



# Zuid-Afrikaansche Boer Republics

## UNPFII INTERNATIONAL SUBMISSION

Submission to the International Community on the Status of the  
Afrikaner and *Boervolk* under International Law

Prepared for International Presentation  
25 February 2026

### Submitted by:

The Temporary Advisory Council, mandated by and on behalf of the living *Boervolk*, collectively united under the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk* (ZAB), administered by the Zuid-Afrikaansche Boer Republics (ZABR).

### Introduction

This submission addresses a critical issue in the discourse on self-determination within South Africa: the erroneous assumption that an "Afrikaner volk" exists as a cohesive entity under international law, and the historical and ongoing marginalization of the *Boervolk's* legitimate claim to *volkereg* (people's rights). The Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk* (ZAB), a representative body of Boer compatriots, acts on behalf of the *Boervolk* to advocate for the restoration of their historical sovereignty, as articulated in the ZAB Declaration of Independence of "100 Men" (ratified July 12, 2025). This declaration asserts the *Boervolk's* sovereignty over the Zuid-Afrikaansche Boer Republics (ZABR), encompassing the 21+ historical Boer Republics, and rejects any foreign interference or agreements made without their consent since May 31, 1902. We argue that the Afrikaner

identity, encompassing all Afrikaans speakers, does not meet the international criteria for a "people" entitled to self-determination, while the *Boervolk*, with a historically recognized sovereign status, has been systematically denied political representation and recognition since 1902. This document seeks to clarify these distinctions, grounded in international legal standards, historical evidence, and contemporary realities, to advocate for the restoration of the *Boervolk's* rights.

The *Boervolk's* distinct historical and cultural standing is summarized in the Boer Declaration (see [Attachment X](#)), emphasizing our origins as a sovereign people with theocratic foundations, rejecting imposed identities, and exercising *volkereg* in harmony with others.

The ZABR, encompassing the 21+ historical Boer Republics, operates under principles derived from the Almighty Heavenly Father's Word (see [Attachment Q: Appendix L](#) from the concept ZABR Constitution – "ZABR According to Biblical Principles").

This submission is accompanied by a Covering Notice clarifying its nature as a statement of record.

### **Declaration and Notice – Status Correction**

This Declaration and Notice is placed on record in good faith and peace before the Almighty Heavenly Father and the international community.

**The Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk* does not act as petitioners, but as a distinct people exercising their inherent right to self-identification, self-determination, and status correction.**

Status correction means the peaceful and lawful rectification of a people's status on the public record, where historical misclassification, administrative subjugation, or imposed political identity is corrected to reflect the true and continuing status of the *Boervolk*.

Nothing in this document shall be construed as a waiver of rights or consent to unlawful jurisdiction. All rights are expressly reserved without prejudice.

## **The Afrikaner Identity: An Invalid Basis for Self-Determination**

### **Defining the Afrikaner Identity**

The term "Afrikaner" is commonly understood to include all Afrikaans-speaking individuals in South Africa, encompassing white descendants of Dutch, French, and German settlers, as well as Coloured, Malay, and other Afrikaans-speaking communities. This broad linguistic grouping has been historically and politically framed as a unified "volk" (people) by Afrikaner nationalist movements, particularly during the 20th century under the National Party's apartheid regime. However, this inclusive definition

undermines any claim to self-determination under international law due to its lack of homogeneity and cohesive national identity.

### **International Legal Criteria for a "People"**

International law, as articulated in the UN Charter (Articles 1(2) and 55), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Article 1), and the 1970 Declaration on Friendly Relations, defines a "people" entitled to self-determination based on several criteria:

- A shared historical tradition.
- A distinct cultural or ethnic identity.
- A degree of geographical concentration (though not always mandatory).
- Self-identification as a cohesive group with national aspirations.
- Objective differences from other groups within the state.

These criteria, further elaborated in the 1990 UNESCO Experts' Report on Self-Determination, require a group to demonstrate a unified identity and, in cases of secession, evidence of systemic oppression or denial of internal self-determination.

### **Why the Afrikaner Identity Fails to Qualify**

The Afrikaner identity, as a broad linguistic community, fails to meet these criteria for the following reasons:

- **Diversity of Composition:** The Afrikaner group includes white Afrikaans speakers (often tied to Boer heritage or Cape-based communities), Coloured communities, and others with distinct historical, cultural, and political trajectories. For example, during the Second Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), ~50,000 Cape Afrikaners supported British forces, demonstrating a lack of unified national aspirations. Coloured Afrikaans-speaking communities often reject Afrikaner nationalist narratives, further fragmenting the identity.
- **Lack of Historical Sovereignty:** Unlike the *Boervolk*, which established sovereign republics in the 19th century, the broader Afrikaner group never formed an independent political entity. Cape Afrikaners were subjects of British colonial rule, and their political loyalties were divided, precluding recognition as a cohesive *volk*.
- **Rejection by International Bodies:** Post-apartheid efforts by groups like the *Afrikaner Volksfront* and *Vryheidsfront*, to secure recognition as a *volk* at the United Nations in 1994, 1996, and 2005 were rejected. The UN Human Rights Committee and African Union found that Afrikaners do not constitute an indigenous or oppressed people, and their diverse composition undermines their claim to *volkereg*. The South African Constitution (Article 235) acknowledges

cultural self-determination but only within the national framework, not as an independent *volk*.

- **Historical Appropriation of Boer Rights:** Afrikaner nationalism, particularly through the National Party (1914–1994), co-opted the *Boervolk*'s historical legacy (e.g., the Great Trek and Anglo-Boer Wars) to construct a broader Afrikaner identity. This appropriation diluted the *Boervolk*'s distinct claim to *volkerereg*, as it subsumed their narrative into a less cohesive linguistic and cultural identity.

### **Conclusion on Afrikaner Status**

The evidence conclusively demonstrates that the Afrikaner identity is invalid as a basis for self-determination under international law. Its linguistic inclusivity, lack of historical sovereignty, and absence of systemic oppression render it ineligible for recognition as a *volk*. Attempts to claim self-determination, such as through the *Volkstaat* Council (1994–1999), failed due to this fundamental flaw, as the international community and South African legal framework do not recognize the Afrikaner as a cohesive people with *volkerereg*.

## **The *Boervolk*: A Historically Recognized People Denied Representation**

### **Historical Recognition of the *Boervolk***

The *Boervolk*, defined as the descendants of Dutch, French, and German settlers who undertook the Great Trek (1835–1840) and established the South African Republic (Transvaal, 1852–1902) and Orange Free State (1854–1902) amongst 21+ Boer Republics, is a South African group with a historically recognized claim to *volkerereg*. This recognition is evidenced by:

- **1841 Dutch Publication on Boer Emigration (1841):** Contemporary and historical sources confirm the *Boervolk*'s distinct identity as a sovereign people. A 1841 Dutch publication, "De uit de Kaapkolonie verdryfde Hollandsche Boeren" (Hollandsche Persing Magazijn voor de Jeugd, 1841), describes the Great Trek emigrants as "Hollandse boere" who established independent republics with Biblical principles and republican governance ("heemrade"), distinguishing them from broader colonial populations and affirming their unique *volkerereg* long before the 20th-century "Afrikaner" construct emerged (see [Attachment R: 1841 International recognition of the \*Boervolk\* as a separate sovereign people](#)).
- **Sand River Convention (1852):** The United Kingdom recognized the independence of the Transvaal, acknowledging the *Boervolk* as a sovereign people with self-governance rights.

- **Bloemfontein Convention (1854):** The UK similarly recognized the Orange Free State's sovereignty, affirming the *Boervolk*'s status as a distinct nation.
- **United States Treaty (1871):** The US signed a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Extradition with the Orange Free State, marking formal diplomatic recognition of the *Boervolk* as a sovereign entity.
- **International Sympathy:** During the Second Anglo-Boer War, nations such as the Netherlands, Germany, and France expressed sympathy and sent volunteers, reinforcing the *Boervolk*'s distinct identity, though formal recognition was limited due to British influence.
- **Faith-Based Identity:** The *Boervolk* has, since her inception, distinguished herself as an ethnic group that seeks its salvation, freedom, and self-determination solely from the Creator of heaven and earth, as articulated in the *ZAB Declaration of Independence of "100 Men"* (July 12, 2025). This Scriptural foundation, rooted in the *Boervolk*'s historical commitment to Biblical principles, has shaped their cultural and political identity, setting them apart from other groups in Africa including the Afrikaner. Their belief in divine guidance for their *volkerereg* underpins their governance structures, including the *Raad van Rigters* (Council of Judges) and *Volkshof* (People's Court), which reflect a covenantal relationship with their Creator. This faith-based identity led to several Vows that the *Boervolk* concluded with the Almighty Heavenly Father, which was heard AND confirmed by Him. These Vows, confirmed by the Almighty, the Supreme Authority for recognition, is a testimony of *volkerereg* for the *Boervolk*.
- **Postal and Monetary Sovereignty of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republic:** The Boer republics' sovereignty was internationally recognized in practical terms through symbols of statehood. The Zuid-Afrikaansche Republic (ZAR) issued its own postage stamps from 1870 and joined the Universal Postal Union (UPU) in 1895, enabling international postal exchange under its own authority. Similarly, the ZAR minted its own gold currency, the "Kruger Pond", from 1892 at the Pretoria Mint, circulated domestically and internationally as legal tender backed by local gold reserves. These postal and monetary systems were clear markers of sovereign status (see [Attachment U: Postal and Monetary Sovereignty of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republic](#)).

***These affirmation, treaties, diplomatic actions, and faith-based principles established the Boervolk as a people with volkerereg, meeting all international criteria: a shared history*** (Great Trek, Boer republics, Anglo-Boer War, Postal and Monetary System), ***a distinct cultural identity*** (Scriptural foundation, Afrikaans-speaking), ***geographical concentration*** (early republics that leads to Transvaal and

Orange Free State), **and self-identification as a nation**. Also see [Attachment H: Boervolk Identity Clarification](#) and [Attachment I: International Archives Holding Boervolk Records](#).

### **The Anglo-Boer War: International Condemnation of Injustices and Lack of Reparation**

The Second Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902) represents a pivotal moment of injustice against the *Boervolk*, marked by the British Empire’s scorched earth policy and the establishment of concentration camps, which resulted in the deaths of approximately ~40,000 Boer women and children (81% under 16 years) and 20,000 Black individuals due to disease, starvation, and inhumane conditions. See [Attachment G: Historical Injustices – Scorched Earth Policy and Concentration Camps](#) and [Attachment M: The Rape and Humiliation of Boer Women and Children under British Authority](#). These actions, coupled with the annexation of the Boer republics (Transvaal and Orange Free State), constituted a deliberate assault on the *Boervolk*’s sovereignty, land, and cultural identity. International condemnation at the time was significant, yet no formal apologies or meaningful reparations have ever been offered, and the *Boervolk* has not been restored to its pre-war status.

#### **International Condemnation of the Scorched Earth Policy and Concentration Camps**

The British scorched earth policy, implemented by Lord Kitchener from June 1900, involved the systematic destruction of Boer farms, livestock, and infrastructure to undermine the Boer guerrillas’ supply lines. Approximately 30,000 Boer homesteads were burned, and 3.5 million livestock were confiscated or killed, devastating the *Boervolk*’s agrarian-based economy and cultural heritage. Concurrently, the establishment of concentration camps in August 1900 interned ~154,000 Boers (mostly women and children) in overcrowded, unsanitary conditions. The camps, described as the first modern concentration camps, led to catastrophic mortality rates due to malnutrition, disease (e.g., measles, typhoid), and neglect. British activist Emily Hobhouse’s 1901 reports exposed these atrocities, prompting widespread international outrage. British Liberal Party leader Henry Campbell-Bannerman condemned the camps as “methods of barbarism” in a June 1901 speech, a sentiment echoed by the Fawcett Commission (1901), which criticized the camps’ mismanagement and inhumane conditions. International media, including *The Times* (1901) and Dutch newspapers (e.g., *De Telegraaf*, 1901), decried the camps as a moral outrage, with Dutch and German volunteers rallying to the Boer cause. The Netherlands and France issued diplomatic protests, though limited by British geopolitical dominance. These condemnations recognized the camps and scorched earth policy as inhumane and a violation of the principles later codified in international humanitarian law, such as the Hague Conventions (1899, 1907). The annexation

of the Boer republics, formalized by the Peace of Vereeniging (1902), was widely viewed as an imperialist act of conquest, stripping the *Boervolk* of her internationally recognized sovereignty established by the Sand River (1852) and Bloemfontein (1854) Conventions. (Sources: SA History Online, 2023; Britannica, “Second Boer War,” 2024; The Guardian, “Boer War Concentration Camps,” 1999; Cambridge University Press, *The Anglo-Boer War*, 2019)

### **Lack of Apology or Restitution**

Despite this international outcry, no formal apology or meaningful reparation has ever been offered by the British Crown, the United States, or Australia for the atrocities committed against the *Boervolk*. The Peace of Vereeniging (1902) included a £3 million fund for war damages, intended for the repatriation of Boer prisoners and reconstruction of destroyed farms. However, this compensation was strictly limited to material losses and did not address the profound loss of life, cultural identity, or sovereignty. The funds were administered by the British-controlled Union of South Africa (established 1910) and largely managed by Afrikaner nationalist structures, such as the precursors to the National Party, which subsumed Boer interests into a broader Afrikaner identity. Historical records indicate that these funds were distributed unevenly, often favoring Cape Afrikaners or urban elites over rural Boer communities, leaving the *Boervolk* without meaningful restoration. For example, SA History Online notes that only a fraction of the £3 million reached Boer farmers, with many remaining destitute post-war being forced to work in the gold mines in the Transvaal. The *Boervolk*, whose identity was rooted in their agrarian lifestyle and independent republics, was never “set back on its feet” economically, culturally, or politically. Subsequent efforts by Boer advocacy groups (e.g., the Boerestaat Party, 1986–present) to seek international acknowledgment of these injustices have been ignored. In 1999, during the war’s centenary, and in 2023, during King Charles III’s visit to South Africa, the British government expressed “regret” for the suffering caused by the camps but stopped short of a formal apology or reparative measures. Neither the United States, which supported the Peace of Vereeniging diplomatically, nor Australia, whose troops participated in the war and camp operations, have offered apologies or reparations. The absence of restorative justice has perpetuated the *Boervolk*’s marginalization, as their historical sovereignty and cultural heritage remain unacknowledged. (Sources: SA History Online, “Peace of Vereeniging,” 2023; RUSI, “The Boer War and British Imperialism,” 2022; The Guardian, “Britain’s Regret for Boer War Camps,” 1999; The Conversation, “Legacy of the Boer War,” 2022)

### **Violation of Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used)**

Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used) of the Peace of Vereeniging (1902) promised the establishment of a civil administration in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, with “the fullest possible measure of self-government compatible with the circumstances.” This commitment was intended to restore the *Boervolk*’s political autonomy, consistent with their pre-war sovereignty under the Sand River (1852) and Bloemfontein (1854) Conventions. However, this promise was never fulfilled. British administration (1902–1910) delayed self-government, prioritizing colonial interests through Lord Milner’s reconstruction program, which favoured British settlers and economic control. The Transvaal Legislative Council (1903) consisted of appointed members, with no democratic representation for the *Boervolk*. The Lyttelton Constitution (1905) promised limited self-government, but it was only implemented in 1906–1907 under strict British oversight. The formation of the Union of South Africa (1910) under the South Africa Act (1909) further subsumed the *Boervolk* into a centralized state dominated by British and Afrikaner elites, such as Louis Botha and Jan Smuts, who co-opted Boer heritage into a broader Afrikaner identity. This denied the *Boervolk* any meaningful autonomy or recognition of their distinct *volkerereg*. The £3 million war damages fund (Article 5) was mismanaged by the Union government, benefiting infrastructure and urban elites rather than rural Boer communities, further undermining their restoration. The absence of self-government, coupled with the lack of apology or reparation for the war’s atrocities, perpetuates the *Boervolk*’s marginalization. The ZAB’s Declaration of Independence of “100 Men” (2025) rejects post-1902 agreements, citing the violation of Article 6 (or 7) as evidence of the ongoing denial of *volkerereg*. Further details on this violation and its impact are provided in Annex: Historical Violations of the Peace of Vereeniging. (Sources: SA History Online, 2023; O’Malley Archives, 2003; Cambridge University Press, *The Anglo-Boer War*, 2019; RUSI, 2022)

### **Impact on Boer Identity and Sovereignty**

The scorched earth policy and concentration camps not only destroyed the *Boervolk*’s material base but also targeted their cultural and political identity. The annexation of the Transvaal and Orange Free State extinguished their internationally recognized *volkerereg*, forcing their integration into the British-dominated Union of South Africa. Afrikaner nationalism, emerging post-war and culminating in the National Party’s dominance (1914–1994), co-opted the *Boervolk*’s historical narrative (e.g., the Great Trek, Anglo-Boer Wars) to construct a broader, less distinct Afrikaner identity. This appropriation, coupled with the mismanagement of the £3 million war damages fund, denied the *Boervolk* the opportunity to rebuild their distinct nationhood. The lack of international

accountability for these atrocities, despite early 20th-century condemnations, has left a legacy of unresolved injustices, which the ZAB seeks to address through its plea for self-determination under UNDRIP (2007). The ZAB Declaration of Independence of “100 Men” (2025) explicitly rejects the post-1902 framework, reaffirming the *Boervolk*’s right to sovereignty and cultural restoration before the Almighty Heavenly Father. (Sources: Cambridge University Press, *The Anglo-Boer War*, 2019; SA History Online, “Boer Republics,” 2023; ZAB Declaration of Independence, 2025)

## Post-1902 Marginalization

Following the Peace of Vereeniging (1902), which annexed the Boer republics into the British Empire, the *Boervolk*’s political status was systematically dismantled:

- **Loss of Sovereignty:** The annexation ended the Boer republics’ independence, stripping the *Boervolk* of their internationally recognized *volkerereg* and sovereignty. The *Declaration of Independence of “100 Men”* (July 12, 2025) explicitly rejects any agreements or claims made without the *Boervolk*’s consent since May 31, 1902, reaffirming their right to self-determination.
- **Integration into Afrikaner Nationalism:** The formation of the Union of South Africa (1910) and the rise of Afrikaner nationalism, particularly through the National Party (founded 1914), subsumed the *Boervolk*’s identity into a broader Afrikaner identity. The National Party used Boer heritage (e.g., Great Trek narratives) to promote Afrikaner unity, but this erased the *Boervolk*’s distinct political voice.
- **Lack of Exclusive Representation:** From 1902 to the present, no significant political party or movement with parliamentary representation has exclusively advocated for the *Boervolk*’s self-determination. The National Party, Ossewa Brandwag (1939–1952), and Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging (AWB, 1973–present) included Boer interests but under the Afrikaner banner, thus failing to represent the *Boervolk* as a distinct entity.
- **Boerestaat Party (1986–present):** The only group to exclusively advocate for the *Boervolk* is the *Boerestaat* Party, founded by Robert van Tonder in 1986. The BSP explicitly distinguishes the *Boervolk* from Afrikaners, seeking the restoration of the Boer republics. However, it has remained marginal, failing to register as a political party due to insufficient membership (fewer than 500 members) and securing no parliamentary seats. Its influence is limited to small advocacy groups and online platforms like *Boervolk* Radio.

- **Zuid-Afrikaansche Boervolk (ZAB):** The ZAB, as formalized in the *Declaration of Independence of “100 Men”*, represents the collective will of the *Boervolk*, with 100+ authorized compatriots mandating the ZAB to pursue self-determination and sovereignty over the ZABR. The ZAB's governing bodies — the *Raad van Rigters* (Council of Judges), *Volksraad* (People's Council), *Uitvoerende Raad* (Executive Council), *Tydlike Adviesraad* (Temporary Advisory Council), and *Volkshof* (People's Court) — are tasked with defending and implementing this sovereignty, free from external interference.

## Contemporary Status

Since 1902, the *Boervolk* has not regained international recognition as a people with *volkereg*. Post-apartheid efforts to secure recognition (e.g., through the UN in 1994, 1996, and 2005) were rejected, with the UN and African Union arguing that the Afrikaners, do not qualify as an indigenous or oppressed people. **Previous attempts by groups such as the Afrikaner Volksfront (1994), the Cyber Republic of the Boer Nation (1996, 2005), and the Boerestaat Party (1986–present) to secure recognition for the *Boervolk's* self-determination failed due to their conflation with broader Afrikaner nationalism, lack of evidence of systemic contemporary oppression, and limited community support. The ZAB learns from these shortcomings by emphasizing the *Boervolk's* distinct historical, cultural, and faith-based identity, supported by the *Volksregister* and *Volksbevestiging*, and by aligning its plea with international legal frameworks such as UNDRIP (2007).**

Furthermore, contemporary evidence of marginalization, including international recognition of injustices against white South African farmers, particularly the *Boervolk*, is detailed in [Annex A: Contemporary Evidence of Marginalization](#). Also see [attachment N: Evidence of Continued Marginalisation and Threats to the \*Boervolk's\* Cultural Survival after 1994](#) as well as [attachment L: White Paper on the Marginalisation of the \*Boervolk\* in South Africa](#), reinforcing the need for recognition of their *volkereg*. Recent statements by U.S. President Donald Trump in 2025 (as detailed in Annex: Contemporary Evidence of Marginalization), offering refugee status to white Afrikaners (including Boers), condemning expropriation without compensation, and criticizing Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policies as discriminatory, alongside historical injustices from the Anglo-Boer War (detailed in “The Anglo-Boer War: International Condemnation of Injustices and Lack of Reparation”), highlight the ongoing and unresolved grievances of the *Boervolk*.

**Unlawful Administration and Coerced Treaties:** The Treaty of Vereeniging (1902) was signed under duress, with Boer civilians detained in concentration camps. British scorched-earth policy, internment, and resource exploitation constituted violations of

the Law of Nations. Post-1902 administration lacked collective Boer consent, perpetuating dispossession. (See [Attachment V](#): Historical Evidence Dossier on British Conduct and Unlawful Administration.)

**Boer Republics Restoration and Truth Initiative:** The *Boervolk* has established a peaceful initiative for truth, archive preservation, and restoration of historical injustices, including concentration camps and ongoing attacks. This voluntary body operates under natural law and Common Law, focusing on evidence collection and reconciliation without political opposition. (See [Attachment W](#): Boer Restoration and Truth Initiative.)

Historical violations of the Peace of Vereeniging, particularly Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used), as detailed in [Annex B](#): Historical Violations of the Peace of Vereeniging, further underscore the ongoing and unresolved grievances of the *Boervolk*. Historical injustices from the Anglo-Boer War (detailed in “The Anglo-Boer War: International Condemnation of Injustices and Lack of Reparation”), highlight the ongoing and unresolved grievances of the *Boervolk*.

The *ZAB Declaration of Independence of “100 Men”* (2025) reaffirms the *Boervolk*’s sovereignty over their historical territories (the 21+ Boer Republics) and heritage, including 126+ concentration camps, monuments, and archives. It establishes the ZAB as the legitimate representative of the *Boervolk*, rejecting foreign claims and asserting governance through the *Raad van Rigters*, *Volksraad*, *Uitvoerende Raad*, *Tydlike Adviesraad*, and *Volkshof*. Despite these efforts, the ZAB and ZABR lack international recognition, and contemporary groups like the Cyber Republic of the Boer Nation have limited political traction. The South African Constitution (Article 235) provides for cultural self-determination, but no legislation has implemented this for the *Boervolk* specifically.

## Implications and Call to Action

### The evidence presented confirms two critical points:

1. The Afrikaner identity, as a broad linguistic community, is invalid for self-determination under international law due to its diversity, lack of historical sovereignty, and absence of systemic oppression. This has been proven by the failure of Afrikaner-based movements (e.g., Afrikaner Volksfront, Volkstaat Council) to secure recognition.
2. The *Boervolk*, with its historically recognized *volkereg* via the Boer republics, has been denied political representation and international acknowledgment since 1902. The subsumption of their identity into Afrikaner nationalism and the lack of exclusive advocacy have silenced their legitimate claim to self-determination, despite the renewed assertion of sovereignty through the ZAB’s *Declaration of Independence of “100 Men”*.

### **We call upon the international community to:**

- Recognize the historical injustice faced by the *Boervolk*, whose sovereign status was extinguished without their consent in 1902, as reaffirmed by the ZAB's rejection of post-1902 agreements.
- Support efforts to investigate the feasibility of restoring the *Boervolk's volkereg*, potentially through diplomatic engagement or international legal avenues such as the International Court of Justice, with the ZAB as the authorized representative.
- Encourage South Africa to implement Article 235 of its Constitution to provide meaningful cultural and territorial autonomy for the *Boervolk*, under the jurisdiction of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Boer Republics (ZABR), distinct from broader Afrikaner initiatives.
- **Acknowledge that the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk*, as articulated in the *ZAB Declaration of Independence of "100 Men"* (July 12, 2025), places her plea for self-determination solely before her Almighty Heavenly Father, seeking divine guidance for her freedom and *volkereg*, as has been her practice since her inception. The international community is requested to respect these foundational principles, recognizing the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk's* spiritual and cultural commitment to self-determination as a distinct people under international law, in alignment with the principles of UNDRIP (2007), Articles 3, 4, and 33.**

### **Conclusion**

The assumption that an "Afrikaner volk" exists as a cohesive entity for self-determination is fundamentally flawed, as it fails to meet international legal standards. In contrast, the *Boervolk's* historical recognition as a sovereign people, reaffirmed by the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk's Declaration of Independence of "100 Men"* (July 12, 2025), provides a legitimate basis for *volkereg*. Yet, their political voice has been silenced since 1902. This submission, presented by the ZABR Temporary Advisory Council on behalf of the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk*, seeks to rectify this injustice by clarifying the distinctions and advocating for the restoration of the *Boervolk's* right to self-determination, in line with international principles of justice and fairness.

## **Reservation of Rights**

This document represents a peaceful, good-faith expression of the historical *Boervolk*, pursued collectively and transparently by concerned compatriots, and not on behalf of any organization, political body, commercial entity, or external interest. All statements herein are made solely in the lawful interest, dignity, and protection of the *Boervolk* themselves.

In accordance with established Common Law maxims and internationally accepted legal principles, where no lawful harm, injury, or proven victim exists, no lawful cause of action arises. Accordingly, no jurisdiction or adverse legal inference may lawfully attach in the absence of a properly established and lawful cause of action.

Nothing in this document shall be construed as a waiver of rights, submission to unlawful jurisdiction, or consent to unreasonable or unjust process. All rights, remedies, and lawful protections are expressly reserved without prejudice. This document affirms respect for lawful authority, due process, human dignity, and peaceful resolution under recognized legal standards.

## **Supporting Documents Attached**

- A.** *ZAB Declaration of Independence of “100 Men”* (July 12, 2025), outlining the ZAB’s mandate and rejection of post-1902 agreements.
- B.** THIS DOCUMENT: *International Submission on Afrikaner and Boervolk Status*, detailing the invalidity of the Afrikaner identity and the *Boervolk*’s historical *volkereg*.
- C.** Abridged ZABR *Volksregister* (Land Record sample), demonstrating the *Boervolk*’s population and effective governance.
- D.** Chapter XVI of the concept ZABR Constitution, formalizing the Temporary Advisory Council’s mandate as a cultural and administrative body.
- E.** ZABR Statement on Distancing from Actions by the *Oranjevrijstaat Boervolk* and Other Movements (November 2025)
- F.** Appendix M of the concept ZABR Constitution – “Reasons for the Non-Recognition of a Traditional Bill of Rights and Recognition of the Almighty Heavenly Father’s Complete Word as the Sole Bill of Rights”
- G.** Historical Injustices – Scorched Earth Policy and Concentration Camps.
- H.** *Boervolk* Identity Clarification.
- I.** International Archives Holding *Boervolk* Records.
- J.** International Observers.
- K.** Public FAQ on the *Boervolk*’s Petition to the UNPFII

- L. White Paper on the Marginalisation of the *Boervolk* in South Africa
- M. The Rape and Humiliation of Boer Women and Children under British Authority
- N. Evidence of Continued Marginalisation and Threats to the *Boervolk's* Cultural Survival after 1994
- O. Contemporary Marginalization of Boer Identity
- P. Partial Extract from Anglo-Boer War Concentration Camp Death Records
- Q. Appendix L from the concept ZABR Constitution – "ZABR According to Biblical Principles" (outlining the theocratic foundation of the ZABR)
- R. 1841 International recognition of the *Boervolk* as a separate sovereign people
- S. The BELA Act as Cultural Assimilation
- T. Economic Marginalization through Mineral Exploitation since 1902
- U. Postal and Monetary Sovereignty of the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republic
- V. Historical Evidence Dossier on British Conduct and Unlawful Administration (1899–1907)
- W. Boer Restoration and Truth Initiative
- X. The Boer Declaration of the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk*

## References

- United Nations Charter, Articles 1(2) and 55, 1945.
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 1, 1966.
- UN Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations, 1970.
- International Court of Justice, Advisory Opinion on Kosovo, 2010.
- Sand River Convention, 1852.
- Bloemfontein Convention, 1854.
- Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Extradition between the United States and Orange Free State, 1871.
- Constitution of South Africa, Article 235, 1996.
- Accord on Afrikaner Self-Determination, 1994.

- UN Human Rights Committee Rejections of Afrikaner and Boer Petitions, 1994, 1996, 2005.
- Declaration of Independence of “100 Men” of the Zuid-Afrikaansche *Boervolk*, July 12, 2025.

## Annex A:

### Contemporary Evidence of Marginalization

The *Boervolk*, as a distinct ethnic and cultural group descended from the Great Trek and the Boer Republics, faces ongoing marginalization in contemporary South Africa, particularly as white farmers (commonly referred to as “boers” in the occupational sense, but including the *Boervolk* as an identity). International bodies and governments have acknowledged injustices against white South African farmers, which directly impacts the *Boervolk* due to their historical and cultural ties to these communities. Key recognitions include:

- **Genocide Watch (2012–2020):** Genocide Watch classified the situation of white South African farmers, particularly those identifying as Boer, as a level 5 (“polarization”) to level 6 (“preparation”) risk on their genocide warning scale, citing farm attacks and murders. These attacks disproportionately affects the *Boervolk*, whose cultural identity is tied to their agrarian heritage from the 19th-century Boer Republics. (Source: Genocide Watch Annual Reports, 2012–2020)
- **UN Human Rights Council (2018):** Discussions at the UNHRC’s 39th session highlighted violence against white farmers in South Africa, with specific references to “Boer farmers” as victims of farm attacks. While not a formal recognition of oppression, this acknowledgment underscores the *Boervolk*’s vulnerability. (Source: UNHRC Session 39, 2018; Reuters, 2018)
- **Australian Parliament (2018):** Australian Minister Peter Dutton proposed humanitarian visas for white South African farmers, citing “persecution” due to farm attacks. The proposal explicitly referenced “Boer farmers,” aligning with the *Boervolk*’s identity as descendants of the Boer Republics. (Source: Australian Parliament Hansard, 2018; BBC News, 2018)
- **European Parliament and Dutch Support (2018–2020):** Motions in the European Parliament, supported by Dutch parliamentarians, called for investigations into farm attacks against white South African farmers, with specific mention of the “Boer” community. The Netherlands’ historical ties to the *Boervolk* lend weight to this recognition. (Source: European Parliament Motions, 2018; NOS, 2019)
- **Online Petitions and Public Awareness (2015–2025):** Global petitions and social media campaigns (e.g., GoPetition.com, 2015–2017; X posts, 2018–2025) have drawn attention to farm attacks and cultural marginalization of white farmers, often identifying them as “Boers.” While not formal recognition, these efforts reflect growing international concern for the *Boervolk*’s plight. (Source: GoPetition.com, 2015–2017; X posts, 2018–2025)

- **U.S. President Donald Trump’s Statements (2025):** In 2025, President Trump issued **Executive Order 14204**, freezing U.S. aid to South Africa and offering refugee status to white Afrikaners (including and predominantly the *Boervolk*) due to claims of racial discrimination, systemic violence, and land expropriation without compensation. Trump’s statements condemned South Africa’s Expropriation Act (signed January 2025), which allows land seizure in limited cases without compensation, as a “**shocking disregard for citizens’ rights**,” and criticized Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policies as “**racially discriminatory non-tariff barriers**.” These actions, including expedited asylum for 54 white Afrikaners in May 2025, highlight international recognition of injustices affecting the *Boervolk* as part of the white farming community. (Source: Reuters, February 3, 2025; NPR, February 13, 2025; The New York Times, October 3, 2025; Al Jazeera, February 3, 2025)
- **Farm Attacks Statistics (2024–2025):** South African Police Service (SAPS) data for Q4 2024/2025 (January–March 2025) recorded 12 farm attacks and 1 farm murder, with victims including farm owners, employees, and dwellers. AfriForum’s 2024 report documented 32 farm murders, down from 49 in 2023, but emphasizing the disproportionate impact on white farmers, predominantly the *Boervolk*. These incidents, often involving extreme brutality, torture, and execution-style killings, threaten the *Boervolk*’s agrarian heritage. (Source: SAPS Crime Statistics, March 2025; AfriForum Farm Murder Report, May 2024)
- **Cultural Marginalization of Afrikaans (2024–2025):** Stellenbosch University research (2024) shows a decline in Afrikaans as a medium of instruction, with only 14% of schools offering Afrikaans as the primary language, down from 20% in 2019, due to language policy reforms emphasizing multilingualism. The 2025 Language Policy Act further marginalizes Afrikaans in higher education, reducing its use at universities like Stellenbosch from 70% to 40% of courses. This erosion threatens the *Boervolk*’s cultural identity, as Afrikaans is central to their Scriptural and historical heritage. (Source: Stellenbosch University Language Report, 2024; The Guardian, August 9, 2025)
- **Continued Threats and Marginalization Post-1994:** A historical ANC document (Circular No 213-6, June 1993) outlines strategies that have shown striking parallels with post-1994 policies and events, contributing to the *Boervolk*’s ongoing marginalization. The document’s call to “exploit the farmers” and the repeated slogan “VIVA KILL A BOER KILL A FARMER” reflect a narrative that has manifested in high rates of farm attacks (over 3,000 murders since 1994) and political rhetoric, including the singing of “Dubul’ ibhunu” (Kill the Boer) at public events. These patterns threaten the *Boervolk*’s agrarian culture and physical security, supporting the need for international protection under UNDRIP. (See

[Attachment N](#): Evidence of Continued Marginalization and Threats to the Boer Volk's Cultural Survival after 1994 for detailed analysis.)

- **The BELA Act as Cultural Assimilation:** The Basic Education Laws Amendment (BELA) Act (signed September 2024) empowers provincial departments to override school governing bodies' language and admission policies. This threatens Afrikaans-medium education, a vital medium for transmitting Boer cultural heritage and Scriptural principles in the mother tongue. Critics argue it accelerates the decline of Afrikaans schools and constitutes forced assimilation, in potential violation of UNDRIP Articles 8 (protection against assimilation), 13 (right to revitalize language), and 14 (right to establish educational institutions in mother tongue) (see [Attachment S](#): The BELA Act and Its Impact on Boer Cultural Rights).

This policy exemplifies ongoing marginalization of the *Boervolk's* linguistic and cultural rights.

- **Cultural and Identity Marginalization:** The *Boervolk's* distinct identity, rooted in historical sovereignty and theocratic principles, continues to be marginalized through assimilation into the broader "Afrikaner" construct. This dilution denies the *Boervolk* exclusive representation of their heritage (see [Attachment O](#): Evidence of Boer Identity Marginalization).
- **Economic Marginalization through Mineral Exploitation:** The Anglo-Boer War was motivated by British imperialism's desire for control over Transvaal gold and Free State diamonds. Since the 1902 annexation, foreign companies have extracted resources valued at trillions of USD (gold alone ~40,000 tons since 1902, current value ~\$2.5 trillion), without mandate from or benefit to the *Boervolk*. This ongoing economic marginalization denies the *Boervolk* rights to their historical territory's wealth (see [Attachment T](#)).

These recognitions, while often framed in the broader context of "white farmers" or "boers" (farmers), directly relate to the *Boervolk*, whose identity as a distinct people is rooted in their historical agrarian lifestyle and sovereignty. The ZAB seeks to build on these acknowledgments to secure recognition of the *Boervolk's volkereg* under international law, ensuring their cultural and spiritual identity, centered on their plea for self-determination before the Almighty Heavenly Father, is preserved.

## **Annex B:**

### **Historical Violations of the Peace of Vereeniging**

The Peace of Vereeniging (31 May 1902), which ended the Second Anglo-Boer War, included commitments intended to mitigate the impact of British annexation on the *Boervolk*. However, key provisions, particularly Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used), were systematically violated, perpetuating the *Boervolk*'s marginalization and justifying the ZAB's claim for restoration of *volkerereg*.

#### **Violation of Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used)**

Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used) of the Peace of Vereeniging promised: "Military administration in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony will at the earliest possible date be succeeded by civil government, and as soon as circumstances permit, representative institutions, leading up to self-government, will be introduced." This commitment was intended to restore the *Boervolk*'s political autonomy, consistent with their pre-war sovereignty under the Sand River Convention (1852) and Bloemfontein Convention (1854). However, the promise was never fulfilled in a manner that preserved the *Boervolk*'s distinct identity or *volkerereg*.

##### **1. British Delays and Colonial Control (1902–1910):**

Following the treaty, the British administration under Lord Milner prioritized colonial interests over Boer autonomy. The Transvaal and Orange River Colony remained under military and later civil administration (1902–1906), with the Transvaal Legislative Council (1903) consisting solely of appointed British officials and loyalists, excluding meaningful Boer representation. The Lyttelton Constitution (1905) proposed limited self-government, but its implementation in 1906–1907 was heavily restricted by British oversight, denying the *Boervolk* the "fullest possible measure of self-government" as agreed. The *Boervolk*, whose identity was rooted in their independent republics, were subjected to policies favouring British settlers and economic exploitation, such as mining interests in the Transvaal. (Source: SA History Online, "Transvaal Colony," 2023; Cambridge University Press, *The Anglo-Boer War*, 2019)

##### **2. Subsumption into the Union of South Africa (1910):**

The formation of the Union of South Africa (1910) under the South Africa Act (1909) marked the final betrayal of Article 6 (or 7). The Union centralized power under a British-dominated framework, with Afrikaner elites like Louis Botha and Jan Smuts aligning with British interests to form a broader Afrikaner identity. This subsumed the *Boervolk*'s distinct political and cultural aspirations into a unified South African state, erasing their claim to *volkerereg*. The Union's governance structures, such as the South African Party (1910), prioritized national unity over Boer autonomy, and no provisions were made to

restore the Boer republics or their self-governance. The £3 million war damages fund (Article 5) was administered by the Union government and largely benefited infrastructure and urban Afrikaner elites, leaving rural Boer communities destitute and without restoration. Historical records indicate that only a fraction of the fund reached Boer farmers, exacerbating their economic and political marginalization. (Source: O'Malley Archives, "Union of South Africa," 2003; RUSI, "The Boer War and British Imperialism," 2022)

### 3. Long-Term Marginalization (1910–Present):

The rise of Afrikaner nationalism, particularly through the National Party (1914–1994), further co-opted the *Boervolk's* historical narrative (e.g., the Great Trek, Boer republics) into a broader Afrikaner identity, denying the *Boervolk* exclusive representation. The National Party's policies, including apartheid (1948–1994), focused on Afrikaner dominance rather than Boer self-determination. Post-apartheid, the South African Constitution (1996, Article 235) recognizes cultural self-determination, but no legislation has implemented autonomy for the *Boervolk*, perpetuating the violation of Article 6 (or 7). Contemporary issues, such as farm attacks (AfriForum, 2024: 32 murders) and the marginalization of Afrikaans (Stellenbosch University, 2024: 14% of schools using Afrikaans), reflect the ongoing denial of the *Boervolk's* right to self-governance. The ZAB's Declaration of Independence of "100 Men" (2025) explicitly rejects the post-1902 framework, citing the violation of Article 6 (or 7) as a core justification for reclaiming *volkerereg* under international law, particularly UNDRIP (2007). (Source: SA History Online, "Peace of Vereeniging," 2023; ZAB Declaration of Independence, 2025; UNDRIP, 2007)

## **Conclusion on Historical Violations**

The violation of Article 6 (or 7, depending on the version used) represents a deliberate failure to restore the *Boervolk's* political autonomy, as promised in the Peace of Vereeniging. This betrayal, compounded by the mismanagement of war damages funds and the subsumption of Boer identity into Afrikaner nationalism, has left a legacy of unresolved injustices. The ZAB seeks to address this through its plea for recognition of the *Boervolk's volkerereg*, emphasizing the need for international acknowledgment of these historical violations to restore their sovereignty and cultural heritage before the Almighty Heavenly Father.