

40, Hamstead Way, N.W. 11
1 March, 1965.

Dear Alan and Derric,

Thanks for your letter, Alan, and the enclosure. I'm currently going to possibly have a row with A-A (and it'll be more than an infinitive which will be split) So I'm just leaving the matter over for a short time, although will almost certainly do as you suggest.

You are not on list of ordinary sponsors. A new list of international sponsors is to be drawn up and I will be let know if you are to be on it. Will write again tomorrow to you, telling you. Meanwhile, my own views are these. S.A. from abroad seems somewhat like an Occupied country, e.g. France during the War. If I was an African living in S.A. now, this is how I would see it I think and I would sympathize with the sort of action which you deplore, even though violence is repugnant to me. There are many people here who would distinguish between the murder of an informer (political) and murder for private motives or arising out of excessive negligence. Moreover, the other side -the authorities- is not chary of using violence, even violence resulting in death. Then I consider, too, that so many cases of wholly innocent hardship are helped; I cannot see that it would be right to penalize them for the few morally-dubious or even morally-repugnant ones. I support the fun! The organization is being much more carefully lately about accuracy of adverts, and statements; they have sometimes been given misleading information. Anyway, I wouldn't like anyone to write to the Times!

I am very fond of Randolph and see him from time to time. I think they all misjudged themselves, their competence and capacity for suffering and what was appropriate to the period. I don't know Adrian and am not sure how I feel about him. I know someone who knows him, so if anyone wants his address, I could get it.

H O P M E Y E : NOY I can get on with that .

I told you I think that I found it compelling reading, all 545pp. of it. I have read it twice and done two minor reviews so am fairly familiar with it but will read it again, and see if any of the questions milling around in my head are answered.

First let me congratulate you: you had a great task and you handled it with greatness. (I have a lot to say, and will not exhaust it in this letter, but writers' vanity being what it is, I daresay you can bear to read another letter on the subject).

The book had for me the dimension of tragedy; I think the theme of Hofmeyr alone was not ^{quite} a tragic one, but the interwoven themes of Hofmeyr and ~~the~~ South Africa resolving on her terrible answer to the question: "what are black hopes, what are white hopes and can they be hoped together?", this is a tragic combination. It is not satisfactory to say that the S.A. theme lent the Hofmeyr theme grandeur: after all, biographies of Smuts I have read had nothing of that quality although Smuts by himself had it; ^{more so} ~~the~~ Smuts and the period; and I daresay Hertzog biographies - I haven't read any - also do not rise to the heights. They are all colossal figures in your book, involved in ^{moving} ~~and~~ conflicts: Hertzog and Afrikanerdom; Hofmeyr and Smuts; Hertzog and Smuts; Hofmeyr's mother ~~and the~~ ^{and the son} ~~and what she~~ saw as his final floating of her. And much more. So, your projection ~~of the man, and the period~~ ^{on a tragic scale}, this is a great triumph.

So, too, is your sustaining of good writing ~~everywhere~~ throughout such great length and by this I mean of course not just expression but what is expressed. Apart from a generally high standard, I found some essential latencies especially memorable, e.g., "although he could not see clearly how to go forward, it was forward he wanted to go"; "the forces of right and justice could have been marshalled.....he did not feel called upon"(312); the "black hopes and white hopes"(ibid, p. 172); you have it in quotes but I take it as you; "the analysis ^{of} the he knew the white man's time for negotiating change..... he was not impelled by that knowledge" (p. 265); and more.

On this subject: there were lapses, I thought, but minor. I think they are all of a kind: they arise out of your fundamental

position as a biographer, which is ^(?) that you wish ^{for the most part} to keep yourself and your judgments out of ^{the} account. Therefore when things are unknowable, you legitimately pose in the form of questions ^{some} ~~at~~ ^{of} the possible answers. But when ^{believe you} know the answer and are going to express it, then I think that since it is fitting for you to use questions for the unknowable, you should be charier of using them for what ^{is said} may be unknowable but what you are going to express a conclusion about. Now if you look at your use of the questions about the Broederbond p. 391, ll. 4,5, I think you will probably agree that this does not merit the question form; compare it, say, with pp. 311, 312: here you are "halting before a grave question" and are entitled, even tho' you are going to ~~provide~~ ^{provide} ~~some~~ ^{some} answers to them, to pose questions. But even here, some of these questions-and-answers could have been put in statement form, e.g., 1.7, "Had he not written..." which actually requires two questions-marks, and the Smuts paragraph beginning: "Could Hofmeyr have broken away....." The first question here ^{re Smuts} is legitimate: the next two may be legitimate but in a context of many questions are undesirable. Alan, really I boggle at my impertinence! But you wanted me to say what I thought. (What's more, I was not only going to tell you what I thought, but I was going to express myself faultlessly!)

I deplore your ending the book with Newhall: I know it might have been Hofmeyr's taste in valedictories; he may have felt that playing the game epitomized conscience-directed endeavour. But it is such a fall from the heights! I make bold enough to say that I hope it will ^{be} omitted in subsequent editions. (The "Boys' camps; the cricket, "mush-mush": they were tremendously important to him; here I wished to know what you thought ^{of their importance to him was} ~~of their importance to him was~~ - just curiosity; I don't mean to suggest that you were obliged to explore this area; although if you were not going to explore it, maybe you could have omitted some of the "mush-mush" references).

Dear Alan, I'm going to stop now. I will just say that much of Hofmeyr is my lifetime; my country; my people: no-one ~~has~~ has written about these as movingly as you have.

Lots of love, and congratulations and love to Dorrie.

I'm sorry about the typing + confusion. I did not make myself clear, I started again. I've been interrupted 4 times.