

SPEECH BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF NATAL AT THE OPENING OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH AFRICA IN DURBAN ON 14TH SEPTEMBER 1968

There is little need for me to remind you that the grounds upon which interpretations of history have been based, have been multifarious — ranging from empirical considerations to notions that are frankly religious or metaphysical in character. On the parochial and national level interpretations have been even less ambitious — many historians making few bones about the fact that their interpretations have political overtones, and what through the ages has been true in respect of differing grounds for interpretation, has to some extent been true in respect of the forms which such interpretations have taken. Marx, for example, portrayed history as following a unilinear pattern in the direction of a particular foreseeable “goal”; Spengler and Toynbee have presented it as conforming to certain regular and recurrent cycles of change; while others again have treated it as somehow combining both these features. The formulae varied and still vary in a hundred different ways.

In the light of all these differences in approach, differences in method, differences in interpretation and differences in the selection of fact and myth, date and period, document and artifact, opinion and event, it is extremely gratifying for the layman like myself to find that there are at least two matters in respect of which historians seem to agree with one another. Firstly, it would appear that common to all interpreters of history and the philosophy of history, is, and always has been, the assumption that the historical process is more than an agglomeration of events “senselessly” succeeding one another in the vast flux of time. All seem to assume that there is an underlying structure or theme waiting to be discovered — an underlying structure or theme in terms of which this apparently arbitrary sequence can be seen to be ultimately meaningful and intelligible. Secondly — and this is equally gratifying and of far greater practical significance — is the common assumption of all historians, and may I say most other categories of intellectuals and leaders, that the study of history has tremendous formative value for the individual and the nation. Those who do not hold this view, who attack the usefulness and validity of history and its study, or for that matter its interpretation, do so because they either do not understand the real meaning thereof or because the history which is being imparted is considered to be harmful to the individual and thus to the nation and country to which he belongs.

You are no doubt aware that a large number of South Africans fall in this category. Many of them hold the view that there is little to be gained from a study of history, be it at the level of formal education at school or university, or in later life. To these people history is “dead”, something of the past, an agglomeration of events and facts, of births and deaths, of developments and set-backs, of periods of nothingness and event-

fulness which are forever gone and which to their way of thinking have little relation to the present, let alone the future. Others in the same category are opposed to the study of history because of their belief that the interpretation of all history (to the fortunate exclusion of their own) is sectional, biased and distorted; false and propagandistic fabrications they believe being conjured up for no other purpose than creating racial, religious or cultural animosity, aversion and even hatred. And invariably to them history and historical interpretation is the tool of the political manipulator, the bigotted racialist and the warped-minded and unredeemable sectionalist or psychic jingo.

Before dealing with this category of people — and may I say right now that their fears, their reservations and prejudices are not in all respects and under all circumstances ill-founded — let me briefly list a few of the numerous and significant advantages which flow from a study of history — assuming that such history is as fair, as “correct”, as objective, as intelligently interpreted and as acceptable to all concerned as any non-exact science can ever hope to be. For it is clear that its value is still, in South Africa and in most countries of the world, hopelessly under-assessed, and, what is more disconcerting, history is losing the importance which once it had in the schools and universities of most countries.

Under the title *Why We Study History* a number of intellectuals, most of them educationists and psychologists, have stated the case for history thus:

Contributor A: “No man who does not know and understand history can claim to be really educated, and the man who knows and understands history, is more than educated: He can also interpret — the events of life, the views and behaviour of men, the joys and frustrations of past generations and the hopes and ideals of those who are to come. In fact, he will understand life itself, and he will live it more meaningfully.”

Contributor B: “Although we are living in times of scientific discovery and technological application, science and technology alone can never bring to full development and absolute happiness the human mind and heart. To my way of thinking, history and literature must always dominate the educational process.”

Contributor C: “The denial of history’s validity — or for that matter its value — is one of the gravest dangers which can befall any people or any culture or civilisation. If the men who drew up the treaty of Versailles had known more about the shifting frontiers of Europe, might they not have made a safer job of their map? If the men who had ruled Europe in the nineteen-thirties — or the voters who in the long run gave them their power — had known and understood more history, would they not have seen war approaching and dealt with the danger before it swamped the world in blood and anguish?”

Contributor D: “The fundamental basis of the value of all history is the fact the past has made the present, and the present alone can make the future. We cannot even attempt to understand the world around

us without a knowledge of the past . . . We study . . . no, we must study history, because it is the most humane of the humaner studies. No human sympathy or understanding is required or produced by the study of geology, mineralogy, physics or chemistry. Biology and anatomy do, indeed, rise to the level of man, but only as an animal. History is the highest form of science because its subject-matter is the highest work of nature."

Contributor E: "History deals with man as a being who possesses a knowledge of good and evil, a standard of right and wrong, who reasons and judges, creates beauty in art, in music, in literature; commends and controls to an increasing extent the forces, and consciously or unconsciously fashions the destinies of the world. If history is not commonly regarded as a science it is only because it is too complex and too human to lend itself to those summary methods of treatment by axioms, rules and formulae which are commonly treated as tests of scientific truth."

But the everyday, practical value of history is even more varied, more impressive and more important when seen within the context of a people's struggle for survival, the evolution and development of their socio-economic patterns, the pursuit of their broader political ideals and objectives and, as in South Africa's case, their endeavours to maintain cultural diversity within a single constitutional and national fabric.

One of our own historians (Prof. Van Jaarsveld in *Historia*, April 1967), has summed up, in Afrikaans, the value and validity of a study of history as follows:

1. Die studie van geskiedenis lei na die verbreding van die intellektuele horison van die mens: dit verruim ons tydhorison, ons werklikheids-horison en ons waardehorison . . .

2. 'n Studie van die geskiedenis belig ons eietydse probleme. Die geskiedenis leer ons insien dat die hede die resultaat is van die werkende kragte van die verlede en dat die hede die uitgangspunt vir die toekoms is. Wanneer ons byvoorbeeld dink aan die rassevraagstuk wat vandag so sterk op die voorgrond staan, kan alleen die geskiedenis van rassekontakte gedurende die afgelope drie eeue die wese daarvan belig; wil ons ons houding daarteenoor verstaan, moet ons nog verder teruggaan in die geskiedenis van die Protestantisme, die Calvinisme en die uitbreiding van die Westerse beskawing in ander kontinente . . .

3. Die studie van die geskiedenis lei ons na die opvoeding tot staats-burgerlike verantwoordelikheid, wat staatkundige, nasionale, kulturele en sosiale vorming insluit . . . Waar die staat uit verskillende volkskultuur-of taalgemeenskappe bestaan, bevind ons ons benewens ons verbondenheid aan die gemeenskaplike staat, nog altyd binne die perke van die groep waarin ons gebore is, en wat ons taal en kultuur in stand hou. Dit leer ons om breed te kyk, maar ook om die eie kultuur-goedere te ontdek, te waardeer en in stand te hou . . . of dit nou taal of godsdiens, volks-gewoontes, tradisies, gebruike of houdinge is.

4. 'n Studie van die geskiedenis help ons om 'n historiese sin aan te kweek. Die geskiedenis leer dat die tyd verander en dat elke tydperk sy eie kenmerke, atmosfeer en leefwyse het, en dat die maatstawwe vir die beoordeling van die mense van die verlede nie uit ons tyd geneem mag word nie. Die maatstaf vir beoordeling moet uit die tyd waarin die mense geleef het, geneem word.

5. 'n Studie van die geskiedenis bring mee wat genoem kan word die skoling vir die lewe. Die geskiedenis gee ons insae in die menslike natuur en in die ewigmenslike. Ons leer ons eie menswees daarin ken, ons verstaan ons verhoudinge in die lig van die eeue, ons ontwikkel 'n kritiese sin teenoor ons eie waardes, ons eie gedrag, ons eie gebruike, ons eie vryheidsdrang, ons eie politieke en persoonlike maatstawwe, ons eie sosio-ekonomiese en sosio-politieke doelstellings. En deur in aanraking te kom met groot historiese persoonlikhede, deur hul ideale, hul dae en gedagtes van naderby te leer ken, suiwer en temper ons ons eie persoonlikheid, ons eie karakters, ons eie kulturele, politieke en morele waardes, ons eie siening, ons eie oordeel, ons eie insig.

Die afname in belangstelling in Geskiedenis

Daar bestaan min twyfel dat onder die intellektuele van die wêreld kommer bestaan oor die afname in die belangstelling in geskiedenis in die afgelope dekade. Dis die geval in Westerse lande soos die Verenigde State, Engeland, Australië, Kanada, Nederland en Frankryk. As dit nie was vir sekere verpligtinge wat in Spanje, Portugal, die meeste lande in die Russiese blok en ander half-diktature opgelê is nie, sou dieselfde dáár gebeur het. En dit is ook sonder die minste twyfel die geval in Suid-Afrika.

Die feit dat dit 'n wêreldverskynsel is, maak die ontleding van die oorsake maklik. En die meeste van die oorsake is ook in Suid-Afrika aan die werk. Maar dan — en dit is belangrik — ek glo dat daar addisionele oorsake in Suid-Afrika is wat van naderby beskou moet word en wat ons tot 'n nuwe benadering van die plek van geskiedenis moet lei.

Breedweg moet die agteruitgang in belangstelling in geskiedenis gesoek word in die ontwikkeling van steeds nuwer kennis-terreine. Dis niks nuuts om te konstateer dat ons kennis in die wetenskap en tegnologie nou nage-noeg elke tien jaar verdubbel nie. Die atoombom, kernkrag en ruimtevaart het aan die wisselwerking tussen menslike vaardigheid en natuurkragte 'n betekenis gegee wat die grootste genieë van 'n kwarteeu gelede nie in hul wildste drome voorsien het nie. Steeds verskerpende industrialisasie — iets wat in alle dele van die wêreld die natuurlike gevolg van verstedeliking is — het die groeiende belangrikheid van tegniek en die meganiese onderstreep, die betekenis van kultuur en tradisie ondermyn, die belangstelling in die landelike en historiese pionierslewe laat afneem, die heroïese in die ondernemersgees van die verlede tot 'n ondergeskikte plek afgetakel en die stryd van vervloë dae amper 'n karikatuur laat word in die lig van hedendaagse gevegte en wapengeweld. Wat vandag in die loop van 'n enkele jaar in 20 dokumentêre rolprente gesien kan word, wat haarfyn en

dramaties beskryf word in talryke tydskrifte en nuusblaaië, wat bekend-gestel word oor die radio oor die oprukkende Russiese tenks in Tsjeggo-Slowakye, die afmaai van Noord-Viëtnamese vliegtuie deur lugafweergeskut en die opspoor van vyandelike duikbote langs die kuste van Suidelike Afrika . . . dit alles laat die beskrywing van die Veldslag van Italeri en die helde-optrede van Danie Theron 'n bietjie vaal lyk. Op die doek gedramatiseerde terroriste-moorde, veelvuldig beskikbare beskrywings van hedendaagse lug- en see-heldedade en werklike James Bond-spioenasie-bedrywighede, maak dit moeiliker as ooit om in die kleinere en minder skouspelagtige eie van volk en vaderland belangstelling te wek.

Maar ook meer. Die afname in die belangstelling in geskiedenis is in groot mate die gevolg van die nadruk wat deesdae gelê word op die natuurwetenskappe, op biologie, op wiskunde en op die handelsvakke. Skoliere en studente wat hulle in hierdie rigtings bekwaam is verseker van goeie en betalende betrekkings. In die private sektor word om hul dienste meegeding en die hele wese van die moderne tegnologie en die wetenskap onderstreep die belowende toekoms wat op hulle wag. 'n Studie van die geskiedenis hou daarenteen weinig materiële voordele in — op skool- en universiteitsvlak lei dit tot nie meer as een of twee beroeps-rigtings nie, en in die latere lewe kan die volwassene wat hom aan 'n studie van die geskiedenis wy, al beteken dit nie veel meer as om één geskiedkundige werk per jaar te lees nie, in harde kontant nagenoeg niks baat nie. Wat hy opdoen aan 'n skerper insig, 'n verbeterde oordeel en 'n dieper begrip van lands-, volks- en wêreldvraagstukke, is nie in fisiese terme meetbaar nie en dien selde om intrinsieke redes as voldoende aansporing tot volharding.

Niemand mag die opvoedkundige beginsel van differensiasie veroordeel nie. Dis goed en reg dat die ingebore eienskappe en potensiaal van elke kind en student getoets moet word, en dit is goed en reg dat die vakkeuse en beroepskeuse van leerling en student deur sy eienskappe, sy ingebore talent, sy aanvoeling en sy rigtingsgeneentheid bepaal sal word. Maar ons moet ons geen illusies maak oor die effek van hierdie en ander opvoedkundige ontwikkelings op die skool en universiteit van ons tyd nie: die keuse van 'n steeds groeiende getal kinders en studente val op ander vakke as geskiedenis.

Reasons Peculiar to the South African Scene

In addition to the above reasons for the decline in the study of and interest in history — reasons which, as I have already indicated, are common to most Western democracies — the South African position has been affected by its own particular set of circumstances. And whilst it may be difficult to reverse the general world-wide trend of events without compulsion, I believe that we can in time infuse new interest in South Africa's history by a new approach, a new accent in the light of the tremendous challenges which are facing South Africans of the future, a new selection and interpretation which must be given a place next to existing selections and interpretations of past events.

Let me immediately warn against being misunderstood. I am not for a moment suggesting that South Africa's historical interpretation is distorted or biased, that our history books are basically political or primarily propagandistic or that our schools and universities are conditioning our children and young people to be suspicious of one another or to over-indulge in the glorification of their own group, their own language, their own culture and their own achievements. There must of necessity be — and there always have been — tendencies of this nature — and in which countries of the world are such tendencies not to be found? — but by and large I believe South Africa has been well served by its historians and archivists, by its teachers and lecturers, by its authors and research workers. Judgement of South Africa's historical scene must always be mindful of the bi-cultural and multi-racial agglomeration of its peoples, of the fact that whatever happened in the country's more than three centuries was, to some extent at least, the culmination of strife and clash between Boer and Britain, between White and non-White, between the forces of civilisation and barbarism, between cultures and religions and economies as far apart and as different as to be found anywhere in the world.

But let us contemplate for a moment the bulk of South Africa's historical interpretation, justifiably objective and fair though it may be. With what was it concerned?

Anybody who is familiar with the South African scene, anybody who has read Eric Walker or Gustav Preller, in fact anybody who remembers the appearance some years ago of books such as Calpin's *There are no South Africans* or Jan Toekoms's *South Africa's Eleventh Hour* must realise that for more than 150 years South African history was dominated by conflict and that the chances of accepting a common history were virtually non-existent.

The very fact that the first contact between the two groups began with what to many was nothing but a war, created a situation which of necessity was to become dualistic in fabric and pattern, creating a gulf between the two groups and their leaders which in time not only penetrated all cultural, political and even social layers, but which was on several occasions during the years to erupt into further bloodshed.

As is clearly reflected by practically all historical and quasi-historical works on South Africa, the inherent dualism became part and parcel of the very armour with which the two groups and their leaders were to write South Africa's history. Not only did they speak different languages, but they regarded themselves as different, clearly seeking out the points of difference, the dividing lines, the opposing viewpoints, the trump cards which could be played to underline the gaps and outdo one another. To every conceivable sphere of living this type of thinking and acting and fighting was extended, and even in their respective approaches to the major problem facing them — that of the struggle for survival against their common foe, the Native tribes — they were at times sadly divided, their viewpoints diametrically opposed.

In *South Africa's Eleventh Hour* the writer clearly indicates that throughout British colonial history, there have always been humanitarian voices that have demanded what they considered to be justice for subject peoples. This was true not only of South Africa but of practically all countries to which Britain's colonial expansion took her governors, her troops and her missionaries. No Rhodes or Raffles ever set forth on empire-building missions without finding a Bishop Colenso among the passengers, and no frontier development took place without the voice being heard of its Dr. Philip. In fact, it was often the Dr. Philips and the Bishop Colenso's who by their actions and utterances determined policies in respect of non-White indigents and other underdogs which were invariably associated with the whole of the English-speaking people living in the country in which they operated as well as with those who were living abroad.

The Boers, the Afrikaners, on the other hand, could never accept liberal protestations at their face value. When they saw a vociferous band of Churchmen constantly taking the side of their natural enemies, while apparently acting in concert with a step-like process by which more and more territory came under British control, they naturally concluded that it was all part of the same plot. Living in isolation, they could not understand that the British administrators spoke with two voices because the government in London was swayed by opposing schools of thought. Even in the fifties, British behaviour, whether official or individual, was often seen as a force threatening Afrikanerdom — the Collins's and Scott's not being private persons, working at their own brands of interference, but agents of the enduring enemy, professional mischief-makers, *aanstokers* intent on destroying the white race from within.

The foregoing adds up to the general conclusion that the dualism in the South African people must of necessity have created to some extent at least, a certain dualism in the interpretation of its history. Nobody who knows and understands human nature, who knows the psychological and social processes at work in the minds of even the most scientific researchers, unbiased writers or objective lecturers, will ever claim that historical events which centred around the conflicts of peoples and cultures can be projected with absolute impartiality. Not only were the people of the country divided in respect of the manner in which their common enemies had to be treated, but they were divided in respect of their views of one another's languages and cultures, their countries of origin, the constitutional relationships between South Africa and the outside world, the membership of this country of the Commonwealth of Nations, the question of the republic or the monarchy, the question of emblems — the flag and the anthem. In fact, so divided were they throughout what was really their common history in a common country with common challenges and common problems that there even in 1939 appeared to be no common approach at all in respect of the most important question in any nation's history — its participation or otherwise in an outside war! The Great Divide, as it

was called, split the people wide open and gave tacit proof of the ascertainment that South Africa had no common history. In fact, some said it had two.

But my own approach — as I have already indicated — is not pessimistic at all. In spite of these difficulties, in spite of certain social, cultural and political divisions projecting themselves right up to the present and constantly obvious in every walk of life, the bulk of historical interpretation in South Africa is sound, and there is every reason why the study of such interpretations should be encouraged. But it is also understandable that history's constant reminder of conflict, its justifiable concern with bloodshed, with scheming, with surrender, with oppression, with subjection, with the struggle for survival and group identification and — in the past quarter of a century — with equality has left with many the impression that South African history can hardly strengthen our nationhood, our unity over diversity, our common and basic loyalties which should transcend all group and sectional loyalties. To many of these people history has become, as I indicated earlier, the source of further division, the tool whereby sectional leaders can force political divisions back on racial lines and the medium through which dualism will be perpetuated into eternity. No doubt, there are many South African parents who for these reasons do not encourage their children to select history at school and who themselves prefer not to read historical works in later life.

This view has of late become an additional reason for the decline in the study of history.

The Fallacy of this Attitude

Whilst fully understanding and appreciating the reasoning behind this type of thinking, I can never agree with it. Surely, if the country's history was one of conflict and if history writing in South Africa is mainly concerned with the struggle of groups to establish their respective identities, and if in the process this caused hatred and bloodshed between them, it still remains our history, *today the legitimate heritage not of one group only, but of both groups*. The point of view that the history of the Afrikaner's struggle should be of interest to him only, is wrong and indefensible, and has at no stage been the point of view of any responsible leader or educational authority in South Africa. By the same token, the struggle of English-speaking South Africans to establish themselves in this country, to contribute as handsomely as they have done to the development of its commerce, its art, its engineering, its industries, its architecture, its mining, its finance, its system of justice and public administration, must always remain the proud heritage of Afrikaner and English-speaking South African alike. To deny this and to close one's eyes to the magnificent contribution which both sections have made to the political, cultural and economic history of South Africa, is to deny the very validity upon which true South Africanism is being built. The approach is wrong because it leaves no room for accepting the basic right of each group to struggle for its own place in South Africa, its own identity, its group loyalties, its sectional rights.

But, having said that, I hasten to add that that is not enough . . . that it is going to be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify only past history in the future. True nationhood, the unifying on a broad national basis of the two groups, will increasingly in future demand of us the development also of a joint history, a history which will concern itself with joint effort and the binding forces of a common destiny.

Die Grondslae vir so 'n Geskiedenis

Wanneer ek in hierdie verband na 'n nuwe benadering verwys, doen ek dit natuurlik in die allerbreedste sin. Dit veronderstel dat „geskiedenis” in sy breëre staatkundige verband gesien word, dat dit aanvullend moet wees tot die behoud van wat tradisioneel as geskiedenis beskou word en dat dit hoofsaaklik in die huidige en toekomstige ontwikkeling gewortel moet wees. Veral mag daarmee onder geen omstandighede bedoel word dat die belangrikheid van die plek wat die bestaande geskiedenis in Suid-Afrika het, daaronder ly nie.

Wat dan?

Laat ek begin deur te sê dat ek ook graag 'n werk oor die Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedenis wil sien waarin die klem hoofsaaklik val op die pogings tot samewerking tussen Afrikaans- en Engelssprekende Suid-Afrikaners in die verlede. En daarmee bedoel ek nie op die terrein van die party-politiek nie. Belangriker was die talryke geleenthede deur die afgelope eeu-en-'n-half waarin Boer en Brit saamgestaan het teen 'n gemeenskaplike bedreiging van binne en ook van buite. Daar was oorloë en natuur-gevaare, opstande en ondermyning van die landsorde en staatsgesag. As daar nie veel van hierdie dinge bekend is nie, is dit onder meer die gevolg van die klem wat in die verlede, heeltemal tereg, op die identifiserings- en groeps-aktiwiteite geval het. Van samewerking op die breë ekonomiese terrein, ten opsigte van die ontwikkeling van sekere landsdele en sekere groot nasionale bedrywe, is daar insgelyks treffende voorbeelde waaroor nie veel bekend is nie.

Belangriker nog as die neerskrif en die beklemtoning van hierdie dinge uit die verlede, is die erkenning van die sterk breë en geskiedkundige nasionale eenheid, die werklike grondslae van nasieskap wat in die jongste tyd die Suid-Afrikaanse toneel begin oorheers het. Dit mag kontemporêre geskiedenis wees, „politiek” in die breëre sin van die woord, maar dit is die kulminasie, die uitvloeiende en die logiese gevolg van die grondslae wat in die verlede gelê is. Nie slegs het baie van die strydpunte van die geskiedenis — die Imperiale element in ons verlede, die ou konstitusionele verskille wat die grondslag van 'n groot deel van ons stryd was — weggeval nie, maar in die plek van verdelende faktore het bindende faktore te voorskyn gekom. Republiekwording het 'n nuwe geskiedkundige tydperk in Suid-Afrika ingelui — die tydperk waarin Afrikaans- en Engelssprekendes vir die eerste keer dieselfde staatsvorm aanvaar, dieselfde basiese lojaliteite deel, dieselfde fundamentele standpunte i.v.m. internasionale houdings openbaar, dieselfde verset handhaaf teen die Kommunisme, teen inmenging van buite, teen ekonomiese druk in die vorm van sanksies en boikotte, teen

bloedgeweld van die kant van terroriste en ondermynende elemente binne Suid-Afrika se grense, teen enige on-Suid-Afrikaanse praktyke van wêreldliggame soos die V.V.O. of die Organisasie vir Afrika-eenheid.

Hierdie eenheid — wat die onderskeie groeps-eenhede op hul regmatige vlakke oorspan — sal, glo ek, die grondslag en materiaal van toekomstige geskiedenis in Suid-Afrika word — 'n gemeenskaplike geskiedenis wat die twee bevolkingsgroepe nie in die verlede gehad het nie. As die eenheid lei tot nasionale verset, tot eenstemmige optrede i.v.m. so 'n basiese saak soos oorlog en die onderdrukking van oproer, sal dit in sekere sin belangriker geskiedenis uitmaak as die meeste gebeurtenisse in die verlede. Dit sal die tasbare bewys lewer van Suid-Afrika se nuwe nasieskap, die blanke se groeiende eenheid, die werklike grondslag van sy nuwe geskiedenis. Dit sal aan kontemporêre geskiedskrywers groter eise stel as die interpretering van die verre verlede, maar dit sal hulle ook in staat stel om die groot riglyne vir die toekoms aan te dui.

Die erkenning van hierdie „nuwe” geskiedenis is ook die belangrikste waarborg vir die toekoms van albei taalgroepe, nou saamgebind in 'n snelontwikkellende nasieskap. Versuim om aan hierdie nuwe tydperk in ons ontwikkeling volle en vroeë erkenning te gee, sal ons dwing tot die deurlewing van 'n geskiedenis wat nie in hierdie stadium sonder meer ons toekoms kan verseker nie. Ons sal in die toekoms albei aspekte van die geskiedenis moet hê. In albei is daar inspirasie, in albei bindende krag. En u, die manne en vroue wat as vakkundiges so 'n belangrike rol speel, kan u land en sy mense nog verder dien deur ook aan hierdie nuwe tydperk in ons geskiedenis beslag en betekenis te help gee.