



Zuid-Afrikaanshe Boer Republics

Contemporary Marginalization of Boer Identity through Assimilation into Broader Afrikaner Constructs and Control of Cultural Heritage

Purpose

This attachment documents the ongoing marginalization of the *Boervolk's* distinct historical identity and cultural heritage through assimilation into broader "Afrikaner" constructs and external control of historical sites, publications (see Att. I: International Archives Holding *Boervolk* Records), and institutions. The purpose is to illustrate how the *Boervolk's* unique *volkerereg*, rooted in sovereign republics and theocratic principles, is diluted, denying exclusive self-identification and cultural preservation under UNDRIP Articles 3 (self-determination), 8 (protection against forced assimilation), and 33 (right to determine own identity). This record is presented in a spirit of peace and truth-seeking, trusting that the Almighty Heavenly Father will reveal all things (Luke 8:17).

1. Historical Context

Since the formation of the Union of South Africa (1910), the *Boervolk's* distinct history – including the Great Trek, sovereign republics, and Anglo-Boer War history – has been

subsumed into a broader "Afrikaner" narrative. This process intensified under Afrikaner nationalism (1910–1994) and continues post-1994, where Boer heritage is presented as "Afrikaner" heritage, managed by institutions or groups that do not recognize the *Boervolk's* separate identity or theocratic foundation (Attachment F).

2. Assimilation of Boer History in Publications

Hundreds of thousands of books and publications on Boer history are reframed as "Afrikaner" history. To name but only a few:

1. The book ***Vir Vryheid en vir Reg*** (Marthinus van Bart & Dr. Leopold Scholtz, 2003) is presented as an "ABO *Gedenkboek*" (Anglo-Boer War Memorial Book), yet its dedication, prologue, foreword, introduction, and summary consistently use "Afrikaner" terminology to describe the *Boervolk's* struggle, subsuming Boer-specific sovereignty and theocratic elements into a broader "Afrikaner" nationalist narrative.

Some examples from this book:

- **Dedicated to** Text: "*En ter nagedagtenis van my oupagrootjie Eduard van Bart en sy seuns, wat met goed en bloed vir die vryheid van die Afrikaner gestry het.*" Translated to English: "And in memory of my great-grandfather Eduard van Bart and his sons, who fought with good and blood for the freedom of the Afrikaner."
 - Direct replacement: The ABO was a Boer struggle (republics' freedom and sovereignty), but here it becomes "Afrikaner" freedom.
- Pg. ix – **Prologue** (Marthinus van Bart):
 - "Afrikanervolk" is used for the people's suffering and struggle. The ABO is presented as "Afrikaner" history, with a focus on "Afrikaner" nationalism.
- Pg. ix – **Foreword** (Dr. Leopold Scholtz):
 - Text Titel: "*Oorlewingstryd vir die Afrikaner*". Translated to English: "Struggle for survival for the Afrikaner".
 - The war is described as "Afrikaner" survival struggle, with references to "Afrikaner people" and "Afrikaner nationalism". Peasant sovereignty is not discerned.
- Pg. x and xi – **Introduction** (Marthinus van Bart):
 - The ABO is celebrated as an "Afrikaner" struggle, with "Afrikaner" heritage as its theme. The book's aim is to preserve "Afrikaner" history, with

references to "Afrikaner" nationalism and "Afrikaner" people. Boer republics are not emphasized as separate sovereign entities – everything is placed in an "Afrikaner" context.

- Pg. xii – **Synopsis** (Dr. Leopold and Ingrid Scholtz):
 - "*Regverdige oorlog*" (Just war) for "Afrikaner"-survival. The British's motives are criticized, but the struggle is presented as "Afrikaner" justification. Boer vs. Afrikaner is not distinguished – the war is portrayed as the "Afrikaner's" struggle.
 - **The article** (to take but one) "*Die stryd tussen Boer en Brit van 1899–1902 het baie name*" (Prof. M.C.E. van Schoor) translated to English "The struggle between Boer and British from 1899–1902 has many names", debates the war's name, preferring "*Tweede Vryheidsoorlog*" or "*Suid-Afrikaanse Oorlog*", but frames the conflict as an "Afrikaner" struggle for freedom, subsuming Boer republican sovereignty into broader Afrikaner nationalism.
 - **General Pattern:** The book uses "ABO" as the title, but the content is "Afrikaner"-focused – a classic example of dilution. It is not an "Anglo-Boer War" commemorating the Boer, but an "Afrikaner" commemorative book.
2. The book ***Majuba: Die Onafhanklikheidsoorlog van die Transvaalse Afrikaners 1880/81*** (M.C. van Zyl, 1981) describes the First Freedom War (Transvaal's independence struggle) as an "Afrikaner" war, using "*Transvaalse Afrikaners*" throughout the title, cover, and foreword, subsuming Boer republican sovereignty into broader Afrikaner nationalism.

Some examples from this book:

- **Cover:** Title uses "Transvaal Afrikaners" – the war is branded as an "Afrikaner" struggle, not Boer Republic's sovereignty.
- **Oppose:** "*Die Onafhanklikheidsoorlog van die Transvaalse Afrikaners*" translated to English "The War of Independence of the Transvaal Afrikaners" – direct replacement of "Boer" with "Afrikaner".
- **Foreword** (pp. 7–8):
 - Van Zyl says the war was "the *Transvaal Afrikaners*" fight for freedom.
 - He consistently mentions "Afrikaner" (e.g. "Afrikaner nationalism", "Afrikaner-volk").

- The Boer's republican identity is not discernible – it is swallowed up in broader "Afrikaner" nationalism.
 - He criticises British "villain" role, but the struggle is "Afrikaner's" one.
 - **General Pattern:** The book consistently refrain from using Boer and replacing it into broader Afrikaner nationalism,
3. The book ***Na Bloedrivier en Paardekraal*** (J.A. Smith, 2001). In the Introduction Smith describes Bloedrivier (Boer theocratic vow) and Paardekraal (First Freedom War Boer victory) as enriching "*die Afrikaner se nasionale bewussyn*" (the Afrikaner's national consciousness) and celebrates 16 December as an "Afrikaner" national day ("*Elke volk het een of ander nasionale dag... Die Afrikaner het gelukkig ook so 'n dag*" → English: "Every nation has some national day... Fortunately, the Afrikaner also has such a day"), despite acknowledging the Boer role in the events. This reframing subsumes Boer-specific theocratic and republican history into broader Afrikaner nationalism.
 4. The book ***Kommandolewe tydens die Anglo-Boereoorlog 1899–1902*** (Fransjohan Pretorius, 1991) opens with the statement in the introduction of the book: "*Teen die einde van die 19de eeu is die politieke toneel in Suid-Afrika gekenmerk deur 'n konflik tussen Afrikanernasionalisme en Britse imperialisme*" ("Towards the end of the 19th century, the political scene in South Africa was characterized by a conflict between Afrikaner nationalism and British imperialism"), framing the Boer republics' sovereign struggle as an "Afrikaner" nationalist conflict.
 5. ZAR-flag (*Vierkleur-vlag*): Historically a Boer republic symbol, but widely used by Afrikaner organisations such as AfriForum, Solidarity and FAK at protests and festivals, where it is branded as "Afrikaner" heritage (e.g. farm murder protests and Heritage Day events). This dilutes the Boer Volk's exclusive historical claim to the flag.
 6. **Similar patterns** in educational materials, memoirs, and historical texts portray the Anglo-Boer War, Great Trek, other incidents and republics as an "Afrikaner" struggle, ignoring the *Boervolk's* unique sovereign status and identity recognized in treaties (Sand River 1852, Bloemfontein 1854). This reframing dilutes the *Boervolk's* exclusive claim to their history, presenting it as shared with a non-sovereign linguistic group.

3. Control of Boer Cultural Heritage and Property

Boer historical sites, museums, libraries, concentration camps, and buildings – tangible cultural property – are managed by institutions or groups identifying as "Afrikaner" or broader entities, NOT by the *Boervolk* her selves. To name but a few:

- **Concentration Camp Memorials and Museums:** Sites like Irene, Bethulie, and Springfontein are commemorated under "Afrikaner" or general South African frameworks, with management not recognizing Boer distinctiveness.
- **Vrouemonument** (Bloemfontein): Commemorates Boer women and children's suffering in camps but presented and managed as "Afrikaner" heritage by national institutions (e.g., War Museum of the Boer Republics and National Museum). Official descriptions emphasize "Afrikaner" women's sacrifice, subsuming Boer-specific experiences. Officially the "National Women's Monument" (Anglo-Boer War Museum). Websites (war.museum.co.za, sahistory.org.za) describe it as "Afrikaner women's suffering" and part of "Afrikaner history". Managed by National Museum (state institution), with a focus on "Afrikaner nationalism". No Boer distinction.
- **Paardekraal-monument:** Commemorates the 1880 Paardekraal Rally (First War of Independence). It is celebrated as "Afrikaner heritage" and descriptions frame it as "Afrikaner" struggle (e.g., organized by AfriForum, which identifies as an "Afrikaner civil rights organization" on its website, using "Afrikaner" terminology in commemorations). Official descriptions (heritageportal.co.za) link it to "Afrikaner struggle". No Boer distinction.
- **Blood River Vow Site:** The Vow is Boer theocratic (biblical covenant), but the site and festival are managed as "Afrikaner heritage", managed by state and heritage bodies without exclusive Boer representation (e.g., bloedrivier.org.za and heritage portals describe it in broader "Afrikaner" context). Websites (bloedrivier.org.za, heritage sites) mention "Afrikaner people" and national unity. Run by state and Afrikaner groups, with little Boer-specific recognition.
- **Vegkop Battlefield:** Commemorates the 1836 victory of Voortrekkers (*Boere*) over the Matabele, a key event in Boer Trek history with strong theocratic elements (vow and faith-based defence). The site and monument are framed as "Voortrekker/Afrikaner" heritage in official descriptions and events (e.g., heritage portals and local commemorations), subsuming the Boer-specific covenantal aspect into broader Afrikaner narratives. The vow and faith aspect (Boer theocracy) is minimized; it is celebrated as an "Afrikaner" triumph.
- **Majuba Heuwel:** Marks the 1881 Boer victory in the First Freedom War, symbolizing Boer republican sovereignty. The national monument and site are

presented as part of "Afrikaner" or general South African history in heritage listings (e.g., SAHRA and KZN heritage sites), with commemorations often using "Afrikaner" terminology, diluting the *Boervolk's* unique claim to this sovereign triumph. The Boer's republican independence is swallowed up in broader "Afrikaner struggle"; British memorials make it "conciliatory".

- **Libraries and Archives:** Boer republic documents, war records and Boer-history books are housed in institutions (e.g., National Archives) framed as "Afrikaner" or national heritage, limiting *Boervolk* control.
- **Voortrekkermonument:** Built as a memorial to the Great Trek (Boer history). This monument is an exception to the rule in such that its architecture and symbolism have been associated and rooted deeply with Freemason influences (architect Gerard Moerdijk, a Freemason), the pinnacle of Afrikaner Nationalism. Although it is a known fact that many of the Boer leaders were unfortunately also Freemasons, from the *Boervolk's* theocratic perspective (Attachment F), this conflicts with Biblical principles and is viewed upon as unscriptural and the monument is a temple for idol worshipping. Thus, the *Zuid-Afrikaansche Boervolk* distances itself from this site as an example of Boer history assimilation with the Afrikaner principles.
- The "**Afrikaner Verklaring**" initiative (afrikanerverklaring.co.za), supported by organizations such as the Afrikanerbond (Jan Bosman, Chief Secretary), Solidarity Movement (Werner Human, Head of Operations), AfriForum (Kallie Kriel, Chief Executive Officer), and the *Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge* (FAK), claims self-determination and cultural rights for "Afrikaners", incorporating Boer historical events without distinguishing the *Boervolk's* unique sovereign and theocratic identity. The site's anonymity (no contact details or specific organizers listed) limits dialogue, exemplifying ongoing assimilation of Boer heritage into broader Afrikaner constructs.
- **Other Examples:** Republic-era buildings are administered without exclusive Boer representation, contributing to cultural erosion.

4. Impact on the *Boervolk*

This assimilation and external control deny the *Boervolk* the right to determine and protect their own history and property, undermining self-identification and theocratic cultural integrity (Attachment F). It perpetuates marginalization by erasing the *Boervolk's* sovereign past in public memory.

Sources

- *Vir Vryheid en vir Reg: ABO Gedenkboek* ((Marthinus van Bart & Dr. Leopold Scholtz, 2003), Table Mountain Publishers, 2003) – dedicated to, prologue, forward, introduction, Synopsis and articles, all examples of reframing in publications.
- *Majuba: Die Onafhanklikheidsoorlog van die Transvaalse Afrikaners 1880/81* (M.C. van Zyl, Human & Rousseau, 1981) – title, cover, and foreword (pp. 7–8).
- *Na Bloedrivier en Paardekraal* (J.A. Smith, 2001) – introduction (pp. 4–5).
- *Kommandolewe tydens die Anglo-Boereoorlog 1899–1902* (Fransjohan Pretorius, 1991) – introduction (first sentence).
- Official site descriptions and heritage listings:
 - Voortrekkermonument:
voortrekkermonument.co.za and heritageportal.co.za.
 - Nasionale Vrouemonument:
warmuseum.co.za and nationalmuseum.co.za.
 - Paardekraal Monument:
heritageportal.co.za and AfriForum event descriptions.
 - Bloedrivier Gelofteterrein:
bloedrivier.org.za and sahistory.org.za.
 - Vegkop Battlefield:
heritageportal.co.za and sahistory.org.za (framed as Voortrekker/Afrikaner heritage).
 - Majuba Heuwel:
sahra.org.za and kznheritage.org (national monument listings).
- Historical analyses on monument symbolism and framing.
- <https://afrikanerverklaring.co.za> (accessed 19 Jan. 26); WHOIS search confirming privacy protection.

This annex is submitted for historical accuracy and cultural recognition, in a spirit of peace under the guidance of the Almighty Heavenly Father.