

SOUTH AFRICAN BAPTISTS AND THE LAND DISCOURSE (1806-1913)

M H Mogashoa
University of South Africa

Abstract

The possession and dispossession of land, access and denial of access to it, has been a critical factor in South African Baptist history. This critical aspect was expressed as follows: the whites had access to the land while the blacks did not. This situation was created and nurtured by the government of the day which favoured the whites. With their access to the land ensured by the government of the day, the European Baptists enjoyed unparalleled benefits as opposed to their black counterparts. With more access to land, they could build on it, cultivate it and live on it. As a result, the Baptist Union, a European-led structure, acquired wealth through the land. As for the natives who belonged to the Baptist Church, they tried to safeguard their land through the Baptist Church structure, by means such as allowing church buildings to be built on their land. More intriguing are instances where the natives are reported to have given their hard-earned land to the European-led Baptist Church of South Africa.

1 INTRODUCTION

This article attempts to describe the nature of the land discourse as it took place in South African Baptist history. The article covers four main aspects. Firstly, the background to the dispossession of natives from their land is briefly discussed in the South African context. In this dispossession, the church was not innocent. Curiously, different scholars interpret this dispossession differently.

The second aspect considered in the article covers the early beginnings of the Baptists' scramble for land. Interestingly, this scramble took place at the time of the secular scramble for land when minerals were discovered. Thirdly, the article discusses the aspect of the natives giving land to the European-led Baptist Church of South Africa. This occurred because native landowners and chiefs handed over their lands to European missionaries to prevent such lands from being confiscated by the government of the day. Lastly, the conclusion provides a critical synthesis of the whole article. Further, this conclusion lays out pointers for further research and analysis.

2 A BRIEF BACKGROUND AND INTERPRETATIONS OF THE DISPOSSESSION OF THE LAND (1806-1820)

Issues of land, a critical discourse in Baptist history, also characterised the nature of relations between the Europeans and the natives in the Baptist Church of South Africa. Since 1820, the commencement of the period of my research interest (Mogashoa 2004), Europeans on the South African colonial frontier had preoccupied themselves with amassing as much land as possible. Prior to 1820, when Britain permanently annexed the Cape in 1806, the Dutch farmers who had been granted land as freehold (loan farms) by the Dutch East India Company (Miller & Pope 2000:4) had this benefit reviewed under English rule. As early as 1813, Sir John Cradock issued a proclamation intended to promote the conversion of unsatisfactory loan farm tenure into perpetual quitrent tenure (Miller & Pope 2000:4). The Kaffir Wars - border conflicts between the Afrikaners and the Negro tribes - brought about confusion and the English refused to satisfy the land hunger of the Boers by annexing the Negro areas (Buskes 1956:8). Between 1835 and 1846, "ten thousand men, women and children left the Cape Province" (Miller & Pope 2000:9). The most important leaders were Hendrick Potgieter, Piet Retief and Andries Pretorius. Prior to their departure, Retief wrote the *Manifesto* (Hofmeyr et al 1991:114-116),¹ which outlined the reasons for leaving the Cape Province. This *Manifesto* was published in the *Grahamstown Journal* (Lekhela 1959:38).²

With some Boers out of sight in the Cape Province, which was also the founding province of both European Baptist work and its mission among the natives, the 1828 Ordinance and other protective declarations for non-whites to obtain land “were no more than tokenism in the prevailing circumstances” (Lekhela 1959:11). More significant still was the incapacity of the nineteenth century British administration to curtail or control the burgeoning and rapacious spread of white settlers through the subcontinent. It would appear that in relation to every indigenous group in the southern African region, the combination of British indifference and incompetence and the driven self-interest of the European settlers spelt disaster in respect of land. What was done for the Hottentots was too little too late. The welfare of the non-European people at the Cape was almost always dissociated from the critical question of land rights.

In order to have land within the colony, the non-European had to be a squatter or a member of a mission station. The single exception - a small one - was the Kat River settlement established in 1829, which provided some small farms for Hottentots along the frontier. Thus, British land policy at the Cape was considered as a regulatory service for the European. (Lekhela 1959:12)

The most significant feature of the nineteenth century development of South Africa from the point of view of land rights, according to Miller, was the loss suffered by the Bantu people as a result of the expansion of white settlement following frontier conflict (Miller & Pope 2000:12-13). Under this heading, Davenport and Hunt comment as follows: “White frontiers were advanced, not only as a consequence of the Difecane and the Great Trek, but as a result of wars fought between whites and the Xhosa, Tswana, Pedi, Zulu, Sotho, Ndebele and other tribes” (Davenport in Miller & Pope 2000:13).

Another view has, however, been expressed on this land discourse, particularly concerning the tension between the Europeans and the Bantu: “The right which the Hottentots had to supplant the Bushmen, the right which the Bantu had to supplant the Hottentots is the same right which Europeans had to supplant the Bantu ... The Bantu have as much right to South Africa as the European population, but no

more” (Brookes 1924:330). Without hesitation, Brookes proposed, “Any argument on the land questions must recognize this principle” (Brookes 1924:330). Theal (1908-1910), another like-minded scholar, popularised the myth of vacant land.³ In his monumental eleven volume *History of South Africa*, he traced the Bantu-speakers back to North Africa, and concluded that: “[there is] evidence to prove that Bantu-speakers arrived in South Africa relatively late, and therefore had no more right to land in the country than whites” (Crais 1991:267). Evans accepted Brookes’ (1924) and Theal’s (1910) arguments in later years (1934), stating that the “Europeans had settled into the areas where the Abantu had not penetrated, or where they were not permanently established, but they had also occupied a great deal of land elsewhere, regardless of any claims the Natives might have had upon it” (Evans 1934:20-21). It was within this context that South African Baptists (Europeans) commenced with their mission among the natives.

3 BEGINNINGS OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN BAPTIST’S SCRAMBLE FOR LAND

Even though ‘recorded evidence’ indicates that Baptist mission work among the natives had been started as early as 1856, by the German Baptists in Tshabo at Berlin, the first record of a South African Baptist purchase of land for mission among the natives only dates back to 1889. Three years earlier, in 1886, the Baptist Union (BU) president Mr T H Grocott, in his presidential address to the Baptist Union Assembly, commented: “While speaking of civilizing and Christianizing the heathen I may remark that, up to the present time, our Union has not attempted to extend its organization amongst the native races of this Colony.”⁴

This was because the Baptist society, unlike other missionary societies, had not ‘established’ its work among the natives. Calling on the Baptists to rise up to the challenge, he added: “other bodies have for years nobly carried on this work - and we wish them God’s speed in their noble efforts to raise and civilise the heathen of this land”.⁵ The nature of the mission of these missionary bodies was such that, along with the mission stations they established, they also attempted

to acquire the land on which these stations were established (Lagden 1904:69).⁶ In many cases, however, according to Lagden (1940:69):

the Missionaries claim that the assistance rendered by them to the Natives has given them rights either to a portion of the land in freehold or to a usufructuary interest over portions of the farms. Some of them claim servitudes over the grounds, which they wish to register against the titles ... The Natives on their part claim to be entitled to the undivided portion of the ground, and they state that the servitude was signed by their Chief and a Headman without their authority.

In 1889, the BU Assembly decided: "In answer to Rev W E Kelly [of Johannesburg], who is anxious to secure plots of ground to the denomination for building sites, the Executive authorised him to get as many sites as he could, and to take the legal steps to secure such sites to the Executive, provided that this Union be not involved in any pecuniary liability."⁷ (It should be noted that this was the period immediately following the discovery of gold in Johannesburg.) According to the *Lagden Report* (Lagden 1904), the missionaries held large amounts of land titles on behalf of the natives, particularly in the Transvaal. This scramble for land was evident not only in church lands but also in commercial land.⁸

Coming back to the Baptist Church, during the same Assembly (1889), the following day, 12 June, Mr T B King - who had proposed the formation of the BU in 1877 - "wished his protest to be recorded on the minutes against the action of the Executive *in re* obtaining grants of land in the Transvaal, considering it a breach of our congregational principles".⁹ This objection should not create the impression that the Baptists were totally innocent in the acquisition of land, especially given the circumstances and the context under which the BU was formed.¹⁰ The particular situation, of course, was in a town established as a result of the relocation of the native population.¹¹ While Mr King, on the one hand, criticised the BU's acquisition of land for religious purposes, the same assembly during the same day's morning session read a letter from C Henkel, Esq "asking if the Union could not undertake Mission work in the

unoccupied fields between the Kei and Natal".¹² 'Unoccupied fields', a term which referred to an area in which there was no Baptist activity, implied that such space was to be occupied for the betterment of the morals of the natives.¹³ Consequently, the Assembly passed the resolution that the BU president "was [to be] requested to send a suitable reply to this very interesting communication".¹⁴ Further, the Assembly resolved, "[t]hat every Church connected with this Union be requested to make a collection (say once a year) on behalf of Mission work among the aborigines, and that the interest of the children in our [European] Sunday Schools be drawn to this work; the Thato [sic] Mission to have the first claim upon the proceeds of this collection."¹⁵

In 1892, on the formation of the South African Baptist Missionary Society (SABMS), Baptist missionary work among the natives was coordinated under this body. The same year, the Baptist Union Executive reported on the Bloemfontein field, about which it was "surprised to find that our brethren of the Congregational Union [CU] were also preparing to occupy that field".¹⁶ The BU Executive "wrote to the Executive of C.U., remonstrating against what appeared like a rivalry".¹⁷ As a result, the CU's secretary replied, "pleading ignorance of our movement, and withdrawing from Bloemfontein in our favour".¹⁸ Pleased about these circumstances, the BU Executive further wrote: "The way being now clear, Mr Dogget came out and the Secretaries went to Bloemfontein to interview the friends there and commence the work ... We were heartily received and generously helped by a whole host of friends in Bloemfontein, and the work was inaugurated under happiest circumstances."¹⁹

Two years later, in 1894, the SABMS acquired two new and unique 'lands'. The first was the purchase of property at King Williamstown, from the European churches. The thought "occurred to take it and make a missionary centre for the many natives who visit or live about the town".²⁰ This church, unlike that of Tshabo, which was situated on a farm, being the only native mission station to date, was an old Wesleyan chapel, in Berkeley Street. The comment on this purchase was, "There was no time to lose, [as] others were willing to give more."²¹ The second and controversial 'land' the SABMS (including the BU) acquired, which the Baptist Union Executive reported as "of

highest enthusiasm”,²² was “the magnificent offer of the Premier, Hon C Rhodes, to us, through the President: Three large farms in Matebeland and Mashonaland for missionary work; two stands in each of the three townships, Fort Salisbury, Fort Charter, Fort Victoria”.²³ Accompanying this magnificent offer was “a donation to the sum of £100, and the encouragement to hope for another £500 by the Chartered Company”.²⁴ These three farms were “3,000 acres each, six stands in townships for Mission Churches and Parsonages”.²⁵ It seemed however, that the BU was not comfortable about accepting these farms, as the Baptist Union Executive reported: “there were fears that we are not strong enough [to accept the offer], but in the end it was decided to accept the offer on terms to be arranged”.²⁶

Concerning these farms in Matebeleland and Mashonaland,²⁷ a subcommittee²⁸ “recommended that Mr Hughes and Mr Cross be asked to visit England as a deputation from the Missionary Society to interest the home churches in the enterprise [of mission in these lands] and collect funds”.²⁹ Of interest is the subcommittee’s comment regarding the choice of these farms that: ‘the Society be allowed to select the farms in any part of the two countries not previously secured by other persons, and the stands in the township not already taken by others [missionary societies]’.³⁰ This land metaphor, as mentioned previously, is based on the premise that as long as land has been neither settled nor demarcated by Europeans (settlers), such land is unoccupied. Reporting on their visit to England, the deputation wrote: “Unfortunately, misrepresentation of our cause had preceded us, and we were met with a good deal of opposition from various sources.”³¹ Nevertheless, “[w]herever we got a hearing we were kindly received, and though not a large sum has been obtained, we are almost surprised that, after all, so much was realized, when the difficulties are remembered.”³² These lands were loaned³³ to the SABMS by the Chartered Company, and it was resolved, according to Dr Harris, a representative of the Chartered Company, that “[i]n the event of the Society being unable to occupy the land given, Dr Harris promised that the Company would deal generously toward the Society with respect to the duration of the time during which possession might be entered upon.”³⁴

4 FURTHER OCCUPATION OF LAND: A NEW TWIST

In 1904, for the first time in South African Baptist history according to BU minutes, a native convert - intriguingly - gave land to the SABMS. This was at Rabula, near Keiskama Hoek, where “[o]ur senior deacon, Mr Jonas Mshumfela, has given a site for a Church to our Missionary Society of about one acre in extent.”³⁵ Commenting on this, the SABMS wrote, “This is unique, for it is the first gift of land [in the Baptist Church] from a Christian native to our Society.”³⁶ Worth noting about this land is that already, “a church is erected ..., the deacons themselves undertaking the responsibility of its erection. The building was officially opened in July [1904] by the Rev H Gutsche, when the natives contributed liberally to liquidate the debt, the donor of the site giving £20 besides.”³⁷ Admittedly, Mr Mshumfela was to some extent ‘well-off’.³⁸ But this donation took place at the time when the Lagden Commission was reviewing, among other land matters, what to do with the land owned by the natives. This act brings us to the controversial issue of land owned by natives and then, ‘granted’ to the Europeans, the main reason being to secure such land from governmental confiscation. Such a practice, according to Van Donk (1994:4), was also common among “chiefs [who] sometimes granted land to missionaries, because this seemed a way to ensure the black population access to land”. In this way, in addition to the Europeans’ own farms, the natives could also retain their ‘private farms’, thus squatting on them under a European title-holder. These natives could also avoid being forced into the ‘labour economy’.

During the same period, the Lagden Commission (1903-1905), also referred to as the Inter-Colonial Commission, chaired by the same Mr G Y Lagden whose views were discussed above, commenced with its duties. This Commission was instituted in order to deal with ‘squatting’, among other issues. It expressed the view that “the unrestrained squatting of Natives on private farms was an evil and against the best interests of the country” (Brookes 1924:331). These squatting natives could not be easily identified and drawn into the government’s economy. With a view “to prevent the continuance and spread of the evil, the recommendation was made that, with the

exception of bona fide farm servants and their families, Natives should not be permitted to live on private farms, except with the Government sanction, which should only be given in special cases, and under the Government control, and should, if permission were given so to reside, pay an annual license” (Brooks 1924:331). This proclamation, according to Brookes, “is the germ of the Native Land Act provision regarding squatting” (Brooks 1924:331), a connection not made by many scholars,³⁹ who think that the 1913 Land Act had brought into being a new terminology, and definitive statutory land discrimination. Unfortunately Brookes, trapped by his liberal tendencies, argued unashamedly that this germ was ‘in itself desirable’ (Brookes 1924:331).

Similar recommendations were made with regard to crown, municipal and other public lands. Even though the Commission resolved that certain restrictions upon the purchase of land by the natives were necessary, it remarked, “Natives ... will be excluded from this privilege except in limited areas selected partly for their unhealthiness and unsuitability for irrigation and cultivation and other kindred reasons” (Brooks 1924:331). This confirms my argument that natives were relocated to and ‘given’ unsuitable and unlivable, poor land. The resolutions, as finally approved, read as follows:

This Commission is of the opinion and recommends:

- 1 That the time has arrived when the lands dedicated and set apart, or to be dedicated and set apart, as locations, reserves or otherwise, should be defined, delimited and reserved for the Natives by legislative enactment.
- 2 That this should be done with a view to finality in provision of land for the Native population and that thereafter no more land should be reserved for Native occupation.
- 3 The creation, subject to adequate control, of Native locations for residential purposes near labour centres or elsewhere on proof that they are needed.

- 4 That the right of occupation of the lands so defined and set apart shall be subject to a condition of forfeiture in case of rebellion. (Brooks 1924:332)

Thus, according to Brookes, it becomes clear to anyone reading the Natives Land Act of 1913 in conjunction with these proposals that the Land Act was not a sudden tyrannical proposal by the Union Government of that date, but was based largely on the considered *Report of the Commission*. “Unfortunately,” Brookes continued, “the recommendations of the Commission were altered in some points for the worse; the [Land] Act [of 1913] was (though by no means sudden, having appeared eight years after the Inter-Colonial Commission’s Report) at the last minute rushed through; [and] the ‘squatting’ provisions were tightened up in a way both harsh and impolitic” (Brooks 1924:332-333). Brookes concluded his liberal argument by patronisingly insulting the native people saying that “the [Land] Act which, wisely planned, might have been a blessing, has been rather a curse” (Brooks 1924:333).

5 CONCLUSION: THE INTERWOVENNESS OF LAND, PROPERTY, FINANCE AND PEOPLE

The South African Baptists’ mission among the natives took place on the land. Miller (2000:3), in her extensive work on the history, use and ownership of land in South Africa, wrote: “The factors which are generally controlling forces in any given society are invariably manifested in relation to land. Land tenure represents social, political and economic considerations for a given society in a particular stage of development.”

Land has great financial value. It is no coincidence that the Baptist Church, like many other European-led churches, saw to it that it acquired land. The primary purpose of doing so was undoubtedly to further advance the gospel by initiating and establishing a mission among the natives. Looking at the South African Baptists’ discourse, in particular on land, four aspects sum up the nature of this discourse. These are: South African Baptists’ attitude to the land; the acquisition of land and the building of property on the land; the

finances needed to purchase and maintain the land; and the people's (both the natives' and the Europeans') relations to the land.

5.1 South African Baptists' attitude to the land

The Europeans in South Africa were not averse to owning land. Their ownership of land, which became huge in extent, was certainly made possible by the European-led South African government. The European-led churches found themselves within such a favourably pro-European environment that it was feasible for them to own as much land as possible. The land that the Europeans came to own was land that had formerly belonged to the natives. It is a myth that the land was vacant and unoccupied.

5.2 Acquisition and the building of property on the land

'Property', a term which applies to both the building and land on which it stands, implies that the erection and maintenance of a building is related to the land on which it is located. If one owns both the building and the land on which the building is located, there is a heavy commitment to the maintenance of both, which accompanies sustaining the financial worth of both. But when one owns one without the other, a sense of conflict arises, which necessitates either ownership of both or letting go of both. The SABMS ensured the former, that is, ownership of both the land and any improvements.

5.3 Finances needed to purchase and maintain the land and improvements

An associated aspect of the ownership of land and improvements is the question of the finances to sustain them. The finances of the Baptist Church were such that the BU occasionally contributed to the SABMS funds. With the establishment of the different funds, for the European workers of the SABMS and the BU ministers, which took place at about the same time as the SAMBS undertook the land and property audit of its work, the funds of the SAMBS were to receive a further boost. In addition to benefiting the European workers of the SAMBS, these funds also served to maintain the SABMS land and

property in the native areas. Natives did, however, contribute financially to the purchase and maintenance of land and property.

It is interesting to note that some of the properties and lands that the SABMS acquired were given to it by the native converts. This raises a curious question: what could have motivated a native convert to give either his or her property or land or both to the SABMS?

5.4 A new relation to the land

With natives generally dispossessed of their land and the Europeans in possession of it, a new relation to the land had evolved. With ownership of the land in their hands, the Europeans enjoyed better livelihoods. Sadly for the natives, as they were landless, they had to trade their labour to generate income. In other words, the land, for the natives, was no longer a source of economic wealth. This kind of scenario also played itself out within the church.

WORKS CONSULTED

Beinart, W, Delius, P & Trapido, S 1986. *Putting a plough to the ground: Accumulation and dispossession in rural South Africa, 1850-1930*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

Brookes, E H 1924. *The history of native policy in S.A.* Cape Town: Nasionale Pers.

Baptist Union Executive Report for 1891-1892, in BU Handbook for 1892-1893.

Buskes, J J 1956. *South African apartheid policy: Unacceptable*. Transvaal: S A Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Committee's Report in *re Northern Missions: Annexure C*, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1895-1896.

Crais, C C 1991. The vacant land: The mythology of British expansion in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Journal of Social History* 25(2), 255-275.

- Davenport, T R H, & Hunt, K S 1974. *The right to the land*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Evans, I L 1934. *Native policy in Southern Africa: An outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grocott, T H 1886. Our Union. An address delivered at the Ninth Annual Assembly of the Baptist Union of South Africa, September 6th, 1886, at King Williamstown, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1886-1887.
- Hofmeyr, J W, Millard, J A & Froneman, C J J 1991. *History of the church in South Africa: A document source book*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Lagden, G Y 1904. *Report by the Commissioner for Native Affairs*. Pretoria: Native Affairs Department.
- Lekhela, S M M 1959. An historical survey of native land settlement in SA from 1902 to the passing of the Natives' Trust Land Act of 1936. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Mogashoa, M H 2004. South African Baptists and finance matters (1820-1948). Unpublished PhD Thesis. Pietermaritzburg: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.
- Miller, D L C & Pope, A 2000. *Land title in South Africa*. Kenwyn: Juta.
- Minutes of 1889 BU Assembly, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1889-1890.
- Minutes of 1894 BU Assembly, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1894-1895.
- Minutes of 1895 BU Assembly, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1895-1896.

Notes on the Union Meetings of 1894, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1894-1895.

Notes on the [Baptist] Union Meetings of 1894, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1894-1895.

Philpott, G & Zondi, P 1998. Church land: A strategic resource in the war against poverty. *Bulletin of Contextual Theology in Africa* 5(3), 17-39.

Randell, G & Randell, D 1977. *We all lived here 1822-1977*. Queenstown: Queenstown Printing Company.

Reid, D A 1976. An evaluation of the policies of the South African Baptist Missionary Society prior to 1971. Unpublished Dip. Theology Dissertation. Johannesburg: Baptist Theological College of Johannesburg.

SABMS Annual Report for 1904, in Baptist Union Handbook for 1903-1906.

Theal, G M 1908-1910. History of South Africa from 1795 to 1875. Vol V, 4th ed, 266, quoted in Miller, D L C & Pope, A 2000. *Land title in South Africa*, 6-7 Kenwyn: Juta.

Tsele, M & Butler, M 1998. Towards a theology of church land in South Africa. *Bulletin of Contextual Theology in Africa* 5(3), 40-45.

Van Donk, M 1994. *Land and the church: The case of the Dutch Reformed Churches*. Western Province: Western Province Council of Churches.

ENDNOTES

-
- 1 See also Randell, G & Randell, D 1977. *We all lived here 1822-1977*. Queenstown: Queenstown Printing Company, 10-11. In this work, the Randells provide among other short biographies, the biography of Piet Retief.
 - 2 Lekhela, S M M 1959. *An historical survey of Native Land Settlement in S.A. from 1902 to the passing of the Natives' Trust Land Act of 1936*. Pretoria: University of South Africa. Unpublished Masters Thesis, 38. Lekhela quoted the following extracts from the *Manifesto*: "We are resolved, wherever we go, that we will uphold the just principle of liberty; but whilst we will take care that no one shall be in a state of slavery, it is our determination to maintain such regulations as may suppress crime and preserve proper relations between master and servant. We will not molest any people or deprive them of the smallest property." In interpreting Retief's publication, Lekhela argued, disappointingly, that: "This is evidence that the intentions of the Trekkers towards the Bantu tribes were peaceful." Fortunately, Lekhela immediately regained his analytical senses by stating: "Conflicts between the Black and whites in the interior of South Africa could not however be long averted as events will show."
 - 3 See my discussion of Crais's argument in Chapter 1 of Mogashoa, M H *op cit*. Briefly this view is based on two notions of vacantness. The first is that vacancy refers to the fact of geographical emptiness in the Western legal denotation of land being 'unoccupied or unused'. The second notion of vacantness, as an 'elision' or 'emptying' of the humanity of the African and the formulation of a set of negative stereotypes, was embedded in this creation of empirical 'fact' – the observation of the apparent materiality of an empty land. Thus, the settlers on arrival in the colony had to organised space which they saw as empty.
 - 4 Grocott, T H 1886. *Our Union*. An address delivered at the Ninth Annual Assembly of the Baptist Union of South Africa, September 6th, 1886, at King Williamstown, in BU Handbook for 1886-1887, 9.
 - 5 Ibid.
 - 6 See in particular, Appendix XIII: Questions Arising out of Land Purchase by Missionaries on behalf of Natives, 69.
 - 7 Minutes of 1889 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1889-1890, 29.
 - 8 See Chapter 2, in Mogashoa, M H *op cit*.
 - 9 Minutes of 1889 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1889-1890, 31.
 - 10 See Chapter 2, in Mogashoa, M H *op. cit*.
 - 11 Ibid.
 - 12 Minutes of 1889 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1889-1890, 31.
 - 13 See Chapter 4, in Mogashoa, M H *op cit*, wherein is discussed the Comaroffs' notion of 'moral geography'.
 - 14 Minutes of 1889 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1889-1890, 31.
 - 15 Ibid. See also the discussion by Reid, D A 1976. *An evaluation of the policies of the South African Baptist Missionary Society prior to 1971*. Johannesburg: Baptist Theological College of Johannesburg. Unpublished Dip. Theology Dissertation, 43-57. His discussion of this monetary collection and the nature of the relationship between the European and black churches it lacks judgement. Basically, it lacks analysis. In introducing this discussion he stated that "in highlighting a divergence between the local church and the mission station, [Reid] is not pleading for an overall attitude of paternalism on the part of the local European congregation, nor of the missionary himself, but rather a sense of responsibility on the part of the European churches ... The up and coming African Church needs a mother church to help it towards spiritual maturity (perhaps we should speak of maternalism rather than paternalism) and it is at this point partnership becomes the issue".
 - 16 BU Executive Report for 1891-1892, in BU Handbook for 1892-1893, 46.
 - 17 Ibid.

-
- 18 Ibid.
 - 19 Ibid.
 - 20 Notes on the Union Meetings of 1894, in BU Handbook for 1894-1895, 8.
 - 21 Ibid.
 - 22 Ibid. This land's potential as a capital generating source is discussed in Chapter 6 of Mogahsoa, M H. *op cit*.
 - 23 Ibid.
 - 24 Ibid. See also Chapter 6, the discussion on the BU's administrative funds.
 - 25 Minutes of 1894 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1894-1895, 32.
 - 26 Notes on the Union Meetings of 1894, in BU Handbook for 1894-1895, 8.
 - 27 These stands and farms "are liable to the ordinary quitrent and license ...quite a nominal fee in each case, being in that of a farm £1 per annum of 1,000 acres, and for a stand 10/- month per stand". (Committee's Report in re Northern Missions: Annexure C, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 59).
 - 28 This subcommittee, appointed during the assembly, consisted of Revs L Nuttall, J Hughes, G Eales, G W Cross, and Messrs J George, E E Watkeys, A Williams, H Paul and G White. They were given the mandate by the assembly to "secure, survey and convey to the Baptist Union the gifts of land in Matebeleland and Mashonaland and to make arrangements for working the same." (Minutes of 1895 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 25).
 - 29 Notes on the [Baptist] Union Meetings of 1894, in BU Handbook for 1894-1895, 9.
 - 30 Committee's Report in re Northern Missions: Annexure C, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 59.
 - 31 Committee's Report in re Northern Missions: Annexure A, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 58.
 - 32 Ibid. According to the minutes, "The following is a summary of the financial results. Total receipts, £549.5s.2d. Expenses of Deputation, £252.13s. Charges in connection with pulpit supplies, £117.15s. Total expenses, £370.8s. Credit balance, £178.17s.2d. Additional promises of £150 yet to be received." (Minutes of 1895 BU Assembly, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 25.).
 - 33 These lands that were confiscated from the natives by the Europeans and in turn loaned to fellow Europeans, were used as a means of income generation for Europeans and institutions initiated for the benefit of Europeans.
 - 34 Committee's Report re Northern Missions: Annexure C, in BU Handbook for 1895-1896, 59.
 - 35 SABMS Annual Report for 1904, in BU Handbook for 1903-1906, 43.
 - 36 Ibid.
 - 37 Ibid.
 - 38 See Beinart, W, Delius, P, & Trapido, S 1986. *Putting a plough to the ground: Accumulation and dispossession in rural South Africa, 1850-1930*. Johannesburg: Ravan. In this work, the authors discuss some of the natives who had 'amassed wealth', through agriculture and farming, in the rural outskirts of the country.
 - 39 See the following articles in *Bulletin of Contextual Theology in Africa*, 5(3). September 1998: Philpott, G & Zondi, P "Church Land: A Strategic Resource in the War against Poverty," 17-39, and Tsele, M & Butler, M "Towards a Theology of Church Land in South Africa," 40-45. On the whole, other articles in the journal, particularly those that were a response to Tsele and Butler's article, such as the one by Maluleke, and the report of the Southern African Anglican Theological Commission which in its historical overview of land usage in Southern African from precolonial times to the 1980's, also came short of understanding the stages that led to the 1913 Land Act.