Social Responsibility and Power II: J.T. van der Kemp's Interventions for and on behalf of the Khoikhoi on the Eastern Cape Frontier (1801 – 1806)

Johannes A. Smit

Abstract
In 'Social Responsibility and Power I', I have endeavoured to provide an argument for the social responsibility and power of J.T. van der Kemp (joined by James Read in 1801) as manifest in his interventions for and on behalf of the Khoi vis-à-vis the British and later Batavian colonial governments, as well as the frontier settler farmers on the Eastern Cape Frontier (1801 – 1806) (cf. Smit 2016a). His own 'power' became manifest in his interventions for and on behalf of the Khoi and his critique of both the colonial governments and the frontier settler farmers. To this we may add his assertion of the freedom of the landless Khoi, and his contention that they should receive a piece of land, to be allocated by government, for a mission station, where they would be subjected to education and be 'civilized'. I have expounded what these developments meant in terms of the 'archive' of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. They included, amongst others, the further de-culturalisation of the Khoi. In this article, I take the argument further by focusing on the 'useful education', 'analytic education', 'institutionalisation', the interaction with the colonial 'government' in these matters, and the 'pacification' of the Khoi by the mission as institution.

Keywords: J.T. van der Kemp, Khoi (or Khoikhoi/ Khoisan), social responsibility, power, Michel Foucault

Electronic ISSN: 2519-5476; DOI: https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2017/sp19a3

1 Introduction

In 'Social Responsibility and Power I', I have endeavoured to provide an argument for the social responsibility and power of J.T. van der Kemp (joined by James Read in 1801) 1801 – 1806 as manifest in his interventions for and on behalf of the Khoi vis-à-vis the British and later Batavian colonial governments, as well as the frontier settler farmers on the Eastern Cape Frontier (1801 – 1806) (cf. Smit 2016a). His own 'power' became manifest in his intervention for and on behalf of the Khoi and his critique of both the colonial governments as well as the frontier settler farmers. To this we may add his assertion of the freedom of the landless and destitute Khoi, and his contention that the Khoi should receive a piece of land, to be allocated by the government, for a mission station, where they would be educated and 'civilized'. I have expounded what these developments meant in terms of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries 'archive'[1].

With regard to the Khoi, missionary power came to the front then in especially their assertion of the 'freedom' of the Khoi vis-à-vis the British colonial government: that they were not slaves (cf. Smit 2016b); that they should have their own piece of land; and that government should provide them with a missionary station for the Khoi. I also dealt with the missionary objective of the 'civilization' of the Khoi and what that entailed, and also expounded this notion from a communication coming from the LMS Directors in London. In a nutshell, my argument was developed in terms of the rising importance of civil society in Europe since the seventeenth century through the eighteenth century. There, Christian denominations formed part of civil society and had started to intervene on behalf of the poor, illiterate, and uneducated through especially education (the building of schools), health (the building of hospitals), the care of orphans (through the building of orphanages) and institutions for the old and infirm. European Governments did so too,

[1] In brief, I take the notion of the 'archive', to comprise of all those statements, in Foucault's sense, together with scholarly views, and thoughts or ideas, expressed, written down and published, or communicated and reported on or sometimes just alluded to, as part of the Knowledge, or more closely, the European and colonising Knowledge-Power complex that was in the process of formation, both in Europe and the colonies during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In Van der Kemp's case, there is a pre-Kantian limit, that has to be acknowledged (cf. Krom 1800,II:lxxf).

especially through the building of asylums, hospitals, schools, orphanages, and prisons, and the setting up of barracks with their accompanying training of soldiers. Government-supporting academics (and sometimes anti-government intellectuals) developed the requisite 'knowledge' that accompanied the setting up of these institutions[2]. The legal fraternity also formed part of these developments, and even though Foucault refer to comparative legal developments in his published work, interviews and lectures, he did not make this a primary focus as for instance, in his enquiries as in the ones he published books on (but see Foucault [1973] 1994). On these topics – which he often called 'limit-experiences' – he primarily worked in the area of knowledge and relations of power (knowledge-power or power-knowledge), and how these intersect with notions of the subject and knowledge, and as these were being produced during the late eighteenth and into the nineteenth centuries (cf. Said 2002a).

In this second article on this topic, I aim to demonstrate that we should understand 'social responsibility' in the late eighteenth century as well as at least the first half of the nineteenth century as part of the interventions of the great denominational variety of Christian missions for and on behalf of indigenous people in the colonies vis-à-vis colonising governments and their (frontier) settler farmers (cf. Ross 1986)[3]. Accompanying the early missions' social responsibility interventions was also their own power or power effects on the indigenous populations of the colonies though. Such power, I reason, was similar to 'power' as it developed hand in hand with the production of the accompanying knowledge by academics and intellectuals as part of the sixteenth through the eighteenth century European Enlightenment, which occurred parallel to the industrialization and modernization of Europe. By implementing discursive practises that resonated with the European Enlightenment, in the colonies, the missions would exert power over indigenous populations, similar to that exerted by both Christian denominations and governments in Europe when they institutionalised the poor, uneducated, illiterate, criminals, as well as the 'lazy', and the 'vagabonds'. This all formed part of the introduction of all citizens into the productive labour force of the

[2] Cf. Foucault's research – Foucault ([1961] 1982a); ([1963] 1973); ([1975] 1979).

[3] Cf. also Freund 1989: 339 - 343, who states that the 'critical tradition' started by Van der Kemp and continued by Philip continued well into the twentieth century.

then rising industrial-capital-labour complexes – both in Europe and the colonies. As in the earlier article, I mainly draw on Van der Kemp's correspondence from his extant South African texts: mainly his diary and letters published by the London Missionary Society (LMS) in its *Transactions* (1804; 1806; and 1812), and on some letters published in Saxe Bannister's *Humane Policy* (1830). For 'power', and 'power effects' in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries' 'power relations' and 'power networks', I draw on the theory and discursive historical studies by Michel Foucault[4].

In this article I then continue my focus on a sample of Van der Kemp's own views and social responsibility interventions for and on behalf of the Khoi in the 'power relations' and 'power networks' of the colony. For the latter, I shall also draw on a few perspectives of Foucault with regard to the significance of related governmental, civil and religious interventions on behalf of the general populace in late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century Britain and France, which are interventions that are symptomatically mirrored in the missionary discourses in Europe's colonies, contesting colonisation in its actual cruelty and de-humanisation effects but also exerting power through their own missionary and institutionalising practices. Even though counterhegemonic, the missions would develop their own 'power relations', 'power effects', and 'power networks' among the colonised, or yet to be colonised. This will provide some indication as to the even broader *episteme*[5], in which we must position Van der Kemp's own judgements,

---

[4] Cf. Foucault (1994 463); ([1983] 1994: 451); and ([1984] 1994:299) amongst others).

[5] In my perception, Foucault's notion of episteme, can usefully be understood as what we may call, an epochal historical, and historicisable, knowledge-power construct. While inherently quite diverse and pluriform, as well as developmental, in its internal Knowledge (or epistemological) and related institutional constitutional articulations, there are certain problematizing and conceptual features that allow different forms of knowledge to be grouped together. In this regard, there is some affinity with Thomas Kuhn's diachronic notion of 'paradigm' in his *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962] 1970), as well as the latter's understanding of the 'incommensurability' of historically consecutive, but also parallel paradigms, synchronically understood. In this regard, Foucault's diachronically understood *episteme*, could also be usefully employed for the study of mutually-exclusionary knowledge-power constructs,

decisions, ideas and initiatives on the Eastern Cape frontier at the beginning of the 'century of missions' in South Africa, but also his own power effects on the Khoi, even though he intervened with government (and the frontier settler farmers, cf. Smit 2016a) on their behalf. (At this point of the research, I do not address the issue of whether there was a discursive 'break' in the Christianities of the time – similar to the discursive epistemic 'break' in the Human Sciences of language, life and labour, toward the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries (cf. Foucault ([1970] 1982b)[6].

2 Background

In order for the churches to have had space for their development of their own processes and projects for taking social responsibility for populations – both in Europe and the colonies – the notion of 'civil society' was fundamental as it developed since the seventeenth century. Their initiatives also fall within the ambit of the variable 'Social Contract' tradition as put forward by Thomas Hobbes (1651), John Locke (1689), and especially Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1782; cf. also Pletsch 1996). The significant difference though, was that whereas the philosophers argued for the existence of 'civil society' and a related 'moral civil liberty' vis-à-vis the universal 'state of nature' underlying

---

especially during times where certain regions of the world, or maybe even the world of scholarship in some combined fashion, undergo some form of epochal transformation. The so-called 'linguistic turn' – where Saussurian linguistics impacted the cultural and social sciences – and the 'cultural turn' and the 'social turn' dating from the 1980s and 1990s respectively, are examples. With the rise of Information Technology and social media, and the increasing 'globalising' of the world, we are currently living through such an era, because there is socio-cultural data about our world that is being produced in society, that previous problematizations and objectifications and conceptualizations – or paradigms/ epistemes – cannot deal with analytically and interpretively. (On request of a reviewer, I repeat this note on the issue of episteme, in 'Social Responsibility and Power I').

[6] The issue at stake, concerns the actual status of what the perception of Christianity or the Christianities, of the time were with regard to the emergence of the discourses on language, life, and labour as 'science' (cf. Foucault 1980:197.)

civilization, the Christian denominations based their understanding of their self-organisation, and that of their communities, on Scripture and also (in some denominations) on the Reformed tradition and its Presbyterian system (cf. Tomkins 2010). As such, they organised themselves in local ecclesiastical organisations – the local churches or presbyteries – which formed the basis of the church denomination and its social responsibility outreach programmes. In general, Foucault ([1973] 1994: 60) says:

> … at a relatively low levels of the social scale, [these] spontaneous groups of persons … assigned themselves, without any delegation from a higher authority, *the task of maintaining order* and of *creating new instruments for ensuring order*, for their own purposes. These groups were numerous, and they proliferated during the entire eighteenth century (e.a.).

In England, Foucault ([1973] 1994:60-64) points out – as I also did with regard to the founding and organisation of the anti-slavery movement and its developments (cf. Smit 2016b:10) – that these initiatives originated amongst the Quakers in the late seventeenth century through the eighteenth century, and amongst the Methodists, especially in the second half of the eighteenth century. The nonconformist Christian Religious organisations and churches joined by some Anglican clergy in the late eighteenth century – attempted amongst others to root out 'drunkenness, adultery, refusal to work', and took on the dual task of 'supervision and welfare assistance'.

> They took on the task of helping *those who didn't possess the means of subsistence, those too old to work, the sick, the mentally ill*. At the same time as they offered assistance, though, they accorded themselves the possibility and right to *observe the conditions* in which the assistance was given: observing whether the individual who wasn't working, was actually ill, whether his poverty and his misery were not due to debauchery, drunkenness, the vices. So these [Christian movements] involved groups *establishing their own internal supervision*, one with a *deeply religious origin, operation, and ideology* (e.a.; Foucault [1973] 1994:60f).

In summary, on the Methodists, Foucault ([1973] 1994:61) points out that John Wesley revived the essentially secular movement, the Society for the

Reform of Manners dating from the late 1700s, in the second half of the eighteenth century.

> It set out to *reform manners* getting peoples to *respect Sunday, …… preventing gambling and drunkenness, curbing prostitution, adultery, cursing, blasphemy – everything that might show contempt for God*. As Wesley said in his sermons, it was a matter of *preventing the lowest and basest class from taking advantage of inexperienced young people and fleecing them for money* (e.a.).

Important for our argument – with Van der Kemp asserting the importance of land ownership by the Khoi (cf. Smit 2017a) – is that the religious development of their organisations in England differed from those in France, except with regard to how land-ownership developed, which was similar in both counties (cf. Foucault [1973] 1994:69f).

> [They] … formed from the petty bourgeoisie …. [and] organized themselves to try to suppress vice, to reform manners, were lower-middle class-citizens, grouped together for the obvious purpose of establishing *order* among themselves and around them. But this desire to establish order was basically *a way of escaping from political powe*r, because the latter possessed a formidable, terrifying, and sanguinary instrument – penal legislation. Indeed, for more than three hundred kinds of offense one could be hung [in England]. This meant that it was very easy for authority, for the aristocracy, for those who controlled the juridical apparatus, to bring terrible pressures on the popular strata. It is easy to understand how it was in the interest of religious groups to try and escape from a judicial authority so bloodthirsty and threatening (Foucault [1973] 1994:62f).
>
> …. To escape that judicial authority, individuals organized into moral reform societies, prohibited drunkenness, prostitution, theft, everything that would enable state power to attack the group, destroy it, to use any pretext to send people to the gallows. So it was more a matter of groups for self-defense against the law than of effective surveillance organizations. The strengthening of self-organized penal processes was a way of escaping from the penal regime of the state (Foucault [1973] 1994:63).

In the course of the eighteenth century, as these groups became more wealthy, they shifted their focus away from the recruiting of the petit-bourgeois. This was the second phase.

> … At the end of the eighteenth century, it was the aristocracy, the bishops, the richest persons who were initiated into these groups of moral self-defense, these leagues for the elimination of vice.
>
> We thus have a social shift that indicates perfectly well how this moral reform enterprise stopped being a penal self-defense and became, on the contrary, a reinforcing power of penal justice itself. Alongside the dreadful penal instrument it possessed, state power was to lay claim to these instruments of pressure, of control. What was involved, in a sense, was *a mechanism for bringing social control organizations under state control* (Foucault [1973] 1994:63).

This shift or second phase in eighteenth century in England, meant that,

> This moral control was exerted by the upper classes, the holders of power, over the lower, poorer strata, the popular strata. It thus became an instrument for the wealthy over the poor, for the exploiting over the exploited, which conferred a new political and social polarity on these [Christian religious] agencies of control (Foucault [1973] 1994:63).

Whereas the aristocracy and bourgeois class did not themselves conform to the morality that was proclaimed by these Christian religious organizations – who still represented the petit bourgeoisie and poor, Foucault goes on to show that they appealed to them to also conform to the morality, so as to set 'an example' to the petit bourgeois and poor. Otherwise 'the poor [would] follow the example of the rich in not observing the laws'. Even though these laws were not made for the rich, if they would set the example, 'there will be at least the possibility of controlling and supervising the poorer classes' (cf. Foucault [1973] 1994:64). Foucault interprets these developments further, by saying:

> In this gradual state takeover – in this transfer of the points of control from the hands of the petit-bourgeois groups trying to escape from state power to those of the social group actually holding power – in

> this whole evolution, we can observe how a morality with a religious origin was brought into and disseminated in a state appropriated penal system that, by definition, turned a blind eye to the immoral conduct [of the rich] and vowed to cut the ties with morality and religion. Bourgeois ideology, arisen and nurtured in the little Quaker and Methodist groups in England at the end of the eighteenth century, now sprang up at the other pole, at the other extremity of the social scale, on the side of power at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Foucault [1973] 1994:64)[7].

Against this background I then continue my analysis of Van der Kemp's social responsibility and interventions for an on behalf of the Khoi. As such, it formed part of the beginning of the numerous interventions of the missions and individual missionaries and ministers – both black and white – on behalf of the indigenous population vis-à-vis at least the first half of the nineteenth century colonial government. (How these formed part of this 'state takeover' of the petit bourgeois organisations, by the bourgeois, will be explicated at a later stage.)

3 Useful Pedagogy

For the pedagogy associated with the criminal and vagabond, the first question concerns identification. Eighteenth-century intellectuals developed 'tables' of crime, where crimes were described in detail. The most significant concerned those criminals who perpetrated crimes related to property, and for the frontier Khoi, due to their 'want of food' and the fact that they did not have land on which to work, this meant that the only option open was 'vices of every kind, which may end in plundering, murders and irregularities of a different nature' (LMS TVDK 1801:496). For Van der Kemp, in his estimation, they were functioning similarly to the criminals and vagabonds in the early industrialising Europe due to their want of land, their inability to work for their own well-being, and their struggle for survival. They were not useful, but according to

[7] France was different, in that it functioned through the *lettres de cachet* that mainly the land owners and bourgeois brought through the system to the king, for the incarceration of the poor and petit bourgeoisie – cf. Foucault ([1973] 1994:64-67).

the then penal laws in Europe, 'harmful to society' (cf. Foucault 19914a:53).

In Europe, due to the general increase of wealth and the production of goods during the eighteenth-century, and compared to medieval laws, crime, punishment and the legal process were also transformed (cf. Foucault 19914a:52ff). From a situation where crimes and punishment were mostly related to blood, they now became ever more related to goods.

> ... the shift from a criminality of blood to a criminality of fraud forms part of a whole complex mechanism, embracing the development of production, the increase of wealth, a higher juridical and moral value placed on property relations, stricter methods of surveillance, a tighter partitioning of the population, more efficient techniques of locating and obtaining information: the shift in illegal practices is correlative with an extension and a refinement of punitive practices (Foucault 1979:77).

In this transformation, the reformers of justice developed a whole new 'economy of power'. This was directed by the desire to do away with the excesses of the old economy and a replacing of the 'super-power' of the sovereign by that of civil society. The crime of pilfering or the illegal appropriation of ownership was not against the sovereign as in medieval Europe (cf. Foucault 1994a:42f), but against society and its citizens. The aim of the new economy was to 'insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body', to punish with greater universality, and 'punish better' (Foucault 1979:78-82).

The identification of other criminals in general was just as easy - they were those people who did not live and function as citizens: the 'vagabonds in the woods' and the 'lazy'. By definition, such people had already excluded themselves from civil society and the body politic. They did not function as citizens. They constituted the 'idle' who lived off the produce of others. It is for such people that the utilitarians developed a 'useful pedagogy'. Foucault (1979:122) comments:

> The useful pedagogy would revive for the lazy individual a liking for work, force him back into a system of interests in which labour would be more advantageous than laziness, form around him a small miniature, simplified, coercive society in which the maxim '*he who*

> *wants to live must work*', would be clearly revealed. *Work would be compulsory*, but so too would be *remuneration*, which enables the [criminal/ prisoner] to improve his lot during and after detention [instruction]. *'The man who does not find his subsistence must be made to desire to procure it for himself by work; he is offered it by supervision and discipline; in a sense, he is forced to acquire it; he is then tempted by the bait of gain; corrected in his morals, accustomed to work, his anxiety aroused by the little money he has kept for his release', he has learned to trade 'that will guarantee a subsistence without danger'* (Vilan) (e.a.).

This pedagogical process derives from the sixteenth-century cell in the monastery. The birth of *homo oeconomicus* and the religious conscience of the cell are here representationally co-extensive. The same rules of 'time-table', 'prohibitions and obligations, continual supervision, exhortations, religious readings, a whole complex of methods "to draw toward good" and "to turn away from evil" held the prisoners [and learners] in its grip ...'. But these mechanisms also meant the transformation of the individual through religious readings, the bible, prayer, and these practices' timetables. Habits of daily work had to be inculcated if the edification or rehabilitation of the individual was at stake. Work had to be done on the prisoner's soul continuously. The prison was a system of 'altering minds' and of rehabilitating individuals to accept their duties as full citizens and members of society - thereby becoming mutually responsible for the contract all shared (cf. Foucault 1979:122,120).

It appears as if the 'ideas' Van der Kemp advanced on the projected mission institution for the Khoi as well as how it became established and eventually functioned, fit this exposition of the 'useful pedagogy' – even though not in the context of the 'prison'. If seeing the Khoi as idle and lazy, and engaging 'vices of every kind, which may end in plundering, murders and irregularities of a different nature', made their existence criminal by definition, then to change this to a 'useful' existence, meant a whole arsenal of technologies of power. A few points can be made with regard to these assumptions.

Firstly, whenever Van der Kemp had the opportunity, he followed a rigorous daily, weekly, and monthly timetable of scripture readings, preaching, prayer, catechism, and schooling - on the ship, the Hillsborrough *en route* to the Cape in 1799, his trek to the Eastern Cape beyond the then frontier, his time

in the area of Ngqika, the time spent at Graaff Reinet, Bota's Place and also when Bethelsdorp was founded. Like timetables drawn up for the prisons, factories, schools, orphanages and academies in Europe, Van der Kemp's timetables also had to effect the training of a disciplined and useful individual. In proper institutional context, this indicates how time was used to exert disciplinary power over the body. In this context, Foucault (1979:125) observes:

> They are processes that effect a transformation of the individual as a whole - of his body and of his habits by the daily work that he is forced to perform, of his mind and his will by the spiritual attentions that are paid to him: 'Bibles and other books of religious practice are provided; the clergy of the different obediences to be found in the town and suburbs perform the services once a week and any other edifying person may have access to the prisoners at any time' (Teeters). But this transformation is entrusted to the administration itself. Solitude and self-examination are not enough; nor are purely religious exhortations. Work on the prisoner's soul must be carried out as often as possible. The prison, though an administrative apparatus, will at the same time be a machine for altering minds.

Secondly, the work on the 'soul' of the individual - mostly referred to as 'experimental meetings', presumably indicating an in-depth questioning and discussion of the spiritual state or well-being of individuals - often referred to in the Van der Kemp texts, did not merely indicate what Van der Kemp called the giving of 'a description of the present state of your soul' (LMS I TVDK 1801:491). As far as 'soul' is concerned, it meant that the power over the body - exerted through the timetable - was reduplicated in a strategic or tactical micro-physics of power on the soul, on the 'non-corporal' (cf. Foucault [1975] 1979: 29). The 'soul' was:

> ... the present correlative of a certain technology of power over the body .... it exists, it has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished [instructed] - and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those who are stuck at a machine and

> supervised for the rest of their lives. This is the historical reality of this soul, which, unlike the soul represented by Christian theology, is not born in sin and subject to punishment, but is born rather out of methods of punishment, supervision and constraint. This real, non-corporal soul is not a substance; it is the element in which are articulated the effects of a certain power and the reference of a certain type of knowledge, the machinery by which the power relations give rise to a possible corpus of knowledge, and knowledge extends and reinforces the effects of this power .... The soul is the effect and instrument of political anatomy; the soul is the prison of the body (Foucault 1979: 29f).

Thirdly, if the Khoi were to be 'instructed' to become 'disciplined' and 'civilized', then, if they remained 'wretches' - a term Van der Kemp on at least one occasion also used for the frontier farmers - this meant that they continued to exist as 'criminals' against the citizenry. In this context, a 'wretched state' representationally indicated 'want of food, clothing, &c' and 'a life of plundering', while 'to be taken into [the missionary] Institution' meant an entry into being 'instructed in the knowledge of God' (LMS II AR 1803:160f).

Instruction and the 'useful pedagogy', then, meant the defence and protection of society. To remain a 'wretch', however, was to be equivalent to a 'monster', 'traitor' and an 'enemy of all'. This 'enemy of all',

> ... whom it is in the interest of all to track down, falls outside the pact, disqualifies himself as a citizen and emerges, bearing within him, as it were, wild fragments of nature; he appears as a villain, a monster, a madman, perhaps, a sick and, before long, an 'abnormal' individual. It is as such that, one day, we will belong to a scientific objectification and to the 'treatment' that is correlative to it (Foucault 1979:101).

The institutionalisation of the Khoi, then, meant that this event formed part of that whole divisioning which took place in Europe at the beginning of the nineteenth-century - where 'modern' society divided all social 'wretches' like madmen, criminals, the ill from the public sphere, had them incarcerated in institutions especially devised for them, and gave rise to the educational, bureaucratic and professional arrangements in and around them. It also gave rise to the production of various (disciplinary) knowledges related to these institutions. In all this, the modern individual was to emerge as the object of

knowledge. But such objectification was not applied to him (or her) from the outside; it originated 'in the very tactics of power and [in] the arrangement of its exercise' (Foucault 1979:102).

Fourthly, in the same way that the monster in natural history, illness in medicine, and crime in penal reform were seen as examples of 'disorder', social disorder representationally mirrored the disorder of illness. Van der Kemp used this concept especially for illness, but then as it afflicted a group of people - through an 'epidemic fever' - indicating its social significance, or a person's total existence - causing one to 'approach' death (cf. LMS I TVDK 1800:418; LMS II AR 1804:240). Once, however, he does refer to 'disorder' in the sense of non-civilized existence - when he reported that the missionaries did not 'oppos[e] the *disorders* of the savages but by christian admonitions and examples, of which they could see the effects in our [Khoi's] (LMS I EJBP 1802:89; e.a.). In terms of their impact on the Khoi, he also frequently referred to the missionaries' impact on the 'order' they created for and with them.

According to Janssens' understanding, Van der Kemp should promote the movement from 'disorder' to 'order', which should constitute the prime objective of his mission among the Khoi. In his 'Instructions to Van der Kemp' of May 31 1803, he says under articles 11 and 14:

> 11. The Institute has to *co-operate in the maintenance of general order, peace and safety*[8]. ….
> 14. Van der Kemp must use his influence to pacify Khoikhoi like Stuurman and *guide them to order and submission to the government*[9].

So the missionaries' prime civil impact on the Khoi – also those 'plundering' groups beyond he colonial frontier – should be that of bringing [civil] order, peace, and safety. This also meant their pacification – cf. below – and their 'submission' to the colonial government.

In Janssens' 'Proclamation' of 1805, this was specified even more clearly. Here he explicitly refers to the 'ideas of social order' 'in the "mother country"' – meaning revolutionary Batavian Holland – and compares that with 'this colony'. Missionary teaching was to be instrumental towards the promotion of that order. Moreover, as part of the power of the colonial

---

[8] This is echoed by Fiscal Van Ryneveld – cf. Bannister (1930: clvi).
[9] Stuurman was regarded as 'vagabond', cf. Bannister (1830: clv).

government, the missionaries were warned to only ‘pray openly’ for ‘the Batavian republic and this colony’ and no other. Janssens wrote:

> 12. As far as the capacity for the [Indigenous Inhabitants] is fit for comprehending *the first ideas of social order, such as exists in the mother country, and in this colony*, the Missionaries be *obliged to teach them* and the Missionaries be prohibited *to pray openly* in the institutions already established or that may be established hereafter, *for any other power or government, than for that of the Batavian republic and this colony* (LMS II P 1805:12).

To accommodate the monster even though it did not fit the natural history tables, to heal illness, to reform the criminal, and educate the lazy all simultaneously signified not only the restoration of social order, but also the prevention of the spread of social disorder. This meant that education and punishment acquired an added significance: these technologies were intended not merely to transform criminal existence and deter people from criminal acts, but to create a whole arsenal of signs which, once instilled in the ‘conscience’ of the social body, would in general prevent the future repetition and multiplication of this existence and its crimes - and therefore of disorder. This made the ‘mind’ and ‘soul’ of the citizen the target of instruction and educational technologies. As such, Van der Kemp’s teaching of ‘reading and writing’ to indigenous people but also ‘printing and publication’ - three of the most important focuses of Van der Kemp’s educational practices - receive archival significance: these were the means through which the mind could be influenced by multiple signs, giving rise to an economy of instruction. Not only the institutionalised body but also the mind had to be influenced - ‘or rather a play of representations and signs circulating discreetly but necessarily and evidently in the minds of all’ (Foucault 1979:101). The purpose was to create social order - or at least ‘the first ideas’ of it.

In the *fifth* place, Van der Kemp was to facilitate the transformation of the Khoi from ‘useless’ and ‘unhappy’ members of society, to ‘useful’ and ‘happy’ ones. In his letter to British Governor Francis Dundas, for example, he said under points 1 and 6:

> 1. ... [that the Khoi were to be] formed into a regular society; and, in the second place, [promote] the *temporal happiness and usefulness of this Society with respect to the country at large* (e.a.). ….

> 6. As we are of opinion that the rule laid down by Paul *'that if any would not work, neither should he eat'*, ought to be strictly observed in every Christian Society, our intention is to discourage idleness and laziness and to have all the individuals of our institution, as much as circumstances shall admit, employed in different *useful occupations, for the cultivation of their rational faculties or exercise of the body, as means of subsistence, and of promoting the well-fare of this society and the colony at large.* These occupations may be referred either to agriculture and farming, the management of cattle, or mechanical arts, and little manufacturies, e.g. soap-boiling, candle-making, spinning of thread, manufacturing of paper, tanning, potting, brickmaking, turnery, &c. (e.a.; cf. also the 'Reflections' in LMS I L1 1802:506).

Closely related to usefulness' or 'useful occupations' as he explicated, on behalf of the Khoi themselves and the colony, is also 'temporal happiness'. Significantly, from archival perspective, this meant how citizens 'experience' their 'existence' or the 'good feeling on earth in connection with the affirmation of everyday life'[10].

In the *sixth* place, the interrelationship of a person being able to take responsibility for his or her own subsistence and the dictum that all must work in order to eat (negatively stated above), also link up with Van der Kemp's exposition of payment for work done. Such payment was to be given for the 'occupations' mentioned under five above.

> 7. As the introduction of these employments will involve the European Missionary Societies in considerable expences, the workmen should be considered as journeymen in the service of the Society and be paid weekly for their labour; but the products of their labours should be the property of the Society and sold for its benefit. The fund, however, arising from the sale of these articles shall be entirely devoted for charitable institutions of a missionary nature …. e.g. the erection of other missionary settlements, an orphan house in which abandoned and fatherless children may be educated, or the subsistence of the sick, old and poor.

[10] Cf. Zefnik's 2014:ix; as well as his Chapters 4 – 6, in his study of Foucault's oeuvre focused on the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; cf. also Smit 2017.

> By these measures we intend not to preclude any one, who by his industry and diligence shall be enabled to elevate himself above the class of journeymen from becoming a master and proprietor of his own business.

Apart from introducing a new economic system into the Colony through these proposals, on the level of the technologies of power, this explicitly links up with the kind of exposition Foucault gave above. Of special significance here is that the labours of the Khoi at the mission were to benefit the mission. This not only indicated a certain understanding of 'usefulness' but also ownership - everything was to belong to the institution and used for its benefit and expansion. As for the economy, it was to be not a subsistence economy or self-help scheme, but a money economy: all the workers at the mission were to be paid by the LMS - giving also the rationale for the continued complaints concerning the shortage of money at the mission. The proposal does allow though for individuals through their own 'industry and diligence' to become 'a master and proprietor of his own business'.

These data provide some idea as to how Van der Kemp indeed formed part of the eighteenth-century understanding of power and how his own exertion to educate the Khoi to be 'useful' - was to be used for making individuals into disciplined, civilised, useful and happy members of society, in the interests of creating social 'order'. The fact therefore, that he organised those who subjected themselves to the missionaries' 'discipline' according to an 'analytic pedagogy' adds a further perspective on how he formed part of a particular colonising epistemic formation of power.

4 Analytic Pedagogy

Van der Kemp's analytic scholarly interests in language (cf. Smit 2001), especially his interest in starting language education from the monosyllable, also has significance in the context of the technologies of power. This significance does not only lie in the representational understanding of language, but also in how this kind of language education had its own hierarchical analysis as part of how it was constituted. Foucault (1979:160) provides an overview in this regard.

> At the beginning of the eighteenth century Demia suggested a division of the process of learning to read into seven levels: the first, for those

> who are beginning to learn the letters, the second for those who are learning to spell, the third for those who are learning to join syllables together to make words, the fourth for those who are reading Latin in sentences or from punctuation to punctuation, the fifth for those who are beginning to read French, the sixth for the best readers, the seventh for those who can read manuscripts. But, where there are a great many pupils, further subdivisions were have to be introduced; the first class would comprise four streams; one for those who are learning the 'simple letter'; a second for those who are learning the 'mixed' letters; a third for those who are learning the abbreviated letters (*â, ê* ...); a fourth for those who are learning the double letters (*ff, ss, tt, st*). The second class would be divided into three streams for those who 'count each letter allowed before spelling the syllable, D.O., DO'; for those 'who spell the most difficult syllables, such as *bant brand spinx*' etc. (Demia). Each stage in the combinatory of elements must be inscribed within a great temporal series, which is both a natural progress of the mind and a code for educative procedures.

Such a process of education also led to individualising activities. It gave rise to the generating of knowledge of individuals, and also to their grouping within distinct classes, indicating a certain hierarchy. Foucault (1979:126) explains:

> This ever-growing knowledge of the individuals made it possible to divide them up in the prison not so much according to their crimes as according to the dispositions that they revealed. The prison became a sort of permanent observatory that made it possible to distribute the varieties of vice or weakness. From 1779, the prisoners were divided into four classes: the first for those who were explicitly condemned to solitary confinement or who had committed serious offences in the prison; the second for those who were 'well-known as old offenders ... whose depraved morality, dangerous character, irregular dispositions, or disorderly conduct' became apparent during the time they were in prison; the third, for those 'whose character and circumstances, before and after conviction, lead one to believe that they were not habitual offenders'; the fourth and last was a special section, a probationary class for those whose character was still not known, or who, if they

> were better known, did not deserve to be put in the preceding category (Teeters). A whole corpus of individualizing knowledge was being organized that took as its field of reference not so much the crime committed (at least in isolation), but the potentiality of danger that lies hidden in an individual and which is manifested in his observed everyday conduct. The prison functions in this as an *apparatus of knowledge* (e.a. Foucault 1979:126).

Similar to the hierarchising of education and other institutions such as prisons in Europe – apparatuses of knowledge – in his scheme, Van der Kemp divided individuals, in this case, settlers in Graaff Reinet in his religious instruction, into three classes.

> The settlers are to be divided as Christians, Catechumens and Hearers. By the last we understand Heathen who will flock to us to hear the word of God. By Catechumens, Heathen who are more particularly under our inspection and care, are instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel and submit to ecclesiastical discipline. Christians are those who will bring forth fruits of conversion, and are by baptism initiated as members of the church (LMS I EL1 1801:498).

This same scheme is duplicated and expanded in the text printed as 'African Missions'. This is the text which provided the rules according to which the LMS missions in areas under Batavian rule would be directed by the Dutch Missionary Society. It is said that Van der Kemp was not only the one who proposed this text, but that he also made a substantial contribution to it. The text reads:

> The people collected there being all Africans, or particularly [Khoi], ought, in order to have a regular plan of occupations for the Brethren Missionaries among them, to be considered as,
>
> 1. Baptized Christians, who already, by confession and baptism, are converted from Paganism to the Christian faith, and therefore are a Christian congregation among the Heathen, and who are in want of edification and confirmation in their faith:
> 2. As Catechumens, who receive instruction in the doctrine of the Gospel, and are prepared to be, from time to time, accepted as baptized into the congregation:

3. As Heathens, who are not yet admitted to the instruction, but must be brought into the kingdom of Christ, by making known to them the Gospel (LMS II AR 1803:170).

Such procedures meant that power was not only articulated directly onto time, but also space - a certain hierarchy which ensured social 'control' and 'progress' from one level or category to another, and analogical to that found in European educational systems.

But, if this was so for the Khoi, then the mission as an institution, itself, had to be organised in the interests of discipline and order.

5 Institutionalisation

In his recommendations to Governor Dundas, Van der Kemp set the pattern of mission institutions – according to how the missionaries were to form part of it and the basis on which people would be admitted or excluded.

Significant on the first point, is that the missionaries were not to lead a separate existence from the Khoi, but were to live with them and set 'an example' for them. Van der Kemp says:

> 2. The chief object and aim of the Missionaries, under which direction this settlement shall be established, ought to be to promote the knowledge of Christ, and the practice of real piety*, both by instruction and example, among the [Khoi] and other Heathen*, who shall be admitted, and *formed into a regular society*; and, *in the second place, the temporal happiness and usefulness of this Society with respect to the country at large* (e.a.).

That Van der Kemp integrated himself into the conditions and lives of the people he served is evident on numerous counts. He often refers to Xhosa and Khoi sleeping with him in his tent - on one occasion, including Ngqika. More significantly, for those who desired it, he often took people up in his household.

On individuals joining Van der Kemp's household, one report refers to the baptism of Mary Staffels who was not only 'educated' by the missionaries but also taken into 'our family' after her father was killed (LMS II AR 1804:237f). And, when Van der Kemp and Read had to leave for the

Cape in 1805, Van der Kemp reports that they had 'twelve souls' in their company - 'four brethren and two sisters' which included the [Khoi] wife of Read and the son of the Xhosa 'Captain Zautzoe', 'who was committed by his father to our care' (LMS II AR 1805:2).

Even so, at least on one occasion, he mentions that a woman taken up into his household in this manner, was most helpful in the household chores. However, it is evident from his vehement opposition to slavery and the fact that he washed his own clothes and linen, even in old age, that he took as much responsibility for his own daily chores as possible. It is evident from Van der Kemp's immersion into conditions of the people he made the object of his mission activities and from the fact that he and Read married a Mallagasi and Khoi woman respectively, that he did not form part of that discourse which would develop into a difference of class between missionaries and indigenous people they missionised in the nineteenth-century.

As far as their 'desire' or 'wish' to be instructed or join the mission is concerned, Van der Kemp continually reported on such persons. What is significant here is the rationale behind each of these reports minuted. On February 7 1800, Ngqika mentioned to Koenraad Buys that he,

> ... imagined, one time or other, he should be a Christian; and that his mother also [the rain maker of the Xhosa at that stage and also sovereign of the Tambouchi 'nation'] and another woman, wished to be instructed in the Christian religion (LMS I TVDK 1800:413).

On February 8, Ngqika repeated this request (LMS I TVDK 1800:414) as far as he himself was concerned. On this occasion, it was in the context of a request to Van der Kemp to 'pray' for 'two of his [three] wives [who] were dangerously ill'. For July 12 1800, Van der Kemp mentions that '[t]wo other *[Khoi]* women and a girl came to school for instruction', and that on July 20, two women belonging to these women's (Sarah's) family, also 'resolved to apply for instruction' (LMS TVDK 1800:420). Nearly a year later, again, Van der Kemp says that,

> Bruntjie brought us a message from the famous Klaas Stuurman, chief of the *[Khoi]* nation, *requesting us to come and settle at the Zwartkops river, that he and his people might be instructed in the doctrine of Christ*. This Captain Klaas had been the terror of the country, and

> committed, perhaps, more murders than any man upon earth. Having consulted my dear brother Read on this subject, *we were of opinion to decline, for the present, this request*, as we were employed in instructing a number of [Khoi], and expecting the return of Gika's [Xhosa], in order to re-establish the mission in [Xhosaland], if it should be the will of God. We promised, however, to take the mission to the Zwartkop's river into consideration (LMS I TVDK 1801:482).

This request by Stuurman on July 1 1801, was repeated on October 7 1801 - i.e. 'to be instructed in the Christian religion' (LMS I TVDK 1801:493).

On his brief return to Xhosaland, when he met up with Ngqika again, Van der Kemp says that Ngqika requested him to come and settle there.

> He said, that he should be happy if we were willing to live again in his country; and upon *my asking him if he would favour our design to instruct his people? he answered, that as to himself he was willing to receive instruction*, and that those of his subjects, who did not choose to follow his example, might let it alone .... (LMS I TVDK 1801:489; e.a.).

This theme of requesting instruction surfaces again on December 5 1803 when Van der Kemp writes:

> ... the [Xhosa] Captain, Gola, came to us, with his wife and four [Xhosa]. His object in coming, he said, was to hear if he could be taken up in *our Institution*, as he wished to be separated from his own people, whose irregular conduct exposed him to the greatest dangers; and *to be instructed (as he said) in the knowledge of good and evil* ... (LMS II AR 1803:164; e.a.).

On the one hand, these reports on requests for instruction may indicate Van der Kemp's playing up to the LMS Directors and the readers of the *Transactions*. Apart from other interpretations, it may also indicate the desire by these people to position themselves outside the silent dynamics of conflict in which they were caught up on and beyond the frontier. On yet another level, it may also show how the Khoi and Xhosa realised that the 'culture' Van der Kemp represented, could be appropriated and be put to use in their indigenous cultural resistance to the encroaching colonising settler culture.

As far as admission and expulsion are concerned, Van der Kemp advised in his letter to Governor Dundas:

> 3. Into this Society only those ought to be admitted who will engage themselves to *live according to the rules of its institution*.
> 4. The actual *admission and expulsion from this Society shall entirely depend upon the judgement of the Missionaries ...* (LMS I TVDK 1801:497; e.a.).

Apart from the events precipitated by 'admission', it appears that Van der Kemp's actual admission into instruction was subject to the decision of the people making the request, to 'leave off drunkenness, swearing, stealing, whoredom, &c.' and to become 'subject to our discipline' (LMS I TVDK 1801:483,486). To this may be added, resolutions to 'leave [a] former life of plundering' (LMS II AR 1803:160f).

On exclusion, Van der Kemp suggested to Dundas as follows:

> 10. *We have no severer punishment than excommunication from the church and expulsion from the Society*. If we shall be compelled to proceed to this last step, we shall think it our duty to acquaint the Landdrosst of the district with the case (LMS I L1 1801:498).

This practice of 'excommunication' was only carried out when 'adultery' was concerned, also reflecting the patriarchal attitude in the mission. In their Annual Report for 1804, Van der Kemp and Read report that:

> We have been obliged to cut off from our communion, one of our sisters on account of adultery; and to dismiss from our institution the person with whom she was guilty (LMS II AR 1804:241).

As for the general regulations of the mission, the text, 'African Missions' - instigated by Van der Kemp's submissions to the LMS as well as the Dutch Missionary Society - became necessary with the changeover of government from British to Batavian rule. Mostly regulatory in nature it treats the following issues, and speaks for itself.

Concerning the general instructions of the missions, nine points were made which had to function as 'general plan'. These concern,

1) 'religion' and its articulation with 'civil and social affairs';
2) the position of the head or Superintendent of the mission;
3) the division of public and private instruction duties among missionaries and/ or teachers at a mission, [which is the responsibility of the Superintendent];
4) the position(s) for and the actual organisation of the school;
5) the position(s) for and organisation of the 'social concerns' of the mission;
6) the aim of all these regulations - to 'promote the general happiness';
7) conducting regular meetings for the missionaries and teachers 'religiously' - i.e. to 'begin with prayer and close with thanksgiving' - in which issues relevant to the mission are discussed, such as:
7.1) the sending of missionaries into parts of Africa 'to extend more and more the Gospel';
7.2) 'provisions and necessaries' - of which 'bills of exchange' had to be sent to the Netherlands Missionary Society (NMS) treasurer - Mr. Uytenbroek;
7.3) their 'cloaths, and other necessaries of the kind';
8) keeping a journal 'in which everything remarkable [was] to be daily written', and of which at least an 'extract' was to be sent to the NMS every six months;
9) choosing 'by majority' another Superintendent in the case of the death of a current one - of which the Directors were to be informed as soon as possible (LMS II AR 1803:172).

Then follow specific rules for each of the positions in a missionary 'establishment' (LMS II AR 1803:173-175): 1) the Principal and Minister; 2) the Director of the School - married male; 3) two Schoolmasters and teachers - two unmarried males; 4) one male, to function as Regulator of the civil and household affairs; 5) one male, to function as Coadjutor of the Regulator of the social affairs. For these positions, women are not mentioned.

The issues and their content broached in these regulations and rules all impact on 1) the question of the sovereignty of religion during the eighteenth-century; 2) 'exchange'; and, obviously, 3) the disciplinary power involved through the mission station as knowledge apparatus. The generalised statement as to the aim of all these regulations (point 6), however, shows that the general framework was to be seen within the context of the utilitarian philosophy one

of promoting 'general happiness' (LMS II AR 1803: 171).

This text was in effect the outcome of the suggestion Van der Kemp initially made to Governor Dundas as article 9 about two years earlier - that '[g]ood order and domestic discipline is to be maintained by the missionaries themselves' (LMS I TVDK 1801:498).

Furthermore, the text, 'Extracts from the Journals of Dr. Van der Kemp and Mr. Read after their settlement at Bota's Place' contains important information on the institutionalising activities activated with settlement in 1802. It covers issues such as available grass, timber, and limestone; housing and how Van der Kemp meted out eight hundred square paces for each Khoi family; regular meetings related to worship, instruction in reading and writing, sermons, catechism, love-feasts, experimental meetings and the printing of a spelling book containing 3138 monosyllables (LMS I EJBP 1802:82-95).

Due to the fact that some of the Khoi did not settle permanently at Bota's Place and would stay in the woods around it, Van der Kemp thought it important to acquire a bell, at the ringing of which people could come from the woods to attend the various meetings at the mission. They acquired one by default when a ship sent from Governor Dundas to the frontier, sank and its bell washed up on shore (LMS EJBP II 1802:85f).

As far as institutional activities and events in general are concerned, one unnamed woman at Bethelsdorp was appointed to take responsibility for 'the spiritual inspection of our women' as well as those at Graaff Reinet (LMS II AR 1804:238). It also relates that Van der Kemp and Read printed an outline of 'Christian religion in the form of a catechism' in Khoi, called *Tzitzika Thuickwedi miko Khwekhwenama - Principles of the word of God for the [Khoi] nation* (LMS II AR 1804:239).

At Bethelsdorp, they had

> seven persons chosen as a kind of Judges, to settle small quarrels and disputes, which daily take place, too numerous for us to attend to, and of too little importance to be brought before the magistrate of the country (LMS II AR 1803:165f).

As far as rites were concerned, baptism was the most important one symbolising entrance into the 'Society' or 'Institution' - not 'church' - as a full member. For this reason, Van der Kemp and Read included statistics of those baptised annually. From Briggs (1952:65), these statistics are as follows:

Year	Adults baptised	Children baptised
1806	9	15
1807	3	11
1808	7	9
1809	4	14
1810	4	10
1811	0	6

These then provide some information on Van der Kemp's institutionalising of his mission. Needless to say, whatever he did was to be approved by first the British and then the Dutch Batavian colonial governments. As such, he was not free from instructions, directives and dictates of the colonial government, similar to the constraints of state in Britain upon civil society organisations such as the nonconformist and reformed religious organisations in the late eighteenth century. They could only operate within the space, and according to the reason of state the government provided.

6 The Colonial Government

From the extensive correspondence of Van der kemp with the governors, it is evident that, from government perspective, there was a two-way split it had to regulate with regard to the mission: one marked the colonial government's regulation of missionary institutions and their practices - the nature of the labours of the missionaries among the Khoi as this impacted on government; the other was the regulation of the interaction of the Khoi at the mission stations with the farmers and those on the farms with the mission stations.

Firstly, in his 'Instructions' to Van der Kemp (May 31 1803), Janssens, for example, started off his letter by saying:

> *The present situation of your [Khoi], being unemployed and destitute is utterly untenable*. The new place allocated to you on the Roodepan, which on your request will be known in future as Bethelsdorp, is very suitable for cattle-breeding, cultivation of wheat and vegetables. The details pertaining to this will later be specified (in Enklaar 1988:131; Briggs 1952:37f; e.a.).

And, on the 'Moravian establishment at the Baviaans Clove', he said in his

'Proclamation', the mission had to endeavour,

> ... to act in all respects according to the *intention of the government ... to impress upon the Natives as much as possible industry*, and *to convince them of the bad consequences from idleness* (LMS II P 1805:235).

Van der Kemp shared these sentiments - Khoi 'destitution', 'unemployment, 'industry' and 'idleness' and other perspectives on such issues as they were part of the common archive in Europe. However, to get a thriving mission established was not easy.

In one of his most poignant statements, Van der Kemp gives a report on the 'state of poverty' of the Khoi:

> .... *Others choose to lie in the bushes, and live upon the roots of the field, rather than be subject to the discipline of a civilized life. Laziness is the most prevalent evil among our people, which exposes them to the greatest distresses. Some, however, are willing to work, if we could employ them; this we cannot do, not having been able for more than a year to get any money from the Cape*, so that we cannot pay them for their *labour*, which circumstances subject both them and us to many inconveniences (LMS II AR 1803:165; e.a.).

If Van der Kemp shared such sentiments, then he also agreed with the fact that the activities at the missions - including crime - were to fall under the jurisdiction of the local commander (at Fort Frederick) or 'Landdrosst' (at Graaff Reinet for example).

As for government control of the missionaries, and aiming to control their ambivalent relations with the colonising government, Janssens' general rules were:

> 1. That all Missionaries, who are upon legal authority in this colony, have freedom to proceed into the interior of this Cape for the purpose of teaching and promoting religion and cultivation among the heathen nations (LMS II P 1805:234). ….
> 4. That all Missionaries, before they proceed to the interior of the country, have to make themselves known to the Governor and

> Commander in Chief, and also to mention the place, where they intend to settle themselves, in which case they obtain a certificate from him, in which such a place or district is expressed in order that government may know at all times where the Missionaries are labouring (LMS II P 1805:234).

In addition, Janssens required ‘reports’ from the missionaries – which provides a brief template for the kind of information the colonial government would find useful for the unstated objective of even further colonisation in future:

> 5. That the Missionaries we oblige to send to government at every convenient opportunity a written account of the state of their schools, in order to know, what effect the cultivation of the [Indigenous Inhabitants] has had through their care, - from what they get their subsistence, - what cattle and other things they possess - the nature of the soil which they occupy and plough, the climate, &c. (LMS II P 1805:234).

Secondly, government regulation of the interaction of the Khoi at the mission stations with the farmers and those on the farms with the missions show that Janssens was set on driving a wedge between himself and especially Van der Kemp. The reason was that he firmly regulated that no interaction take place except one - that of Khoi coming from the missions to work on the farms. For Van der Kemp, this rule was untenable.

As far as Janssens’ general regulations are concerned, he instructed the Moravian mission at Baviaans Kloof ‘to take care not to seduce any Native or Bastard from the service of their masters to their instruction’ (LMS II P 1805:235). For Van der Kemp, the regulations were even more explicit. Janssens ruled:

> B. That only wandering [Khoi] or others who from this institution have gone into the service of the inhabitants shall be permitted to receive instruction; *But no [Khoi] who are actually serving the inhabitants; or have served them in the course of the preceding year, be permitted to be received in it* (LMS II P 1805:236; e.a.). ….
> 11. *No instruction in writing*, as *this is not absolutely necessary in the commencement of cultivation*, shall be permitted in the schools already

> established, or that may be established hereafter; but this instruction shall be postponed till express licence from the Governor and Commander in Chief be obtained for it (LMS II P 1805:236; e.a.).

On the fact that Janssens did not rule on Khoi going from the missions to the farms, it appears that it was personally communicated earlier to Van der Kemp that the missionaries were in fact to actively encourage this practice. This Van der Kemp opposed and it may be the reason why this rule was in the end not included in Janssens' regulations. In his Annual Report for 1804, Van der Kemp writes that he sent a letter to Janssens - dated April 18 1804:

> We *thought it our duty to declare ... that our consciences would not permit us any longer to observe that hard article of the settlement granted to our institution, by which we were recommended to encourage the voluntary engagement of the [Khoi] into the service of the Colonists*, on account of the *cruelty* and *injustice* with which those who entered into their service were treated ... (LMS II AR 1804:241; cf. also Smit 2016a).

While government and Van der Kemp shared views on the 'cultivation' of the Khoi, 'industry' at the mission and the transformation of this people from a life of 'laziness' - which amongst others, belonged to the general discourse of crime and the criminalisation of the illiterate and uneducated in Europe - their views on Khoi working on the farms differed. Suffice to say that despite this difference of 'opinion', it appears that at archival level - as far as it concerned the operationalising of technologies of power at the missions and the 'cruelty' of the farmers - there was not much to choose between these two options. Among others, this may be substantiated (from a Khoi perspective) by Van der Kemp's report of their 'aversion from every other kind of mental or bodily exercise', that they 'have no care upon them to provide for themselves', and that they would 'lie in the bushes, and live upon the roots of the field', rather, than being 'subject to a disciplined life' (LMS II L 1804:152; II AR 1803:165). Even though for many Khoi, joining the mission was a last option, there certainly was much aversion to that choice too.

With regard to the eighteenth century archive, it is indicative that all the institutions generated by both governments and by most nonconformist religious organisations in civil society in Europe and in the colonies – for

education, for health, for orphans, for the old and infirm, and in the case of governments, also asylums, prisons, and barracks for soldiers – included both 'mental' and 'bodily' exercises. Continuously emphasising the teaching of 'reading and writing' – also vis-à-vis the colonial governor's non-support of the teaching of writing – Van der Kemp here also adds 'bodily' exercise. We do not have any data as to the nature of this bodily exercise at Bethelsdorp at this point, but it is significant that Van der Kemp adds this datum as part of his social and individual care for the Khoi. Furthermore, he contrasts not to 'care … and provide for themselves' in terms of the colonial economy, and just living off the 'roots of the field' with a 'disciplined life'. The institutionalisation of a 'disciplined life', on the colonising frontier, was similar to its institutionalisation in the schools, barracks, and orphansages of Europe. This formed a primary rationale of Van der Kemp's intervention, and motivations for a mission station, as it did for both the colonial government and the LMS directors.

7 Pacification

If the objectives of freedom and civilisation, the operationalising of a useful and analytical pedagogy, institutionalisation and contending with government regulations all formed part of not only the eighteenth-century European archive but also its power exerted on the bodies and souls of people, then pacification was its outcome. This was also the outcome of the effects of power as employed in mission on South Africa's Easter Cape frontier.

The policies, acts or processes of pacifying the Khoi (and the Xhosa) were aimed not only at cultivating a 'docile' body and mind in the rising money economy of the time, but also the seeking of peace and the defusing of a situation of continuous warfare – with the plundering and banditry of the roaming landless Khoi groups, as well as the to-and-fro of cattle rustling and related cruelties between the settler farmers and the Xhosa.

Having arrived on the Eastern Cape frontier during the so-called third frontier war – where some Khoi and Xhosa cooperated in the attempt to stop the deterrilorialication the Khoi experienced due to the encroachment of settler farmers onto their lands, and the retro-raiding of settler farms – Van der Kemp was at pains to assert not only his 'neutrality' but also his non-alliance. This, however, did not deter him from playing an active role in intervening on the Khoi's behalf, in various conflicts, and in actively assisting in the pacifying of

the Khoi and attempts at the cessation of hostilities[11].

Despite his assertion of his non-alliance, the Xhosa suspected him of representing 'English' interests. On September 2 1799 - and before he met with Ngqika - Bruntjie, Van der Kemp's companion, pointed out to him that,

> ... the [Xhosa], seeing our musquets, had observed that these (pointing to the bayonets), were the very English instruments by which their countrymen were treacherously murdered; that they looked upon us as sent to betray them, and certainly, would betray us at the first commencement of war (LMS I SA 1799:391).

The same suspicion comes to the fore in Van der Kemp's interrogation at Ngqika's homestead.

> In the afternoon I was examined in Dutch by a Bengalese interpreter (sent by Gika's mother to welcome us) before two judges, and confronted with Bruntjie in the [Khoi] tongue. Many questions were put concerning our plan, political connexions, and if we were not sent over by the English. To this I answered in the negative; but said that we had found favour from every government with which we had to do; that the English Governor had permitted us to go to and fro the colony, and had given us a passport and a letter to General Vandeleur, not to hinder us ... (LMS I SA 1799:396)[12].

For October 4 1799, again, Van der Kemp says:

> The old accusation of our being Englishmen, and betrayers, was said to be renewed in the mind of Gika, and that we must not be surprized if we were all put to death the next day (LMS I SA 1799:398f).

He also reported:

---

[11] For a more elaborate explication of these dynamics, cf. Smit (2017a:275ff). These 'suspicions', are part of the still 'hidden transcript of anti-colonial resistance discourse among the Xhosa in the Eastern Cape in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century (cf. Smit 2017a: 255ff).

[12] General Vandeleur lead the colonial forces against the Xhosa.

> ... I asked leave from Gika to go with Brother Edmond to Graaff Reinet, urging the request of Governor Dundas; but he was so far from giving his consent to it, that he gave me no answer at all, and treated with contempt my proposals, which renewed his suspicions of our being connected with the English Government in prejudice to his country (LMS I SA 1799:409).

Within the context of war, and as part of the 'hidden transcript' of continuous suspicion of the indigenous population, not only endangered one's own life but also raised the possibility of the war escalating further. However, it appears that Van der Kemp's fifteen months in Ngqika's area, at least to some degree, defused hostilities. He may have had a hand in assisting a certain Prinslo to negotiate peace between Ngqika and Graaff Reinet's Resident Commissioner H.C.D. Maynier (LMS I FA 1799:387f). This, however, is not specified - but it did pave the way for Van der Kemp to make contact with Ngqika's people. That his mere presence beyond the frontier, however, played a role in Maynier not attacking the colonists beyond the frontier in Ngqika's area, is reported on May 14 1801[13]. He says that Maynier,

> ... told me that my stay with the emigrated Colonists in [Xhosaland] had been the only obstacle by which the march of a body of soldiers to seize them had been prevented, as he foresaw that this violent step would have exposed me to considerable danger (LMS I TVDK 1801:479).

To this may be added that Van der Kemp's settlement for a few months beyond the Keiskamma may have provided the opportunity for Maynier to venture into Xhosaland and to personally visit Ngqika (LMS I SA 1799:408f).

His journey from Graaff Reinet to Ngqika - and to see whether he could accompany the latter to Graaff Reinet to negotiate peace with Maynier - further shows that Van der Kemp was actively involved in peace negotiations (cf. LMS I JC 1801:487-490). That he was also ready to lay his life on the line, is evident from his willingness to stay on as hostage for the farmers during the rebellion of 1801 - something they declined, because they said: 'although our

[13] It is believed that is primarily these exiled or dissident colonists, but also deserters (soldiers) from the colonising military, who have introduced and provided the Xhosa with firearms.

commanders were killed, we should not like to kill you' (LMS I TVDK 1801:485).

Other examples come from Van der Kemp's insistence that all deserters and settlers beyond the frontier - not only some - were to receive 'pardon' from Maynier and company for their atrocities within the Colony (cf. LMS I FA 1799:384; I TVDK 1801:300). He also did not mind scolding both Xhosa and colonist for their atrocities (cf. LMS I TVDK 1801:472,485).

Against the background of such activities, Van der Kemp was perfectly clear about the fact that starting a mission establishment for the Khoi would also intervene in the common cause they made with the Xhosa against the colonists. The fact of this state of affairs was already mentioned on his first trek to Ngqika (LMS I 1799:383). That Van der Kemp's initiative to establish a mission for the Khoi would also mean the breaking up of this alliance, is evident not only from interactions with Maynier and Dundas but also with Janssens, when the latter granted the establishing of Bethelsdorp on the following conditions amongst others.

> 7. Only Van der Kemp, and no Khoikhoi, is allowed to possess any firearm. Permission has to be asked when firearms are needed for hunting purposes.
> 8. Only small amounts of gunpowder are allowed in the Institute.
> 9. New arrivals have to turn in their weapons.
> 11. The Institute has to co-operate in the maintenance of general order, peace and safety.
> 12. It will render the fullest co-operation to Fort Frederick.
> 14. Van der Kemp must use his influence to pacify Khoikhoi like Stuurman and guide them to order and submission to the government. (in Enklaar 1988:131; Briggs 1952:37f).

In this context, Van der Kemp asserted his and his mission's neutrality. In terms of actual hostilities and war, he says that he asserted that,

> ... we were neutral, having no quarrel with the [Xhosa]; that we should guard to our best against every hostile attempt, and defend ourselves against every personal attack (LMS I FA 1799:384).

This view is echoed in the Extracts of journals of 1802.

> We have always instructed our people, that *the duty of a christian required, that he is obliged rather to part with his earthly goods, than to save them by killing another; and that it was not permitted to kill any body, but when the safety of his own life, or that of a third person should render it absolutely necessary*. But our [Khoi] understood the business not in the same meaning, and looked upon themselves as competent to make use of their arms, as well to defend their goods as their lives; *they also shewed too plainly that they had obtained a certain pleasure in fighting*. We are not at all pleased with this, because our intention was *to gain our enemies by a soft and amiable behaviour, and thus by no means to provoke them by a hostile opposition* ... (LMS I EJBP 1802:89; e.a.).

In the face of some fighting and with colonists assisting the missionaries, they then decided to move the mission from Bota's Place to the fort - Fort Frederick. This led the colonists to assume that Van der Kemp would now support their own activities against the Khoi and Xhosa. This, however, he denied by stating again that they were 'neutral'.

> ... [T]he Colonists .... thought undoubtedly, that we should now make common cause against [the Xhosa]; but saw themselves deceived, when we told them the intention of our mission, and *that we should keep a complete neutrality in the war with the [Xhosa], and that we did not make use of arms, but only for unavoidable self-defence*, nor *opposed the disorders of the [Indigenous Inhabitants] but by christian admonitions and examples*, of which they could see the effects in our [Khoi] (LMS I EJBP 1802:89; e.a.).

Van der Kemp was not only to assist in the 'maintenance of general order, peace and safety' but actively to 'pacify Khoikhoi like Stuurman and guide them to order and submission to the government' as Governor Janssens required. In time, this submission, amongst the other effects of power the mission exerted, was one of the outcomes of their labours - not only among the Khoi, but also for other groups of indigenous people in South Africa among whom the LMS and other mission organisations established their missions. In the complex networks of the colonising deterritorialisation of indigenous populations, and indigenous resistance add defence, no-one is neutral.

8 Conclusion

This second article on social responsibility and power demonstrated further, that social intervention on behalf of indigenous populations by European missions, as part of their social responsibility vis-à-vis colonial governments and settler farmers, was not without its own uses of power. Such power extended European power as exercised in nonconformist institutions in Europe to the colonial frontiers of the world (cf. Said 1991:219-225). In general – and one can just peruse the great variety of reports to the LMS directors from all over the world where the LMS was active – we must see this as a global missionary phenomenon, not without its ambivalences (Cf. *Transactions* I – III). As far as the missionary institutionalising of indigenous populations is concerned, this would not only form part of the colonising activities of the colonial powers themselves – even though critical of colonisation as indicated – but would also resonate with the effects of similar religious organisations in Europe. As stated, in the colonies, these mostly nonconformist organisations formed part of civil society, but that, a civil society that could not operate outside the limits and constraints set by the colonising governments, even though they were competing with it, as part of the outside of *the* Colonial (cf. Smit 2017a:263 – 268).

When Van der Kemp saw the destitute conditions of the Khoi and intervened to set up a mission station for them, started a school, as well as campaigned against the cruelties they were subjected to be frontier settler farmers, the Khoi have already been subjected to the devastating impact of colonisation for nearly one and a half centuries. They had not only lost their ancestral lands, but also much of their culture. And even though Van der Kemp's interventions for them and on their behalf, would provide some kind of reprieve, they would also be subjected to the impacts of the power that the mission would exert on the personally as well as culturally. As the mission stretched beyond the colonial frontiers, this impact would not only be reserved for the Khoi but also impact other indigenous societies and groups in Southern Africa during the nineteenth century. The ambiguity of missions – or we may say their own ambivalence or paradox – where they would on the one hand take social responsibility and intervene for an on behalf of indigenous populations subjected to colonialization, but on the other hand subject them to a similar power exerted on citizens in Europe through a great variety of enlightenment institutions, 'westernising' them – would remain. As such, in

developing a discourse for the missions and for the indigenous people subjected to colonisation, Van der Kemp and the missionaries that would follow, had to both develop their own discourse as an 'object of struggle' vis-à-vis the colonising governments and settler farmers, as well as use this developing discourse 'as tool by which the struggle is conducted' (cf. Said 1991:216; and 2002b:113).

Finally, despite Van der Kemp's interventions and exertions for and on behalf of the Khoi, especially his critique of the cruelty, exploitation and repression of the frontier settler farmers and conflict with the colonial governor on this issue, his vehement resistance of and protest against slavery, his anti-slavery campaigning, as well as his critique of the use of Khoi in colonial government works, the colonial government and farmer exploitation of Khoi labour would escalate after his death. *Firstly*, it is indicative of Van der Kemp's outspokenness, that Philip quoted him in his *Researches* (1828) referring to the occasion of the 1809 visit to Bethelsdorp of Lieutenant-Colonel Collins 'appointed to visit the frontier districts of the colony'. The latter posed some questions to Van der Kemp (on instigation of the local Graaf Reinet Major Cuyler it was adduced). This was in the presence of the much criticised 'Major Cuyler, Mr Stockenstrom, the landdrost of Graaf-Reinet and Mr. A Stockenstrom, who has since succeeded his father as the chief magistrate of the district'[14]. The questions and answers – which also reflect on the realities of slavery experienced by both Khoi and Xhosa – were as follows:

> 'Will you, Sir, agree to send over to Uitenhage, [Khoi] whose services may be required by the magistrate, Major Cuyler?' To this Vanderkemp directly applied in the negative. Being requested to state the grounds on which he rested his objections, he remarked, 'that to apprehend men as prisoners, and force them to labour in the manner proposed, was no part of his duty.' To a question, 'whether he did not consider it his duty to compel the [Khoi] to labour,' he replied, 'No, Sir; the [Khoi] are recognized to be a free people, and the colonists have no more right to force them to labour in the way you propose, than you have to sell them as slaves.' Being asked why he would not obey the order of the landdrost, in calling in the [Khoi] who were

[14] Philip states that this is present in the latter's report to the colonial government back in England.

> among the farmers, when they were required by the landdrost; 'Because, Sir,' said he, 'that is the duty of the landdrost himself, and he is paid for it. Being asked, if he would agree to prohibit the [Xhosa] from visiting his institution; and whether he would send such as might report to him under pretext of coming to seek instruction, as prisoners to Uitenhage; he replied 'Sir, my commission is to preach the gospel to every creature, and I will preach the gospel to every one who chooses to hear me. God has sent me, not to put chains upon the legs of [Khoi] and [Xhosa], but to preach liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound' (quoted in Philip 1828:124f).

This in a nutshell captures some of the moral imperatives Van der Kemp was committed to – also quoting the very significant Luke 4:18/ Isaiah 61:1 texts in this regard.

Secondly, with regard to what happened after his death in 1811, John Philip's section on 'Effects of Dr. Vanderkemp's Death on the Missions' in the first section of Chapter 10 of his *Researches in South Africa* (1828) is informative. His analysis is as follows:

> Without reflecting on the missionaries who survived Dr. Vanderkemp, we cannot suppose that his removal could happen without seriously affecting the prosperity of the mission. It is obvious from his correspondence, that Dr. Vanderkemp always considered [both] the [British and Dutch] colonial government[s] as favourably disposed towards the [Khoi] and that he viewed them as misled by the misrepresentations of the colonists and the local authorities of the districts. He never seems to have considered the opposition he had to encounter as a part of the colonial system. His mistake, in this instance, may be easily accounted for. The fear inspired by his abilities obliged the officers of government to conceal, as much as possible, their real views; and, in their answers to his representations, they either affected to disapprove of what could not be defended, or they attempted to make him believe that the indefensible case was an exception to a general rule; while the circumscribed sphere of his operations, which allowed him little opportunity *of seeing the working of the system*, except in his own case, and the remoteness of

> his situation from the seat of government, contributed their different points of influence to prevent him from discovering the universality of those feelings, which were viewed by him as merely local in their operation. This limitation of his views did not, however, render him less fit for the situation he then filled. A more *perfect knowledge of the system* might, perhaps, have proved unfavourable to the continuance of his exertions, and the final triumph of his principles; and it is probable that had he been acquainted with all the difficulties in his undertaking, it would have been abandoned in despair. While Dr. Vanderkemp lived, the missions and the aborigines found an able defender; after his death, the missions fell into a state of confusion, which furnished their enemies with the opportunity they had long wished for to successfully assail them (Philip 1828:198f; e.a.).

Indicative of this last point, is that Philip (1828:201) describes Bethelsdorp on his first visit in 1819, as follows:

> On the visit of the deputation (Campbell and Philip) to Bethelsdorp, we found that institution in a deplorable condition. The system of oppression, of which Dr. Vanderkemp so bitterly complained, and under which he sunk into his grave with a broken heart, had been carried on for years without a single check. The institution was virtually converted into a slave lodge, and the people were called out to labour at Uitenhage, to work on the public roads, to cultivate the lands of the local authorities, or to serve their friends, or the colonial government, receiving for their labours never more than a trifling remuneration, and very frequently none at all.

Significant for our purposes is that Philip describes Van der Kemp as oblivious to the fact that the opposition he and the Khoi experienced (from the frontier settler farmers, and to some degree from the governments) was 'a part of the colonial system'. Philip then explains that his ignorance was due to the fact that the 'officers of government' were not honest with him and concealed their real views from him due to 'the fear inspired by his abilities'. Furthermore, they agreed with him on his views in their 'answers to his representations' or argued that he could not universalise his views and that his submissions were exceptions to the 'general rule'. With regard to Van der

Kemp's inability to detect such deception, Philip reasons that this was due to him not being able to see 'the working of the [colonial or colonising] system'. The opposition he experienced was in fact universal (inclusive of both frontier settler farmers and colonising officials), or as Philip avers, based on a 'universality of those feelings …. A more perfect knowledge of the system might, perhaps, have proved unfavourable to the continuance of his exertions, and the final triumph of his principles …. While Dr. Vanderkemp lived, the missions and the aborigines found an able defender; after his death, the missions fell into a state of confusion'. The first half of the nineteenth century missions in South Africa, especially under the leadership of John Philip (cf. Ross 1986), would be characterised by a continuation of Van der Kemp's taking up social responsibility for the exploited and repressed indigenous populations and his counterhegemonic struggles, to various degrees (cf. Said 1991:222, and 246 on Gramsci).

Acknowledgements
* I want to extend my sincere thanks to the detailed comments of the two independent reviewers, on whose wisdom I could draw for the improving of my argument in this article.
* In addition, I want to thank the University of KwaZulu-Natal for the sabbatical during which I could do the research and write-up this article, amongst others.
* I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude for the multiform assistance and help that I have received from Ms. Faith Bhengu, UKZN Principal Librarian (Durban), Ms. Celeste Johns, Circulation Supervisor, Mr. John Timms, Circulation Desk (Interlibrary Loans), and Mss. Shanitha Bhim and Bronwyn Tayler, Circulation Desk (Pietermaritzburg).

References

Bannister, S. 1830. *Humane Policy; or, Justice to the Aborigines of New Settlements, Essential to a Due Expenditure of British Money and to the Best Interests of the Settlers, with Suggestions how to Civilise the Natives by an Improved Administration of Existing Means.* London: Thomas and George Underwood.

Briggs, D.R. 1952. *An Historical Survey of the Bethelsdorp Station of the London Missionary Society, from its Inception, and Until the Death of Doctor van der Kemp, in 1811.* BD Thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.
Enklaar, I.H. 1988. *Life and Work of Dr. J. Th. van der Kemp, 1747-1811. Missionary Pioneer and Protagonist of Racial Equality in South Africa.* Cape Town & Rotterdam: AA Balkema.
Florence, M. 1994. Foucault. In Faubion, J. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Aesthetics.* London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. [1961] 1982a. *Madness and Civilisation. A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* Howard, R. (trans.). London: Tavistock.
Foucault, M. [1963] 1973. *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception.* Sheridan-Smith, A. (trans.). London: Tavistock.
Foucault, M. [1970] 1982b. *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences.* London: Tavistock.
Foucault, M. [1973] 1994. Truth and Juridical Forms. In Faubion, J. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Power.* London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. [1975] 1979. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison.* Sheridan, A. (trans.). London: Penguin.
Foucault, M. [1972] 1980. *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977.* Gordon, C. (ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, M. [1982] 1994. The Subject and Power. In Faubion, J. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Power.* London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. [1983] 1994. The Risks of Security. In Faubion, J. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Power.* London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. [1983] 1994. Structuralism and Post-structuralism. In Faubion, J. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Aesthetics.* London: Penguin Books.
Foucault, M. [1984] 1994. The Ethics of a Concern of the Self, as a Practice of Freedom. In Rabinow, P. (ed.): *Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954 – 1984: Ethics.* London: Penguin.
Freund, W.M. 1989. The Cape under the Transitional Governments, 1795 – 1814. In Elphick, R. & H. Giliomee (eds.): *The Shaping of South African Society, 1652 – 1840.* Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
Hobbes, T. 1651. *Leviathan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krom, Herm. I.O. 1800. Voorrede van de Uitgever. In Van der Kemp, JT. 1799, 1800, 1802. *De Theodicée van Paulus, of de Rechtvaardigheid Gods door het Euangelium uit het geloof, aangetoond tot geloof, in eenige Aanmerkingen op deszelfs Brief aan de Romeinen, met eene niewe vertaling en paraphrase.* (Volumes I-III.) Dordrecht: A Blussé en Zoon.

Locke, J. 1689. *Two Treatises of Government: In the Former the False Principles and Foundation of Sir Robert Filmer and his Followers are Detected and Overthrown. The Latter is an Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government.* London: Whitmore & Penn.

Philip, J. 1828. *Researches in South Africa: Illustrating the Civil, Moral, and Religious Condition of the Native Tribes: Including Journals of the Author's Travels in the Interior: Together with Detailed Accounts of the Progress of the Christian Missions, Exhibiting the Influence of Christianity in Promoting Civilization.* Volumes I and II. London: James Duncan. Potkay, Adam.

Pletsch, C. 1996. 'Civil Society' and Rousseau's Place in the Social Contract Tradition. *The European Legacy: Toward New Paradigms* 1,1:322 – 328.

Ross, R. 1986. *John Philip (1775 – 1851): Missions, Race and Politics in South Africa.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Rousseau, J-J. [1762] 1782. Civil Society. In *The Social Contract*. Cole, G.D.H. (trans.). Available at: http://www.constitution.org/jjr/socon.htm. (Accessed on 10 May 2017.)

Said, E. [1991] 1994. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. London: Vintage.

Said, E. [1988] 2002a. The Ethics of Language: Review of Michel Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge and Discourse on Language*. In Smart, B. (ed.): *Michel Foucault: Critical Assessments.* Volume II. London & New York: Routledge.

Said, E. [1988] 2002b. The Problem of Textuality: Two Exemplary Positions. In Smart, B. (ed.): *Michel Foucault: Critical Assessments.* Volume II. London & New York: Routledge.

Smit, J.A. 2001. The Language of the Other. *Alternation* 8,2: 70 – 106.

Smit, J.A. 2016a. J.T. van der Kemp and his Critique of the Settler Farmers on the South African Colonial Frontier (1799-1811). *Journal for the Study of Religion* 29,1: 6 – 56.

Smit, J.A. 2016b. J.T. van der Kemp's Link to the British Anti-slavery Network and his Civil Rights Activism on Behalf of the Khoi (1801 – 1803). *Journal for the Study of Religion* 29,2 (2016) 5 – 28.

Smit, J.A. 2017a. #DecolonialEnlightenment and Education. *Alternation* Special Edition 19: 253 – 311. Available at: https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2017/v24n2a13

Smit, J.A. 2017b. Social Responsibility and Power I: J.T. van der Kemp's Interventions For and On Behalf of the Khoikhoi on the Eastern Cape Frontier (1801 – 1806). *Alternation* 24,2: 12 – 44.

Tomkins, S. 2010. *The Clapham Sect: How Wilberforce's Circle Transformed Britain.* Oxford: Lion Hudson.

Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I, Including: *Dr. Vanderkemp's Specimen of the Caffra Language*, *Nature of the Country of Caffraria*, *An Account of the Quadrupeds of Caffraria*, and History &c. of Caffraria, 1804. pp. 323-507.

Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II, 1806. pp. 1-253.

Zefnik, L. 2014. *Critical Perspectives in Happiness Research: The Birth of Modern Happiness.* Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht & London: Springer.

Archival Resources

LMS I FA 1799. *First Attempt to Enter Caffraria. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I*, Including: *Dr. Vanderkemp's Specimen of the Caffra Language*, *Nature of the Country of Caffraria*, *An Account of the Quadrupeds of Caffraria*, *and History &c. of Caffraria*, *Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I*, 1804. pp. 323-507.

LMS I JC 1801. *Journey to Caffraland.* Journals dated: August 10 - November 11, 1801. (pp. 487-505). *Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I*, 1804. pp. 323-507.

LMS I SA 1799. *Second Attempt to Enter Caffraria in the Year 1800. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I*, Including: *Dr. Vanderkemp's Specimen of the Caffra Language*, *Nature of the Country of Caffraria*, *An Account of the Quadrupeds of Caffraria*, *and History &c. of Caffraria,* 1804. pp. 323-507.

LMS I TVDK 1800. *Transactions of Dr. Vanderkemp, in the Year 1801. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume I*, Including: *Dr. Vanderkemp's Specimen of the Caffra Language*, *Nature of the Country of Caffraria*, *An Account of the Quadrupeds of Caffraria*, *and History &c. of Caffraria,* 1804. pp. 323-507.

LMS I EL1 1801. *Extracts from Letters of Van der Kemp from Transactions I. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 92-95.
LMS I EJBP 1802. *Extracts from the Journals of Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. Read, after their Settlement at Bota's Place. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS I L1 1802. *Letters of Van der Kemp from Transactions II. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS I EL1 1802. *Extracts from Letters of Van der Kemp from Transactions I. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804.
LMS II AR 1803. *Annual Report of the Missionaries at Bethelsdorp, South Africa, for the year 1803, From the Missionaries Vanderkemp and Read. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS II L 1804. *Letters of Van der Kemp from Transactions II. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS II L1 1801. *Letters of Van der Kemp from Transactions II. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS II AR 1804. *Annual Report of the Missionaries at Bethelsdorp, South Africa, for the year 1803, From the Missionaries Vanderkemp and Read. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1804. pp. 1-253.
LMS II AR 1805. *Annual Report of the Missionaries at Bethelsdorp, South Africa, for the year 1803, From the Missionaries Vanderkemp and Read. Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1806. pp. 1-253.
LMS II P 1805. John William Janssens, Governor and Commander in Chief, together with the Members of the Board of Police at the Cape of Good Hope, &c. 1805. *Proclamation.* Dated February 20 1805. pp. 233-236.
LMS II AR 1805. Van der Kemp, J.T. *Extracts from the Annual Report of the Missionary Institution of Bethelsdorp for the year 1805*. pp. 401-404. *Transactions of the London Missionary Society Volume II*, 1812. pp. 2-10,249f; 398-409.

Johannes A. Smit
Programme in Religion and Social Transformation
School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics
University of KwaZulu-Natal
smitj@ukzn.ac.za