the life of the Bantu” both historical and ethnographical, and thus examines his use of source material. Although secondary material dominated his bibliography, he included 23 pages of original documents, a chronology, an ethnographic map, several genealogical tables, and fairly detailed index. This thesis’ Chapters Five and Six study his use of sources in constructing intellectual debates and authenticating his own opinions. These chapters render a more ample and accurate account of the discursive trends and tendencies from which he drew his ideas.

He read far more broadly than the bibliography’s two sections suggested: “Books referring directly to Africa” and “Books referring indirectly to Africa”. The first category included historians (including Herodotus), ethnographers, missionaries and travellers, while the second embraced Ovid, Machiavelli, Hume and many others. These ideas and their allusion to wider spheres of meaning beyond his text — Classical Roman literature (Ovid), the Italian Renaissance (Machiavelli) and the European Enlightenment (Hume) — made Molema a philosophically complex writer. The problem was that his attempts to invert the “white dominated” approach to South African history did not always succeed entirely; two major sources, Theal and Evans, were bastions of the racially-based thinking he encouraged readers to escape.

Molema, like many African historical writers, did not receive much positive attention from academic historians. Chapters Five and Six attempt to re-assess two 1980s’ historiographers’ contentions that he was a Thealite (Saunders) and “mission-inspired” (Smith). As illustrated, Molema’s relationship to

---

48 Bundy, 1979: 38.
49 Cf. supra, p.18.
50 See Molema (1920: 368-88) for the documents and this thesis’ Appendix C for a list of the documents and bibliography. For the chronology, see pp.xv-xix. The genealogies are on pp. 39, 48, 57, 388-90. The hand-drawn Map is between pp.20 & 21, and is reproduced supra, p.266. The Index follows the text and the Appendix, from pp.391-99.
51 Cf. supra, pp.231 & 289-92.
52 Molema, 1920: ix-xi.
Maurice, given,/ He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,/ Dominion absolute; that right we hold /By His donation; – but man over
to Molema: “O execrable sin [son], to aspire/ Above his brethren, to himself assuming,/ Authority usurpt, from God not
1941).
61 Keane, 1895 (see supra, p.344 fn.332). BL Putnam Weale, 1910. (See supra, p.344). Spencer, 1874 (see supra, pp.255, 257-59), Bent, (see supra, pp.268).

Molema’s critics apparently did not observe that he used twentieth-century writers of African descent (Du Bois, Rubusana and Plaatje) to offset the Settler purview.55 Missionary writers were his mainstay: especially Livingstone and Stewart (Theal’s opponent), whom he regarded as pro-African as well as Moffat and Mackenzie.56 This reliance on missionaries and Anti-Slavery activists linked him to the grand narratives of the European Enlightenment, with their liberal and Romantic notions of human freedom and perfectibility. The words of eighteenth-century Anti-Slavery evangelicals, Clarkson, Granville Sharp and Wilberforce rang with particular moral force in The Bantu.57 Their moral backing helped him attack the slave trade, which he blamed for Africa’s disorganisation.58 Missionaries, he held, offered a moral critique of white governments’ many injustices. Like these thinkers, he drew on Europe’s seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Enlightenment philosophers for the moral foundation of his liberalism: Rousseau, Montesquieu, Kant, and Hume.59 He also engaged with Darwin and Social Darwinists: Huxley, Weismann, and Spencer, but did not indicate knowing that Afrikaners religious fundamentalists might find them controversial. Victorian economists, philosophers and social theorists, like JS Mill and FD Maurice, were among his readings — he even cited the latter’s analysis of the Rolong role in the Siege of Mafikeng!60

Much of The Bantu was structured as a debate between opposing ideas about Africa. Molema sometimes deferred revealing his own opinion to readers, but let the voice of “right” speak through chosen critical sources. The texts of writers whose ideas tended to offend him became his “stalking horses”: Keane, Weale, Spencer and Bent.61 Towards The Bantu’s close, he countered all claims of white superiority, particularly the growth of aggressive Afrikaner Nationalism by quoting liberal philosopher, Bertrand Russell:

Theal’s works was complicated. He relied substantially on Theal for his depictions of pre-colonial and nineteenth-century southern Africa. Yet, as both Smith and Saunders revealed, almost all South African historians at this time relied on Theal to some extent. Even Macmillan (a contemporary of Molema’s), who opened up a newly liberal seam of historical writing, depended on Theal for certain information.53 In 1995, Dubow’s masterly analysis of early South African anthropological discourse emphasised that most early twentieth-century historians and social scientists were, like Theal, heavily influenced by Social Darwinism; even the early work of left-wing writers, like Jack Simons, manifested its imprint.54

55 For Du Bois, see pp.23-24, 260, 264-66, 312-13, 316, 331, 340-42, 344-45. For Rubusana, see Molema, 1920: 160. Some of many references to Plaatje are too numerous to cite individually.
56 Cf. supra, p.323 fn. 231.
58 Molema (1920: Chapter XIV, “Slavery”) began with a quotation from Milton, who epitomised “right reason” and morality to Molema: “O execrable sin [son], to aspire/ Above his brethren, to himself assuming,/ Authority usurpt, from God not given,/ He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,/ Dominion absolute; that right we hold /By His donation; – but man over man,/ He made not lord, such title to himself/ Reserving, human left form human free.” (Paradise Lost, XII, 64-71). Whether the error in the quotation’s first line (“sin” instead of “son”) was Molema’s or the publisher’s is unknown.
“[t]here is first of all a conviction of the superior excellence of our own group, a certainty that they are in some sense the chosen people. This justifies the feeling that only the good and evil of one’s own group is of real importance, and that the rest of the world is to be regarded merely as a material for the triumph or salvation of the higher race. In modern politics, the attitude is embodied in Imperialism. Europe, as a whole, has this attitude toward Asia and Africa”.62

To a large extent, Molema’s practice throughout was to indigenise debates that had taken place in Europe and America over several hundred years, by applying them to southern Africa. He sought recourse to a common historiographical tradition, because so few South African black writers had been published by 1920. By giving these ideas local application, he hoped to begin an African historiographical tradition to contest many of the assumptions that historians of European origin made at Africans’ expense.

Like so many of his sources, he represented South Africa as a specific social and discursive space with a uniquely complex racial structure and a colonial heritage that had encouraged theories of racial difference to proliferate. The Bantu strove to depict as familiar, people whom earlier writers had depicted as foreign. To achieve this end, he deployed the technique of cultural translation, portraying supposed “extreme” African tyrants (Shaka, Mzilikazi) as little different from Europe’s great dictators (Nero, Napoleon). Tacitus, Gibbon and Green helped him assert that Africans, like those Ancient Britons who had resisted the Roman Empire, were often portrayed as unredeemed “barbarians”, but might, through education and training, become world leaders, like those Britons’ descendants.63

Dr Molema’s considerable use of literary allusion contributed to The Bantu’s allegorical structure, again evoking a context of meaning beyond his text. Shakespeare’s Hamlet, for example, conveyed his welling anger at the way Africans were treated as the objects of white researchers’ investigation and white government policy.64 Alternatively, Henry V’s exhortation to English soldiers before Harfleur reinforced his declarations of patriotism during the Great War.65 Earlier, he deployed four of Pringle’s poems to assert the indigenous voices of San, Khoi and Xhosa against the tide of degrading colonial discourse.66 Excerpts from British writers enriched his writing, either creating a British cultural equivalent of an African experience (Milton and Scott), or expressing his own religious or philosophical outlook (Browning and Campbell).67 Setswana proverbs, poetry and song featured in his three published works and communicated, respectively, that culture’s wisdom and the personalities of Chiefs Tawana, Moroka and Montshiwa. His own Setswana poem “Thaba ’Nchu”, conveyed the Black Mountain’s place in the history of African Christianity.68 The chapter on “Bantu Language” contained a verse from Rubusana’s Zemk’ Inkomo Magwala ndini.69

The use of this new information about Molema’s intellectual origins and ideas challenges previous academic judgments of his work, such as Saunders’ statement that Molema was heavily reliant on Theal. In 1920, he emerged as a widely read intellectual, just beginning to reevaluate the then leading

63 Cf. supra, pp.320ff.
64 For Molema’s application of Hamlet, III ii, 384-96, see supra, pp.309, 313ff.
65 Cf. supra, p.353.
66 Cf. supra, pp.273-74, 290ff, 313.
67 Cf. supra, pp.328 fn.238 (Milton), 300 (Scott), 359 (Browning) & 343ff (Campbell).
68 Cf. supra, p.70. For the song about Tawana, see supra, pp.62 fn.141 and 66 for Montshiwa’s Praises. See Molema (1951: 147) for a stanza from Chief Moroka’s Praise Poem.
69 Molema, 1920: 160. Odendaal (1984: 162) translates this Xhosa saying as, “‘There go your cattle [i.e.rights] you cowards!’” was used in politics, when black feared that the white National Convention would rob them of their rights in the Act of Union. Jordan translated the saying more figuratively as “Defend Your Heritage”. See supra, p.175 fn.73.
South African historian and ethnographer, Theal. He later tackled Theal’s pro-Boer bias even more in, *Moroka* (1951).\(^\text{70}\) In fairness, Smith’s view that Molema wrote under missionary influence was generally accurate, but did not specify the missionary tradition to which he belonged or the racial complexity of his phrase “mission-inspired”. Firstly, Molema and many black intellectuals regarded the missionaries as liberal alternatives to the conservative Settler tradition of historiography.\(^\text{71}\) Secondly, Molema was part of the missionary tradition by descent: his grandfather had been the first black Wesleyan Methodist evangelist north of the Vaal River from 1848, and had helped to establish a syncretic *Methodist*-Rolog culture at Mafikeng.\(^\text{72}\)

Molema wrote as an amateur, yet acknowledged an impressively broad array of sources; during this period, professional writers often did not name their sources, or revealed only the most significant.\(^\text{73}\) This lengthy booklist, and his identification of Theal’s bias indicate that it is largely erroneous for South African historiographers to charge him with being an uncritical Thealite. Indeed, this thesis argues that the once comfortable classifications that Saunders and Smith used in the 1980s require a rigorous reappraisal, already begun in the 1990s by Bundy, Bozzoli and Delius, Lodge and Dubow.\(^\text{74}\)

This thesis’ analytical chapters offer an alternative reading of Molema’s “place” in the South African historical canon. In conventional depictions, he was a fairly insignificant, rather conservative writer, an early African nationalist with political, historical and religious views of nineteenth-century Cape liberal origin. The present study finds that Molema experienced his world in ambiguous ways that impacted on his writing. As African Christians, his family inhabited the cultural ambiguity that Christianity created, and were often in conflict with the Tshidi leadership. His class affiliations and education often left him identifying strongly with colonial values, *The Bantu* often illustrated. Political struggles in South African society and the contemporary discourses of history and ethnography also influenced the main themes he selected and his style of debate. However, his own informal political education, at Lovedale and in Glasgow, and his SANNc connections, enabled him to formulate a nascent African Nationalist response to many of the issues raised in *The Bantu*.

**Some Implications for Further Research:**

The initiation of a sustained, intellectual African Nationalist critique was the work of several writers in the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s; Plaatje began it and his *Native Life* served as a model to Molema. Soga, Fuze, and Mweli-Skota would follow, each raising questions about the generic complexity of their work. The life genres have played a vital role for nearly a century in South Africa, and their relationship to the writing of history and ethnography still requires more investigation — a task for historians, literary scholars and anthropologists. This study has used a life genre, biography, to write about *The Bantu*, identifying it as belonging to another life genre, autoethnography. To situate the work more amply, the thesis has attempted an intellectual history of Dr Molema and two generations of his immediate ancestors. Given his own and his father’s prominence in articulating African opposition to successive South African governments made them both forerunners of today’s post-Apartheid intellectuals. There is still a great deal of research to be done on the chain of transformations that links their generations’ past to the present.


\(^\text{71}\) For example, see *supra*, pp.282ff: Molema’s use of Stewart’s version of events in the First Basuto War, to gainsay Theal.

\(^\text{72}\) Dr Molema’s own studies, *Moroka*, *Montshiwa* and unpublished “History of the Barolog” have provide insights into this culture as do the Comaroffs two volumes *Of Revelation and Revolution* (1991) and (1997) and their *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination* (1992).

\(^\text{73}\) Cf. *supra*, pp.247, 249 & fn.130, which mention Theal’s non-disclosure of sources. Macmillan followed the convention of footnoting only, and not providing a detailed bibliography. Eleven years later, De Kiewiet (1940: xi-xii) provided a “Select Bibliography” which separated out 19 major secondary works from 10 Official Publications. He audaciously (for the times) omitted Theal’s works from this bibliography, but revealed his Liberal intellectual affiliations by citing four of Macmillan’s.

\(^\text{74}\) For a brief overview of Saunders and Smith’s historiographical canons, see Appendix B.
In the broader sense, this research has implications for others investigating nineteenth-century South African history, the interactions between indigenous and colonial polities and cultures. Chapter One on Chief Molema explores the long prelude to the formal colonisation of British Bechuanaland, during which the Chief and his sons annexed themselves to British ways (and were, in turn, annexed by them) through the medium of missionary imperialism. Little has been written in recent years of the small group of indigenous evangelists whom the Wesleyans trained to carry the Word into parts of the subcontinent then virtually unknown to white missionaries, traders and travellers. The Comaroffs have already analysed the split of the Tshidi into Wesleyan and traditional factions, and this thesis further examines this division through the individual lives of several Molema and Montshiwa generations.

There is considerable scope for further research on early missionisation and indigenous responses to it in other Tswana communities and elsewhere in southern Africa. The Comaroffs’ style of linguistic and cultural research is particularly important, as it examines one of the methodologies through which our knowledge of the African past has been constituted: missionary intervention and documentation. Dr Molema attested to the importance of missionary records in Moroka, calling 13 January 1821 “…the commencement of Barolong recorded history”, as Rev Broadbent, the first missionary to publish an account of the Rolong, arrived on that day.

Apart from its insights into twentieth-century African intellectual history, this thesis helps to texture our knowledge of the African middle class’s daily lifestyles, their school curricula, interactions with one another, journalistic publications and economic ventures. At another level, it records their aspirations and disappointments, as political leaders and professionals. Like Willan’s Plaatje, this thesis is also a narrative of their many disappointments: their desire to belong to the South African body politic in 1910 and their ruthlessly deliberate exclusion from it by the alliance of Afrikaner nationalists and English-speaking settlers, who took control of the Union of South Africa. The increased freedom of access to State Archives and University Collections of Historical Papers since 1994 will make other such studies possible.

Post-Apartheid efforts to reverse the depredations of the 1913 Natives Land Act suggest that, around the country, there are more stories like the Molemas’ that have yet to be told. Dr Molema was not one of the key actors involved in resisting the Act, being too young at the time. But his father and their family friend Plaatje played major roles in the resistance, and gave evidence to several Commissions on African land holding, which offer researchers a rich source of information on contemporary African opinion. The protest and publicity that the SANNC organised around the NLA helped to take their organisation, formerly a smallish, middle-class clique, to a far larger cross-section of the African people. Dr Molema was one of the young men who, six months after the Act’s passing, trekked to Bloemfontein to attend the annual SANNC Conference for the first time. It was his first step into the political arena, which he never really left. Any further work on Molema would need to devote more attention to his political career.

Referring to the period after The Bantu’s publication, it is important to note that this thesis does not continue much beyond 1921, except in brief allusions to Silas Molema’s death, and some of the works

---

75 Cf. supra, pp.70ff.
76 See particularly, supra, pp.54, 85, 97ff, 104, 106.
78 See Willan, 1984: Chapter 13, “The 1920s: a leader without a people”.
79 Cf. supra, pp.201 & fn.22 for Keegan’s use of the term “catharsis” to characterise the NLA’s longterm effects, and p.345ff.
80 See Bibliography, infra, p.375.
81 Molema, Johns Interview, 1964.
and essays Modiri Molema wrote after returning to South Africa. There remains a wealth of material that would greatly assist anyone working in the fields of medical history, political history, and African historiography. Molema kept several thriving medical practices in Mafikeng, where relations between him and the white medical establishment became strained in the later 1920s.\textsuperscript{82} He also sat on many Local, Divisional and Advisory Councils, including that of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, until the early 1960s, and thereby played a strong role in shaping local and regional politics. He took a leading role in national politics, especially under Dr Moroka’s ANC presidency (1949-52) during the Defiance Campaign, which helped to establish the organisation as a mass resistance movement.\textsuperscript{83}

What of Dr Molema’s later historical work? This thesis’ Chapters One and Two rely heavily on his published biographies in reconstructing the lives of Chief Molema and Chief Silas, and the history of their milieu. Initially I had intended to include chapters on both Moroka and Montshiwa but later chose to make use of them as source material, for the sake of greater brevity. A study of his later work should also include his fascinating unpublished works, Piet Cronjé, The History of the Barolong, Sol T Plaatje, and essays.

It is to be hoped that this thesis will lead to the republication of Molema’s historical writings with explanatory introductions and notes. One would hope, too, to see more work being done by scholars who have joint interests in history and literature, on the writings of other African historians, biographers, autobiographers and autoethnographers. It is time for historians to take to heart ZK Matthews’ comments on the content and ideology of South African history, and revisit the marginalised works of African historians, and to regard them as the basis of a new history of South Africa.\textsuperscript{84}

That said, the Molema-Plaatje Papers at the University of the Witwatersrand and UNISA still contain many untapped resources on matters pertaining to African landholding, tenancy leadership, the linguistic history of African languages, and literature. Another research area this thesis touches on is the history of oral and written literatures in Africa. These are areas in which Tim Couzens, Isabel Hofmeyr and Jeff Opland have done tremendous amounts of work. It is a broad field, and much remains to be fully researched here. In the shape of life-stories, archives such as those of SOAS and the ICS at London University hold several fascinating autobiographical interviews with early twentieth-century intellectuals.

Chapters Two and Three discuss Silas and Modiri Molema’s experiences at school. The research that I was able to undertake in the Cape Archives revealed a wealth of documentation on Healdtown and Lovedale: more recently, information on another Eastern Cape Mission school, Salem, where Israel Molema and Stephen Lefenya studied, as has recently come to light at Rhodes University. This information and the substantial remains of the Lovedale Archives, also at Rhodes, would suggest that there is space for a new history of Lovedale. Moreover, the history of Healdtown would have a new meaning at this time, as another ex-pupil, ex-President Mandela is raising funds to re-open the school.

Chapter Four demonstrates that considerable numbers of South Africans of all races were obliged to travel overseas for their medical studies, and that many chose the Scottish Universities. There is little published information on the reasons for this enforced (for black students) and voluntary migration (for white students after the opening of the UCT and Wits Medical Faculties). Several students under the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{82} See \textit{supra}, p.340ff on the 1927 Strike against Dr Molema.
  \item \textsuperscript{83} See \textit{supra}, p.13 for details of Molema’s banning order and charges under the Suppression of Communism Act.
  \item \textsuperscript{84} See, for example, Willem Saayman [date], “Subversive Subservience: ZK Matthews and missionary education in South Africa”. In \textit{Missionalia, (Journal of the South African Missiological Society)}, \url{http://www.geocities.com/missionalia/articles.htm}. It examines the strength of Matthews’ religious vision and his critique of South African historical writing.
\end{itemize}
aegis of Professor Shula Marks are now studying the experiences of black South African doctors in Britain. 85

What the thesis has not been able to do:

This thesis set out to write a biography of the Molemas in their working lives, and political and social capacities. Although Modiri’s letters occasionally speak intermittently of his personal life, I did not ask intimate questions in my interviews. During these, I felt very conscious of the impropriety of a relatively young woman’s “interrogating” the family of a much older, and now deceased, male authority figure. Perhaps the demands of academic enquiry — and my academic “right” to relentless questioning in pursuit of the truth — should have made me press forward with inquiries into Dr Molema’s personal life, but I saw no reason to offend the Molema family or Dr Molema’s friends. Out of their own generosity, they agreed to meet with me, a self-appointed biographer of their father and rrēmogolo, and it would have been indelicate of me to have asked questions about the nature of his two marriages. His family members, Leloba, Solomon and Warada Molema attested to his generosity and his personal seriousness, his dedication to his work.86 Future researchers may wish to proceed in this direction, but should certainly do so with a prior protocol between researcher and the family members concerned.

As stated under implications for further research, this thesis has not, to my regret, dealt sufficiently with Dr Molema’s later writings. While I believe that Chapters One and Two give insight into them, greater attention needs to be devoted to both Moroka and Montshiwa, which Mr Mapanya considered Molema’s finest work.87 His comments direct us to the tremendous interest that African intellectuals, like Skota, displayed in precolonial leaders, from the 1920s on, as the Introduction and Chapters Five and Six have shown. I believe that the period in which Moroka and Montshiwa were written differed radically, both politically and socially, from that in which Molema wrote The Bantu and require a detailed, separate analytical study — perhaps as part of a biography of Molema’s later years.

The African Races of Glasgow is an organisation that I am still researching, and recently had a breakthrough in tracing some of its members with the aid of Glasgow University and the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, Edinburgh. The next step in this research would be to trace these doctors in their countries of origin and to attempt to establish whether they maintained contact after leaving Glasgow.88

The passage of time made it impossible to re-interview some of the people who initially assisted me; shortly after our interview, Dr Sefetoge Molema passed away, as did Dr Molema’s attorney, Spencer Minchin. As an undergraduate, I fortunately met his wife, Mrs Connie Minchin in 1979, while visiting Mafikeng with Professor Couzens. Owing to her long illness and sad death, I could not interview her for this thesis. She had known the Molemas and the town of Mafikeng at an earlier time and the thesis would have been the richer for including her memories. Mr Michael van Reenen, Dr Molema’s friend, who negotiated the transfer of some of his papers to UNISA, also passed away before I began this research.

Then, there are The Bantu’s biblical subtexts. With the aid of a Bible Concordance, I have striven to mention these, to show the richness of Dr Molema’s allusions, and of his faith. However, it is possible

86 Warada Molema commented (Interview, 1992) “…basically he was just a loving father and a very good husband…to my mother”. Spencer Minchin Interview, 1991: his first wife, Anna Molema’s death devastated Dr Molema completely.
88 See supra, pp.218-19.
that I have not included as many as *are* there, as my own biblical knowledge falls far behind his. For this, I apologise. While working on *The Bantu, Moroka* and *Montshiwa*, and on Dr Molema’s letters, my respect for his and his family’s faith has increased greatly, and I trust that this thesis represents them in this regard.

**On knowing Dr Molema:**

I did not know Dr Molema personally, but wish that I had. From a generational point of view if nothing else, this might have been possible: he was born a year after my grandmother, who lived until 1979. Had we lived in Mafikeng, he might well have been our family doctor. This is not such a stretch of the imagination; even in those “far-off” apartheid days, white friends of mine from Thaba ‘Nchu were brought into the world by Dr Moroka. Alas, such imagined meetings were not to be, but I count myself fortunate to have met Dr Molema through his many writings and the other works that illuminated his life and work.

◊

*The End*