How far do Sources F and G challenge the evidence in Source D about the reasons for the outbreak of the Second Boer War?

The three sources given all show varying reasons for the outbreak of the Second Boer War, in some ways source F and G support source D while in others they disagree, suggesting an alternative reason for the outbreak. To generalise the outcome, it seems that source G supports source D while source F appears to oppose it and not agree with D’s idea that the Second Boer was caused by a threat to ‘the position of Great Britain in South Africa’ - here we will see to what extent the sources challenge this idea.

To begin with, source F appears to completely challenge the idea that the ‘contest for supremacy between the Dutch and English’ was the reason for the outbreak of war, instead it states very clearly that ‘the motive for the Boer War was gold’. This statement alone is enough to say F strongly challenges the evidence in D, however if we look a little further into the source it uses the phrase ‘motive for colonial expansion’ which suggests the source does support this ‘contest for supremacy’ as both the Dutch and English were looking to ‘colonially expand’ and were in competition with each other to do so. Although a seemingly tenuous link to the evidence in D, it seems that F sees gold as a more important factor causing the war but acknowledges that ‘colonial expansion’ was a very important factor to consider. Writing almost one hundred years after the Boer War for what seems to be a speculative book that is written about the idea of empire, it is possibly safe to assume that the author sees the idea that the British want to expand their Empire as an obvious cause for the Boer War that does not need pointing out - hence choosing to discuss gold instead. If this is the case then the weight of challenge given to source D from source F is hugely depleted. However, due to the fact this is purely assumption, it appears that source F relatively strongly challenges the evidence in source D, suggesting that gold was a greater reason for war than the ‘contest for supremacy’.

In contrast to source F’s seemingly clear challenging of source D, in source G seems to completely support, thus posing no challenge at all. Source D says that ‘the position of Great Britain in South Africa’ is what is at stake and that they must fight for ‘our power and influence… throughout the world’ and source G not only disregards the idea of the gold fight given in F but also completely agrees with D, saying that ‘it was not gold that Britain was after… but the establishment of British power and influence’ - this is the same point word for word as D gives as the reason for war. It could be said that G challenges D by offering lots of other reasons for war (eg. ‘to protect British trade’ or ‘to secure access to the supply of gold’) however it clearly strikes them off as invalid reasons and so cannot be said to really challenge D but