

Fort Hare,
Alice, C.P.
11-10-44

Dear Professor Schapera,

Thank you very much for your letter of the 3rd inst. and for your comments on the paper I sent you. I have noted the points you have raised and will make the necessary amendments in the text. In regard to one or two of the points mentioned I should like to make the following observations:

1. About objections to Lotlamoreng's becoming chief, I know that the Molemas were the leaders of the opposition, but I am not aware that they actually then raised the point that they themselves were entitled to the succession on the ground of the 'seantlo' marriage of Molema 1 to the 'widow' of Seetsela. I believe their case rested principally on the ~~fact~~ contention that 'seantlo' marriages were contrary to the principles of Christian marriage, Christianity having as it were become the official religion of the tribe. There was also the fact that even it were held that 'seantlo' unions were still valid in the tribe, in the case in question the custom had been violated in that Montshiwa himself was the natural father of Lotlamoreng; in other words it was contended that it was improper for a father to 'enter into the house' of his deceased son, correct procedure being for a brother to do so. Apparently even before Lotlamoreng was born, questions were raised as to whether he would be entitled to succeed if he were a boy. Montshiwa is reputed to have said then, "What will you with him? He will have to succeed." Hence the name "Lotlamoreng". It must also be remembered that the Molemas were particularly interested in this case, because Bakolopang whom Lotlamoreng succeeded a son-in-law of the Molemas, having married Masemela, a daughter of Silas Molema (Dr Molema's father). Unfortunately Bakolopang had no child by Masemela. In fact ~~xxxx~~ that marriage was dissolved before Bakolopang died, and Masemela was later married by Robert Setlogelo (now Dr.). I know that on more than one occasion since then the Molemas have tried to raise the question that in tribal affairs they should be given precedence over the Motshegares on the ground of this Seetsela 'widow' marriage, but they have failed to establish their claim. I have not gone into these details about the Lotlamoreng dispute, because I am aware that Lotlamoreng is very sensitive about this question of his parentage. In fact about 1938 when Dr Molema referred to it in an article which he wrote for the Mafeking paper, he was hauled before the Kgatla and fined a beast for his 'defamation' of the Chief. I may say that I have not been able to ~~xxxx~~ trace the published record of the Lotlamoreng succession case. It must have been tried in the Griqualand West Local Division of the Supreme Court if it went as far as that. Our local court library has not got the Reports of that Division. You might be able to find it in Cape Town.
2. I have no information about a dispute about Montshiwa's succession to the chieftainship. It is quite possible that there was such a dispute but on the other hand it may be that the Kgatla regiments to which you refer merely attended the installation ceremony as a matter of courtesy.
3. Thank you for your information about the Barolong Farms. The references which I have consulted about the matter have not been too clear on the point.
4. I shall be glad to get from you your genealogies of the house of Tawana. I have a lot of material on that too, but mine was not checked and passed by Lotlamoreng. It will be interesting to compare notes on this point. The same applies to the wards in the tribe. They should form very useful supplements to the history.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,