

https://dspace.org/

Politics, principles and problems of a profession: Afrikaner historians and their discipline, c. 1920 - c. 1965

Grundlingh, A.

1990-02-06T07:10:02Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/7869

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG
HISTORY WORKSHOP



STRUCTURE AND EXPERIENCE IN THE MAKING OF APARTHEID

6 - 10 February 1990

AUTHOR: A. Grundlingh

TITLE: Politics, Principles and Problems of a Profession: Afrikaner Historians and Their Discipline, c. 1920 - c. 1965

AFRICANA LIBRARY

POLITICS, PRINCIPLES AND PROBLEMS OF A PROFESSION: AFRIKANER HISTORIANS AND THEIR DISCIPLINE, C.1920 - C.1965

Albert Grundlingh

This paper is an attempt to explore the internal dynamics of the Afrikaans historical profession. It focuses on academic historians and the way in which wider political concerns were accommodated and promoted in the profession from about 1920 to approximately 1965. During this period, Afrikaner historians, without compromising the political interests of Afrikanerdom, established a tradition of historical writing in which the notion of "objective-scientific" history was elevated to an inviolable principle, and historians also sought to emphasize their work as a professional occupation. To understand the interrelated nature and trajectory of this process, one has to look at the context in which it was forged and the influences that were brought to bear.

Afrikanerization and university departments of history

Professional historical writing was closely linked to the universities, and the universities in turn, particularly in the thirties and forties, played a significant role in promoting the wider nationalist enterprise of ethnic mobilization.[1] History was regarded as a crucial discipline; the past was needed to legitimize the present. In an influential text written in 1941 on Afrikaner universities, the importance of the past was emphasised in near religious terms: the "calling" and "destination" of the Afrikaner people were pre-determined by their past and the "volk" therefore had a duty to honour and obey the sanctity of that past[2]. A "volksgeskiedenis" was required during this period - a history infused with romantic notions of God-fearing, intrepid 19th-century pioneers, great visionary leaders and loyal

followers who, despite trials and tribulations, established a "civilized" form of government in the interior. It was a form of history which stood in contrast to the prevailing imperialist view of the time in which South Africa only featured as a part of the British Empire, or the emerging liberal perspective which had a more composite view of South African society and its past. Afrikaner historians were expected to buttress the intellectual battlements of nationalistic history and to serve the cause by making their work known through popular magazines like Die Huisgenoot and Die Brandwag[3].

Considerable influence and direction emanated from the University of Stellenbosch. What the Oxbridge universities were to the national life of Britain and the Ivy League universities were to America, Stellenbosch was to the Afrikaner. Stellenbosch was the home of the Afrikaner intellectual elite; it was, as one commentator has observed, the "brain power and cognitive machinery behind Afrikanerdom. Who wanted leadership, had to look to Stellenbosch. If Stellenbosch sneezed, the whole of South Africa had a cultural cold."[4]

In part, at least, the leading position of Stellenbosch in Afrikaner circles can be traced back to its origins. It grew out of the earlier Victorian College to become the first autonomous Afrikaans University in 1918. The university was guided by a Council representing the Afrikaans community, and which sought to distance itself from the predominantly English-speaking University of Cape Town through the promotion of Afrikaner ideals and culture. "Stellenbosch", it was claimed later, "was born out of the need of the Afrikanervolk". As a "true 'volksuniversiteit'", it saw itself as a "steady light.... and beacon", illuminating the road of Afrikanerdom[5]. And it was firmly believed at Stellenbosch, during the thirties and forties, that the political goals of Afrikanerdom could only be understood in the light of what was considered the Afrikaner past[6].

The department of history at Stellenbosch assumed a central role in providing credence to history as an academic discipline without questioning the main tenets of "volksgeskiedenis". Particularly adept at maintaining a symbolic relationship between the demands of academe and the demands of the "volk", was Prof H.B. Thom who headed the department between 1937 and 1954 and then became rector of the university.

During these crucial years of growing Afrikaner nationalism, Thom was not a rebel-rousing propagator of Afrikaner history; on the contrary, in the more sedate style of the Cape Afrikaner, he promoted the linkages between the "volk" and their "true" past in a sober, calm, dignified and at times even detached manner. He was considered the ideal Afrikaner aristocrat and scholar; one who could skilfully blend cultural and political life, and "science" into "one harmonious whole".[7] His magnum opus, a biography of the Voortrekker leader Gerrit Maritz, which appeared in 1947, was viewed as an eminently successful synthesis of "volksgeskiedenis" and "scientific" history[8]. Thom's achievement was not without implications for Afrikaner historical writing as a political discourse; weaving a seamless web between the "volk" and academe and investing it with all the authority of science, Thom gave added weight to the legitimacy and "truth" of "volksgeskiedenis" and contributed towards the effective entrenchment of a nationalist tradition of writing.

Thom was very active in Afrikaner circles. He served on numerous cultural and political bodies, and between 1952 and 1960 he was also chairman of the Afrikaner Broederbond. These outside commitments did not mean that Thom neglected the training and shaping of young historians. On the contrary, he was an excellent lecturer, methodical and clear, and took great pains to supervise post-graduate students promptly and efficiently[9]. Moreover, he was instrumental in shifting the emphasis from the history of agriculture which

was the main theme in the 1920's, to political and Voortrekker history in the 1930's and 1940's[10].

His influence radiated far and wide; after 1948, virtually every Afrikaans history department in the country, as well as the bi-lingual departments of the University of South Africa and the University of Port Elizabeth, employed former Stellenbosch graduates, and often in leading positions. In addition, at the inception of early "apartheid universities" like the University of Western Cape, and also at the University of Fort Hare which was transformed along apartheid lines, the care of the history departments was entrusted to ex-Stellenboschers[11].

Many of Thom's ex-students kept in touch with him; to them he was mentor "extraordinaire". Although Thom did not encourage slavish adherence, his studied aloofness only served to enhance the respect his students had for him. For some former students, working at different universities, there could be no higher form of professional recognition then to be deemed worthy of being invited to act as external examiners for Stellenbosch doctoral theses[12]. The mystique of Stellenbosch could be intoxicating, even to the extent that certain members of the department actually took their "superiority" for granted. Thus a professor in the department, and an ex-student of Thom's, explained in 1974 upon receiving the Stals-prize for historical writing from the predominantly nationalist South African Academy of Science and Art, that "it was rather to be expected that Stals-prizes should be awarded to Stellenbosch: it is logical in terms of our departmental tradition. If one is appointed here as a professor, then one has to receive the Stals-prize, else the University will be disappointed in one."[13]

Under Thom's guidance the department not only moulded a generation of historians, but also contributed towards a sharpened commitment to the Afrikaner cause. Writing to Thom, an ex-student confessed in 1948 that when he had started at Stellenbosch he was a lukewarm Afrikaner "who did

not realize the real importance of the Afrikaner ideal". However, Stellenbosch had shown him the error of his ways and he was most grateful to Thom, in particular, for playing such a "substantial role" in transforming him into a "full-blooded Afrikaner."[14]

Given his stature in Afrikaner university life, it is not surprising that Thom was a powerful academic broker. Students flocked to him for recommendations and testimonials. He also acted as a mediator between Afrikaner academe and the outside world. Approached by W. K.Hancock in 1954 for possible participants in a seminar on South Africa at London University, Thom recommended D.W. Kruger of the University of Potchefstroom; his main reason for suggesting Kruger was that he considered the latter a "true Afrikaner" historian who would use the "opportunity of putting our case effectively."[15]

On the whole, Afrikanerization at Stellenbosch was a relatively gentle and quiet process.[16] This early achievement, which involved no major battles, instilled a sense of serene self-confidence. As far as history is concerned, it meant that a blend of "scientific" and "volksgeskiedenis" could, without any opposition, be established as the dominant discourse. This was in contrast to the institutions of the north which received their autonomy later than Stellenbosch. During the thirties and forties the University of Pretoria and the University College of the Orange Free State were locked into the 50/50 (50% Afrikaans and 50% English) educational policy of the United Party government. For these centres to become fully Afrikanerized, meant a volatile and at times fierce struggle. Under these circumstances the nature and content of history also became a contested terrain.

To Afrikaner ideologues in the north the 50/50 language policy, designed to create a white South African nation as opposed to an exclusive Afrikaner nation, was an unacceptable compromise with the J.B. M.Hertzog and J.C.Smuts United Party government. Such a policy was considered inappropri-

ate and completely at odds with the needs and aspirations of the Afrikaner youth. "The Afrikaans university", it was argued at the time, "cannot and should not be satisfied with a bit of patch-work reform - it had to be transformed totally." What was required, was "not an evolution of that which was foreign to the Afrikaner, but a revolution to establish that which was his own." Higher education had to "carry the stamp of 'land en volk'."[17]

At the University of Pretoria the political stridency of a resurgent Afrikaner nationalism of the thirties made itself felt quite forcibly in the halls of academe. A lecturer in French, H.P.Lamont, who wrote a book (War, Wine and Women, under the pseudonym Wilfred Saint-Mandé) considered to be defamatory to the "boerevolk", was unceremoniously tarred-and-feathered by the students and dismissed by Council in 1932. The Lamont incident strengthened the hands of those who wanted to turn the University into an exclusive Afrikaner institution, and it was precisely at this time of heightened political consciousness that the department of history at the university came under closer scrutiny.[18]

At the head of the department was Prof. Leo Fouché. He had been at Pretoria since 1909 and was a firm supporter of Smuts and the 50/50 policy of the government. The Afrikanerization of the University was opposed by Fouché on all fronts, which made him a controversial figure and a target for the nationalists. Fouché drew considerable fire; his integrity as an historian was questioned because he had written a pro-government report on the Boer Rebellion of 1914-15, and his department was subjected to an official university enquiry because his lectures were given mainly in English and insufficient emphasis was placed on the "history of the fatherland". The outcome was that two outspoken nationalist professors of theology who also had a background in history, were, without Fouché's consent, added to the department in order to remedy the perceived deficiency.[19] These developments put an end to Fouché's career at the

University of Pretoria. It was an embittered man who wrote in 1934 that

> two notorious firebrands have been pitchforked into my Department, 'to strengthen it', and to teach History according to a new principle, laid down officially: History is not a neutral science. No one with a shred of self-respect could have continued under such circumstances.[20]

(Fouché's view of history as a neutral science is not without its ironies, because, as we shall discuss later, Afrikaner historians often claimed that history was precisely that.) Through Smuts' intervention, Fouché obtained the chair which had been vacated at the University of the Witwatersrand with the departure of W.M.Macmillan. Fouché's successor at Pretoria was I.D.Bosman, predictably a man with impeccable Afrikaner credentials and infused with "true Boer nationalism."[21]

At the University College of the Orange Free State (to become an autonomous institution in 1950) similar processes of Afrikanerization were at work by the late thirties and early forties. The institution, particularly the hierarchy, was deeply divided between those who were in favour of the "neutral" 50/50 government policy, and their nationalist opponents who were determined to move the University College into a "positive Christian and pure Afrikaans direction." Student activism was rife as the vast majority of students vociferously demanded a "pure Afrikaans" institution; protest marches were held, classes were boycotted (and those who dared to attend lectures were despised), and controversial and outspoken Afrikaner professors were feted.[22] One professor of Afrikaans-Nederlands, D.F.Malherbe, who had been temporarily suspended, told an enthusiastic student audience during an open-air meeting that he had always tried to lead them along the path of their "forefathers" because that was the "source of their power". The path, he claimed in the familiar iconography of Afrikaner nationalism, went

from "Slagtersnek and Umkungundhlovu, to Bloodriver and ... the peaks of Majoeba."[23]

It was under these conditions, in which history served an overt and immediate political purpose, that the departmental chair at the University College had to be filled. The political division was reflected in the two candidates who competed for the position: the candidate for the nationalist section was a studious Afrikaner of Stellenbosch, P. J. van der Merwe, who had written on the "trekboers" in early Cape history, whilst the 50/50 faction went into battle with C.J.Uys, a former student of Leo Fouché who had studied in Britain and written a thesis in English on British expansion in South Africa between 1842 and 1877. Unlike what happened at Pretoria, the nationalist section did not win the day at Bloemfontein. Intense behind-the-scenes political lobbying and manoeuvering saw to it that Uys won by a narrow margin. Disappointed, D.F.Malherbe, one of Van der Merwe's main supporters, later explained to the losing candidate what had happened:

> You were the only person recommended by Senate and enjoyed a good majority of the votes. But on the Council Dr Uys (an anglicised Afrikaner) was appointed with a majority of <u>one</u> vote. Their side is stronger on the Council and they realize that your appointment will mean a transferral of the baton to the Nationalists. [The] appointment has given rise to bitter dissatisfaction, but what can we do. Last week we worked hard for 20 hours to promote your cause, but eventually the matter went out of our hands to the voting cattle. Now you realize our circumstances. What a future for the subject history![24]

Uys had a somewhat chequered career at Bloemfontein where he stayed till his retirement in 1963. He was, by all accounts, a stimulating lecturer, but inclined to be conceited and condescending at times. He was also involved in some unseemly wrangles with post-graduate students, which

were not without political overtones. His historical writing, apart from an overview of the life of Paul Kruger, was inclined to be episodic; he indulged in short popular articles for the press. Uys was also given to polemics, and was even regarded as a cheap sensationalist in certain Afrikaner circles. If such sensationalism had been in the cause of Afrikaner nationalism, it would probably have been condoned. Uys, however, never succumbed to the charms of nationalism and preferred to follow his own, if somewhat eccentric, bent. He did chip away at the nationalist paradigm, but often in a rather trivial and idiosyncratic way, such as disputing the exact date of Paul Kruger's birth or the precise location where the Voortrekkers pledged the vow of 1838.[25]

The University of the Orange Free State became increasingly Afrikanerized with the appointment of a sympathetic rector, H. van der Merwe Scholtz, in 1946. With the general shift, Uys was marginalized and gradually overtaken by younger scholars like J. J. Oberholster and especially M. C. E. van Schoor, who had a more pronounced Afrikaner approach to the past.[26]

At the other northern Afrikaans University, the University of Potchefstroom, no process of Afrikanerization was required. The University grew out of an exclusively Afrikaans 19th-century theological seminary, and self-consciously pursued and officially inscribed in its charter a rigid Calvinist philosophy of education which infused Afrikaner national life with an even more explicitly defined divine mission and calling.[27]

Here the legitimacy of "volksgeskiedenis" was never in doubt or under attack. A.J.H. van der Walt, who joined the history department in 1921, became professor, and head in 1928, till 1946, when he was appointed Director of External Studies at the University of South Africa. Although Van der Walt was not a rousing politician, he had explicit links to a populist organisation like the "Ossewa-Brandwag", which was

formed in the aftermath of the 1938 centenary celebrations of the Great Trek and which displayed characteristics similar to those of the national-socialist movement in Germany at the time. Academically, Van der Walt was one of the moving forces behind the first comprehensive Afrikaans university textbook, Geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika, which appeared in two volumes in 1951. The publication, which had a distinct Afrikanercentric slant, was originally conceived before the Second World War as a counterweight to the South African chapters in the imperialistic Cambridge History of the British Empire. The Geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika, later condensed into one volume, went through several editions and for almost 20 years it was widely used as a general text at Afrikaans universities.[28]

It is abundantly clear that political loyalty to the wider nationalist movement in the thirties and forties was an important element in the profile of Afrikaans history departments. With the exception of the University College of the Orange Free State, these departments, during a period when the search for a national identity, culture and legitimizing history was conducted with vigour and intensity, were reliable and receptive allies who could assume the status of professional authorities for the authentification and promotion of the new past which was required in the broader political process of refashioning the present.[29]

The role of Afrikaner historians in this respect is not unique; invariably in countries involved in nation-building exercises, historians are prone to "indulge in excesses of patriotic myth-making."[30] At the same time, the nationalist movement also fed back into academic activity. The wider political interest in history had a regenerative effect on Afrikaner scholarship. For instance, the number of post-graduate theses at the University of Pretoria increased significantly with the departure of Fouché and under the new reign of Bosman.[31]

The connection between politics and scholarship can

easily be oversimplified. One has to bear in mind that Afrikaner historians had to justify themselves in terms which not only carried political but also academic weight. It is in this respect that the relationship between "volksgeskiedenis" and "objective-scientific" history came into play.

"Objective-scientific" history and professionalism.

It is not the intention here to discuss in detail the issue of "objectivity" in the actual writing of history and to consider whether this "ideal" can or cannot be achieved.[32] Nor is it the intention to pronounce on whether Afrikaans historical writing has been "objective"; it will be an almost impossible task in terms of the volume of writing and the criteria to be used, and ultimately the results will be of little significance. As one American commentator has recently remarked: "It seems to me that to say of a work of history that it is or isn't objective is to make an empty observation, to say nothing interesting or useful".[33] Equally it is of no interest here to try and determine whether history can or cannot be considered a "science". My concern is rather to unravel the function and ramifications of the "objective-scientific" concept in the Afrikaans historical profession.

The terms "objective" and "scientific" were often linked, hence the hyphenated form. It was, as also happened in the Netherlands and Germany during the late 19th and early 20th century, that under the agency of "objectivity" historical writing had to be disciplined in order to conform to the dictates and demands of a "science". The two concepts were therefore used in tandem.[34]

Not surprisingly, it was at the University of Stellenbosch that the notion of "objective-scientific" history was emphasised and propagated, and transmitted from there to other Afrikaans Universities. With some justification the history department at Stellenbosch could claim in the six-

ties that it had a "famous tradition" in this respect. It was a source of great pride that they were responsible for laying the foundations of the "new tradition in South Africa of thorough archival research and objective, critical judgement of the facts".[35]

One of the earliest expressions of the "objective-scientific" idea in Afrikaans was that of S.F.N. Gie, the first professor of South African history at Stellenbosch, where he lectured from 1918 to 1926. Addressing the student historical society in 1920, Gie accentuated an "honest and objective" attitude as an essential requirement for the "scientific" historian. These intellectual qualities, Gie argued, could only be gained through "hard work and experience" in dealing with the subject.[36] Some 15 years later, J.A. Wiid, Gie's successor in South African history, endorsed much the same view. He did admit, though, that complete objectivity was not possible and that "subjective factors" would always intrude. Nevertheless, this should not deter the historian from striving towards objectivity.[37] Taken at face value this statement seemed reasonable enough, but the built-in contradiction, how to achieve something that cannot be achieved, was never confronted. This point of departure also had other implications; under the guise of "unavoidable subjective factors" various versions of "volksgeskiedenis", as long as they were not openly propagandist, could receive the authoritative approval as acceptable "scientific" history.

This interpretation of "objective-scientific" history assumed the status of a holy writ. Year after year the history methodology lecture rooms at Stellenbosch reverberated with the ritual incantation of "objective-scientific" history. The tablets of stone were being handed down; not to be questioned, but to be obeyed. Besides Gie and Wiid, several other influential professors - W.Blommaert, Thom and Van der Merwe subscribed to, and impressed upon generations of students, the same ideal of historical practice.[38] The apparently noble aims of "objective-scientific" history cast

a powerful spell. As recently as 1987 the current head of the history department at Stellenbosch, Prof D.J. van Zyl, could, like his predecessors, proclaim without any sense of self-doubt that "the striving towards objectivity ('objektiwiteitstrewe') remains a fundamental principle."[39]

As pointed out earlier, Afrikaner historians found "objective-scientific" history entirely compatible with "volksgeskiedenis". This was the case partly because of the "unavoidable subjectivity" factor, but more importantly, there was also a distinct tendency to collapse "objective-scientific" history into "volksgeskiedenis". Thom combined the two almost effortlessly: the "main aim" of history was "to search for the truth in an honest way, and to keep that aim pure, but at the same time we had to do that in the midst of the 'volk'".[40] The possibility that the "truth" might be found outside the closed circle of the "volk", was not really a consideration that merited serious attention. There was a strong belief that "objective-scientific" history would vindicate "volksgeskiedenis"; provided one's research has been thorough enough, the "facts" themselves, without any embellishment, would reinforce and strengthen the case of the "volk".[41] This view was not restricted to Stellenbosch, but was found in an even more robust form in Afrikaner universities to the north.[42]

The enmeshment of "objective-scientific" history and "volksgeskiedenis" meant that political and socially conditioned values were relatively easily accommodated. In turn, these factors also influenced the internal structure of the discipline itself: research priorities, the loci of power within the profession, the division and allocation of resources, career patterns and advancement, decisions on material to appear in print and the reception of publications. Ultimately then, "extra-scientific" pressures were mediated through these "intra-scientific" structures, priorities and networks, and the knowledge generated in this way cannot be seen as separate from the process through which it has been forged.[43]

Proponents and adherents of the "objective-scientific" view were very sensitive to any criticism. This was especially true if the criticism came from within the fold. In the early fifties a young historian, recently graduated with a doctorate from the University of Groningen in the Netherlands, had the temerity to suggest that professional historical writing in Afrikaans, especially in the northern universities, displayed certain weaknesses: it lacked structure and cohesion, it often amounted to an uncritical and mechanical reproduction of knowledge without any attempts at solving a clearly defined problem, and that too much emphasis was placed on nationalistic, as opposed to a more broadly conceived national history. The young historian was F.A. van Jaarsveld, destined to become the most prolific, and in some respects controversial, of all Afrikaner historians.

Van Jaarsveld's criticism implied that some Afrikaner historians fell short of the ideal of proper "scientific" history. His attempt to improve the level of "scientific" writing, to strengthen the paradigm, was not welcomed. On the contrary, condemnation from the establishment was complete; Van Jaarsveld, somewhat ironically today, was labeled a Marxist - a particularly vicious and potentially damaging insinuation at the time. It was a case of being tainted by association; Van Jaarsveld was linked to a Dutch historian with socialist leanings, Jan Romein, whose seminars the young academic had attended. The main reason for the attack is not difficult to discern: Van Jaarsveld was seen to be driving a wedge between "scientific history" and "volksgeskiedenis". These Siamese twins, who had only fairly recently been nursed to life, had to be protected from the surgical experiments of an overzealous young doctor. It was a chastening experience for the enterprising and energetic historian, especially as he had yet to find an academic position. Privately Van Jaarsveld wrote: "I know that I am busy with a thankless task; one has to absorb the shocks - but the road which has not yet been traversed, has to be

cleared. That the issue has been personalized with all sorts of underground motives ascribed to me, is a pity".[44]

As the Van Jaarsveld case illustrates, pressures which emanated from the Afrikaner establishment were not conducive to a vigorous scrutiny of the application of the concepts which had been made the basis of professional historical writing. There was an almost "irrational taboo" against probing too deeply.[45] The lines were drawn; and although Van Jaarsveld was still given to test the limits from time to time, he too stayed largely within the parameters.[46]

The situation was compounded with fewer and fewer Afrikaner history students leaving for further study in Europe in the sixties and seventies where they could come into contact with different post-war developments and critical theories of historical writing. With a few exceptions, Afrikaner students now preferred to study at local universities. In part, at least, this was the outcome of the weakening of traditional Afrikaner ties with Germany and the Netherlands as apartheid South Africa was being increasingly isolated from the sixties onwards and Afrikaner students themselves developed reservations about the value of learning emanating from the "liberal West". The idea of "objective-scientific" history thus remained largely unchallenged. Consequently, Afrikaner historians, as one commentator pointed out in 1988:

> are still attached to a methodology of the ... kind that they believe will ensure the objectivity of their findings. In response to this it needs to be shown that in other western societies confidence in attaining objectivity along this path has been severely shaken....

It had to be understood that there

> is no possibility of applying a purely fact-based, empirical method of historical enquiry. Apprehension of the facts themselves implies interpretation and interpretation implies identification through the use of concepts and also selection of certain principles that

go beyond the conventional historical evidence itself.[47]

In contrast to the more recent generation of Afrikaner scholars who did not receive their training abroad, an earlier generation had a thorough European grounding. Afrikaner academics of the thirties in particular, showed considerable interest in and at times admiration for developments in Germany.[48] This was no coincidence; the growth of National-Socialism in Germany occurred precisely at the same time that certain Afrikaner intellectual and cultural entrepreneurs were involved in their own programme of ethnic mobilization.

At Stellenbosch there was a concentration of academics with European experience. Gie, Wiid and Thom had all studied in pre-war Germany. Blommaert, a Flemish immigrant, had graduated in Belgium, and Van der Merwe completed his doctorate in the Netherlands. At Potchefstroom was Van der Walt with a doctorate from Germany, and at Pretoria, Bosman, with one from the Netherlands.

With considerable justification it could be claimed that the "European scientific method had a wide following in South Africa" as far as the Afrikaans Universities were concerned.[49] Those Afrikaners who went abroad, came into contact with pre-war German historicism, which at the time, incorporated the ideals of Leopold von Ranke's empirical, documentary, "objective-scientific" history. It is true that in the transmission of Ranke's ideas to America and elsewhere some distortion took place and that "what Ranke himself had thought, was, in a sense, less important to the development of historiography than was the image of Ranke in the historian's mind."[50]

Regardless of the precise way in which Ranke was interpreted, successive generations of students and scholars paid great attention to technical details and the recovery of "fact". As one commentator has noted:

In the <u>historische Vorseminarien</u> of their German

> mentors, graduate students encountered a dazzling array of refined and esoteric techniques for ferreting out and verifying the historical fact: paleography, numismatics, epigraphy, sphragistics, and many more. Technique was important, but even more important was rigor, assiduity in research, an infinite capacity for the most painstaking and arduous pursuit of the fact. Their ideal was the man who would "cross an ocean to verify a comma."[51]

Another important strand of historicism was not to admit to a clear and specific view of the world, but claiming to rise above politics and ideological suppositions by pursuing a firm commitment to past-mindedness, uncontaminated by presentism. Definitive history, it was fondly believed, could be written in this way. Through the "objective-scientific" method, history could be kept from becoming a handmaiden of politics, and from being continually reinterpreted to meet current demands. In Germany, it was "this belief that made historians confident of historicism's ability to be a bulwark against the Nazification of history."[52]

They were over-confident; despite the sincere efforts of men like F.Meinecke, H.Oncken and others, "objective-scientific" history offered little resistance to a regime which in the most partisan of ways used the past to legitimize the present. The German "objective-scientific" ideal in fact hosted the germ of its own fallibility; it had a paralyzing effect and at a crucial stage predisposed scholars like Meinecke, to misunderstand despite being anti-Nazi, and misread the real nature of the National-Socialist movement. By and large German historicans were of the opinion that "party squabbles and petty politics were not part of the lofty realm they believed themselves to operate within".[53] For fear of not appearing objective and scientific, German historians, with a few exceptions, were incapable of providing a meaningful defence of the intellectual battlements of their realm.

Whilst the "objective-scientific" ideal contributed to the passivity of many German historians, in South Africa Afrikaner historians used much the same notion in an active way to promote certain ideas and denigrate others. Their main target was what they considered the English "liberal" school of historical writing. That much becomes apparent when considering the way in which Thom in 1940 reviewed a book by J. S. Marais, senior lecturer at the University of Cape Town at the time, on the history of the Cape 'coloured' people from 1652 to 1937.[54] Thom had little or nothing to say about the importance of the topic, the contribution (or otherwise) of the book to existing knowledge, the ideas and issues it raised, and the possible new avenues of research it opened. He preferred, instead, to judge the book on what he considered "objective-scientific" criteria. In essence these criteria only amounted to a strenuous defence of the prevailing Afrikaner view of history. Whereas Marais was fairly critical of the way in which Boers had treated "coloureds" in the 19th century and earlier, Thom did his best to exonerate the Boers on "scientific" grounds. This was not an isolated case. In a general address given in 1943 Thom also took English-speaking historians to task for not being "objective" enough in their historical writing.[55] By claiming that certain ideas were not "scientific", their value and wider currency would immediately be discounted. The only "true" historical knowledge was that which was "value-free" and "scientific"; if it could be "proven" not to be scientific, it could also not be "true".[56] In a similar way, "scientific" history could also be used to cast aspersions on Afrikaner historians who appeared to operate outside the fold. Thus C. J. Uys, the "deviant" of Bloemfontein, was refused a grant by the National Council for Social Research on the basis of recommendations of select Afrikaner historians who maintained that his work was not "entirely scientific."[57]

For Afrikaner historians the ideal of "objective-scien-

tific" history came to constitute a defence against any form of history seen to undermine their view of the past. Other histories were politically inspired, but history as written by Afrikaner professionals, so it was claimed, rose above politics because it was "objective" and "scientific". The belief in the superiority of their "a-political" tradition was firm; as late as 1982 "objective-scientific" history was posited as a neutral counterpoint to ideological "nationalistic, liberal or radical historical writing".[58] There was no realization that "objective-scientific" history was in itself a political position infused with conservative notions.

The emphasis on "objective-scientific" history furthermore encouraged conformity and consensus. Most Afrikaner historians subscribed to it and its centrality and importance reduced the potential for conflict over substantial matters of interpretation. Those who dared to pursue themes considered unorthodox and controversial by the establishment could easily fall foul of accusations that their research might compromise the sacred tenets of the profession. "Objectivity", in fact, "was valued not as the outcome of professional conflict, but as a prophylactic against it."[59]

The "objective-scientific" posture and rhetoric also served a wider purpose in that it contributed to the legitimisation of the profession. "Objective-scientific" knowledge has authoritative connotations, as opposed to the merely subjective opinions of lay people.[60] It is common practice to give a young profession cohesion and strength through what has been called "linguistic modelling" - the systematic and repetitive use of a single metaphor designed to create a knowledge base which can serve as a bastion and a model for the profession.[61] In addition, for the emerging Afrikaner middle-class of the forties through to the sixties, of which university historians were part and parcel, pretensions of professionalism were also significant for status reasons. If the standing of the discipline could be enhanced by ele-

vating it to a "scientific" level, the status of the actual practitioners could benefit accordingly. Because claims of "objective-scientific" history were important pillars providing respectability and strength to the profession, it also become more difficult to question these ideals without actually compromising and embarrassing the profession itself.

The profession, however, was not only sustained by claims to be an objective science. It also established its own publications as tangible proof of its status. One such important publication is the Archives Yearbook. The idea for such a yearbook, incorporating the results of "scientific" research, originated at Stellenbosch. Prof J.L.M. Franken, professor of French who had a special interest in history, and Thom were the driving forces behind the publication. According to Thom, the establishment of the yearbook was a "scientific labour of love in the interest of our 'volk' and the history of our fatherland".[62] The venture was sponsored by the government through the archives. The first edition appeared in 1938 and to date (1989) a total of 169 theses have appeared, the overwhelming majority in Afrikaans with Stellenbosch leading the other universities.

Since its inception the Archives Yearbook was meant to be a showcase of the best that the historical profession in South Africa had to offer, and the editorial board, consisting mainly of prominent Afrikaner historians and archivists, was therefore selective in what they accepted for publication. The series, which has been sustained for more than 50 years, constitutes a formidable body of readily accessible material on a number of topics. Indeed, viewed in narrow terms of providing an outlet for historical research, the enterprise was undoubtedly successful.

Although the series is very valuable as a resource base, in a broader context it has not established a reputation for publishing seminal and path-finding scholarly work. For a considerable number of years the Dutch historian W Ph.

Coolhaas, who had a specialized knowledge of South African history and an outsider's sharp eye for picking out that which South African historians were oblivious to, regularly provided perceptive reviews of the yearbook. In general, Coolhaas was impressed with the technical side of the published theses and the amount of primary archival research involved. But, with a few exceptions, he found the way in which the material had been presented, disappointing: larger questions of end or meaning hardly featured; topics were researched not because they presented an intrinsic problem, but only because they had not been researched before; theses were too narrowly conceived and were regularly overburdened with irrelevant factual detail; and black people, if they were not actually written out of the history, appeared only in one-dimensional form.[63]

Coolhaas was not alone in his criticism. The talented C.W. de Kiewiet, who started off as a South African historian in the twenties but later emigrated to America, also noted some early flaws which were never quite eradicated even in much later volumes. Commenting on a thesis dealing with the relationship between the Boers and Basotho in the 19th century, De Kiewiet wrote in 1941 that the work "suffers severely from a naive conception of the struggle with the Basotho tribes as part of the epic of Boerdom in its fight against ignorance and slavery". In advance of many practitioners in South Africa, De Kiewiet had hoped that "such simplisme has been abandoned by most capable historians".[64] In reviewing another thesis in 1943 on the Great Trek, De Kiewiet found that it was a case of scholarship being used in "the service of nationalistic trends and parochial convictions."[65]

Although nationalistic theses found their way into the Archives Yearbook, the editorial board frowned upon remarks in theses which had immediate political relevance, especially if the remarks contradicted their own political views. Thus, in 1949 the introduction of one thesis was censured

for fear of antagonizing the Nationalist government; the offending passages were blatantly described as "nigger-loving, anti-apartheid, negrophilistic nonsense" which would do the series "much harm and no good".[66] Similarly, the board was keen to avoid a possible controversy which might have arisen as a result of a genealogical study in which some Afrikaner families were proven to have a "mixed ancestry".[67] Such sensibilities on matters of colour and the perceived ramifications thereof, are also reflected in the quandary the board found itself in when an Indian, B. Pachai, submitted his thesis for possible publication. The thesis was on M. K. Ghandi and the newspaper, Indian Opinion, which he had started in Natal in 1903. It was considered a "controversial" topic, which could, to "the detriment of the state, be misused in international politics". Pachai's work was only accepted after the board had satisfied itself that the thesis was not a veiled "attack on the government", and that the author had not embarked on his research with "ulterior motives".[68]

Although the board primarily saw themselves as "scientific" historians, serving the profession, there was also a fond hope that the work being published in the series would provide historical legitimisation abroad for the policies of the Nationalist Party government. In a departmental letter the chief archivist explained in 1956 that the publications "contained reliable historical facts, based on careful scientific research, putting our problems in perspective". Because of this, he claimed:

> these publications are potent methods to fight against misunderstandings and malevolence, here and particularly abroad. They provide correct information to professors and lecturers in overseas countries who, as academics, transmit the information to their students. In this way a positive influence is exerted in intellectual circles which should gradually work like yeast to counter evil propaganda.[69]

This statement might have been naive, but its political

contents and direction cannot be misinterpreted.

The professionalization of historical writing was not matched by an increase in readership; few lay people could be expected to wade through the often turgid prose of the theses which appeared in the Archives Yearbook. This was in contrast to the wide readership during the thirties and forties of the doyen of popular Afrikaans historical writers, Gustav Preller. Preller's "fighting scholarship" appealed to thousands of readers during the period of Afrikaner ethnic mobilization.[70] Preller wrote purple prose; he ridiculed the notion of "objectivity"; his work had a clear political purpose and although he often used primary sources he made no claim to be a "scientific" historian. In a way, it can be argued that Preller was more honest than academic historians whose work often reflected narrow nationalistic tendencies, but who for professional and other reasons tried to hide it under a cloak of "objective-scientific" history. There was, indeed, no major conceptual gulf between "scientific" and "non-scientific" history.[71] It is true that professionals wrote on a wider variety of topics in more subdued tones, and added some refinements and nuances especially as far as scope and technique were concerned. But their central vision of the South African past, to the exclusion of much else, remained essentially that of a resilient Afrikanerdom marching inexorably to its pre-determined destination as the legitimate rulers over non-Afrikaners in South Africa.

In the fifties and sixties a confluence of political and economic developments saw to it that public interest in history gradually waned. Politically Afrikaners had captured the state in 1948 and their ideal of a republic was fulfilled in 1961, whilst a major upsurge in economic growth in the sixties and concomitant prosperity combined to render an immediate interest in the past less compelling. An increasingly confident Afrikanerdom could afford to be less dependent on the past.

The declining interest in history brought about by the new environment was noted with some regret by certain academic historians.[72] They responded not by re-conceptualizing the past, but by retreating further into professionalism. In 1965 the South African Historical Society was formed in Bloemfontein, "dedicated to the promotion of the specific interests of professional historians."[73] The initiative for the founding of this organisation emanated from the Afrikaans campus of the University of the Orange Free State, but in a period of increasing co-operation between the two white language groups, a concerted attempt was made to draw Englishspeaking historians into the organisation. With this development, Afrikaner historians to some extent disassociated themselves from the other existing Afrikaans historical organisation, the "Historiese Genootskap" which catered mainly for teachers.[74] Thus they self-consciously sought to put some distance between them and other "lesser" practitioners, and instead tried to establish links with other professionals. This happened without any of the two academic parties involved having to make major political concessions. Afrikaner historians still retained their nationalistic framework, and Englishspeakers their liberal orientation. The pragmatic ideology of professionalism, so it seems, helped to cement the structures of the South African Historical Society.

Conclusion

The political achievement of Afrikaner historians must not be underestimated. Under the guise of "objective-scientific" history they helped to entrench a narrow nationalist view of the past. It is salutary to be reminded that "Afrikaans historiography is the historical tradition which feeds into school-books that the great majority of literate South Africans experience" and that "with all its merits, the Afrikaans school makes the only major attempt at a national historiography".[75]

Liberal historians, though they might have disagreed with the Afrikaner presentation of history, failed to challenge the basic assumptions which claimed to provide Afrikaans historians with a "true" version of the past. In part at least, this was the case because liberal historians themselves, though less obsessively so, were also partial to the notion of "objective-scientific" history.[76] On a different level, the Afrikaner view of the past was greatly aided by the National Party coming into power in 1948. Greater control over education contributed to the entrenchment of a specific Afrikaner interpretation in school textbooks.[97]

When wider societal changes slowly started to render that particular version redundant, Afrikaner historians responded to the new context by emphasising and strengthening their professional status along organisational lines. Their basic framework, however, remained intact. In the long run this left them ill-equipped to cope with the transformation of South African historiography during the past decade and a half. Notions of "objective-scientific" history were simply inappropriate to deal with new concerns such as class conflict, class formation, capital accumulation and proletarianization which first made their influence felt in the seventies. This brought about a dilemma in professional Afrikaans historical writing which is yet to be resolved.[78]

NOTES

1. A. du Toit, "Facing up to the future: Some personal reflections on the predicament of Afrikaner intellectuals in the legitimation crisis of Afrikaner nationalism and the apartheid state", Social Dynamics, 7 (1981),p.3. For the rise of Afrikaner nationalism during the thirties and forties see T.D.Moodie, The rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, apartheid and the Afrikaner civil religion (Berkeley, 1975); H. Adam and H.B. Giliomee, The rise and crisis of Afrikaner power (Cape Town, 1979); D. O'Meara, Volkskapitalisme: Class, capital and ideology in the development of Afrikaner nationalism, 1934-1948 (Johannesburg,1983).

2. T.J.Hugo, Die Afrikaanse universiteit en sy taak in die volkslewe (Cape Town,1941), p.116. (Translation).

3.F.A. van Jaarsveld, Historiese Verkenninge (Pretoria,1974), p.209. (Translation).

4. F.A. van Jaarsveld, Die Afrikaner se groot trek na die stede en ander opstelle (Johannesburg,1982), p.246. This volume contains a wide-ranging essay on the development of the history department at Stellenbosch. For an overview of the precursor of the department see D.J. van Zyl, "Geskiedenis op naskoolse vlak op Stellenbosch, 1874-1918", Die Unie, November 1976.

5. H.B. Thom (ed.), Stellenbosch, 1866-1966: Honderd jaar hoër onderwys (Cape Town,1966), p.353; D.J. Kotze (ed.), Professor H.B. Thom (Stellenbosch 1969) p.78-79. (The quotations which are translated are from the latter source).

6. Compare Thom (ed.),Stellenbosch, pp.554-555; H.B.Thom, "Oor historiese oriëntering", Historia, December 1973, p.221.

7. Kotze (ed.), Thom, pp.29,83. (Translations).

8. Van Jaarsveld, Ander opstelle, p.271. (Translation).

9. Interview with Professor C.F.J. Muller in Pretoria, 31 October 1989. (Prof. Muller, who was head of the department of history at the University of South Africa for 33 years, was a student of Thom).

10. Van Jaarsveld, Ander opstelle, pp.259-260. It needs to be pointed out though that somebody like P.J. van der Merwe at Stellenbosch still persisted in writing a form of rural socio-economic history. See F.A. van Jaarsveld, "P.J. van der Merwe: ondersoeker van die Afrikaner se landelike-pioniersgeskiedenis" in Wie en wat is die Afrikaner? (Cape Town, 1981).

11. See Van Jaarsveld, Ander opstelle, p.258 for details and and University of Stellenbosch Library (USL), H.B. Thom Papers, 21/A/5, Thom - C.Coetzee (Fort Hare), 6 June 1954.

12. For example USL, Thom Papers, 21/A/1, J.J. Oberholster (from Bloemfontein) - Thom, 12 March 1954.

13. South African Academy of Science and Arts Archives (SAWEK), Stals-prize, 20/9/5, Copy of D.J. Kotze's acceptance speech, 19 October 1974. (Translation).

14. USL, Thom Papers, 21/B/3, F. Kreuzer - Thom, 26 August 1948. (Translation).

15. USL, Thom Papers, 21/A/1, D.W. Kruger - Thom, 4 August 1954 and Thom - Kruger, 7 September 1954.
16. G. van N. Viljoen, "The Afrikaans universities and particularism" in H.W. van der Merwe and D.Welsh (eds.), The future of the university in South Africa (Cape Town, 1977), p.178.
17. Hugo, Afrikaanse universiteit, pp.113-114,115.
18. Ad Destinatum: Gedenkboek van die Universiteit van Pretoria (Johannesburg,1960), pp.60-63.
19. Ad Destinatum, pp. 112-113; F.A. van Jaarsveld, "Leo Fouche" in South African Biographical Dictionary, 1987; H.S. Coetzee, "Die lewe en werk van Prof. Leo Fouche" (Unpub. B.A. Hons. essay, University of Pretoria, 1981), pp.3-5. (I am indebted to Prof. F.A.van Jaarsveld for a copy of this essay, as well as all other references to University of Pretoria Hons. essays).
20. University of the Witwatersrand Library (UWL), M. Ballinger papers, B 2/16/1, L. Fouche - M. Hodgson, 19 February1934.Emphasis in original. (I am indebted to Alex Mouton for this reference).
21. A.N.Pelzer, "Izak Daniel Bosman, 1897-1947", Historiese Studies, 8, 1947, p.7.
22. M.C.E. van Schoor, 60 jaar op die bult (Bloemfontein, 1970), pp.130,134; J.C. Steyn "Nasionalisme en die politisering van taal en kultuur in die dertigerjare"; D.F. Malherbe - gedenklesing, 5, 1986, p.1.
23. Quoted in Steyn "Politisering", p.2. (The quotation has been translated but the spelling of place names left unaltered).
24. USL, P.J. van der Merwe Papers, 6, D.F. Malherbe - Van der Merwe, 14 Februarie 1941. (Translation).
25. Compare F.A. van Jaarsveld, "Cornelius Janse Uys" in South African Biographical Dictionary, 1987; USL, Thom Papers, 21/B/2, B.J.Barnard - Thom, 5 March 1946; Central Archives Depot Pretoria (CAD), Archives of the Archives Yearbook (ARH) 170/10/2;B.J.Barnard - J.H.Breytenbach,16 February 1949; C.J.Uys "Die huidige stand van geskiedskrywing in Suid-Afrika",Historia,1957,p.130; Interview with Prof.C.F.J. Muller,Pretoria,31 October 1989;Interview with Prof.B.J. Liebenberg (a former student of Uys') Pretoria,1 November 1989.
26. Compare M.T.du Toit,"Die bydrae van Prof.M.C.E.van Schoor tot die Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedskrywing"(Unpub. B.A.Hons.essay,University of Pretoria,1981),p.13; Van Schoor, 60 Jaar,p.137;USL,Thom Papers,21/B/3,J.J Oberholster - Thom,5 June 1948.
27. J.S.du Plessis,Geskiedenis van die Potchefstroomse Universiteitskollege vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys,1919-1951 (Potchefstroom,1975),pp.1-10,60-75.
28. Compare B.Kriek,"Die bydrae van Prof.A.J.H.van der Walt tot die Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedskrywing" (Unpub. B.A.Hons.essay,University of Pretoria,1979),passim; C.F.J. Muller,"A.J.H.van der Walt" in Kleio,IV,2,October 1972,pp.1-2; D.W.Kruger,"Prof.A.J.H.van der Walt" in

Koers,XXIII,4,February 1956,pp.191-195;P.de Klerk,"Afrikanerdenkers en die beginsels van die Ossewabrandwag" in Journal for Contemporary History,14,1, June 1989,p.54;A.J.H.van der Walt,"Ons geskiedenis hersien" in Die Huisgenoot,11 December 1936,pp.79,87;USL,Thom Papers, 21/B/1,Van der Walt - Thom, 5 September 1936;Interview with Prof. C.F.J.Muller,Pretoria,31 October 1989.

29. One arena in which this took place was in the popular Afrikaans press.Numerous examples can be found in J.J. Joubert,"Die geskiedskrywing in die Die Huisgenoot,1923-1949" (Unpub.M.A.thesis University of South Africa,1983),passim.

30. H.Seton-Watson,"On trying to be an historian of Eastern Europe" in D.Deletant and H.Hanak (eds.), Historians as nation-builders:Central and South-east Europe (London,1988), p.13.

31. Pelzer,"Bosman", Historiese Studies,8,1947,p.7.

32. For a recent statement of this in the South African context see N.G.Garson,"South African historians and the call for objectivity" (Unpub.paper,Stellenbosch,September 1988).

33. P.Novick, That noble dream:the "objectivity" question and the American historical profession (Cambridge,1988). Emphasis in original.

34. F. R. Ankersmit,"Geschiedenis,historiciteit en wetenschapbeoefening" in Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis,101, 1988,p.497.

35.Thom (ed.),Stellenbosch,1866-1966,p.470; Kotze (ed.), Thom,p.17.(Translation).

36.S.F.N.Gie,"Die Geskiedenis as 'n wetenskap" in Die Huisgenoot,October 1920,p.254.(Translation).

37. J.A.Wiid,"Subjektiewe faktore in die geskiedskrywing", Stellenbosche Oudstudent,April 1935,pp.19-22.

38. Compare A.Moorees,"Prof.Blommaert",Stellenbosche Oudstudent,April 1935,pp.2-3;USL,Thom Papers,28/A/2, Notebooks on methodology,undated but probably in the late 1920's; USL,Van der Merwe Papers,38 (a),Notebooks on methodology,undated but probably in the late 1930's;H.B.Thom,"Die huidige stand van historiese navorsing in S-Afrika",Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1943,p.17; Interview with Prof.H.B.Giliomee, Stellenbosch,16 October 1989.(Prof.Giliomee,currently from the University of Cape Town was a student and lecturer at Stellenbosch for more than twenty years).

39. D.J.van Zyl,"Geskiedenis as vak en wetenskap:nuwe uitdagings",South African Historical Journal,19,1987,p.3.

40. Thom,"Historiese navorsing",Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1943,p.18.(Translation).

41. USL,Thom Papers,28/A/2,Notebooks on methodology,undated but probably late 1920's;USL,Van der Merwe Papers,38(a), Notebooks on methodology,undated but probably late 1930's. The notes on this issue are almost literally the same.See also Gie,"Geskiedenis as wetenskap," Die Huisgenoot,October 1920,p.26-27.

42. Compare for instance Pelzer, "Bosman", Historiese Studies, 8, 1947, pp.26-27.
43. The basic idea has been expressed by H. Wolpe, "The liberation struggle and research", Review of African Political Economy, 32, April 1985, p.74.
44. Compare J.T.du Bruyn, "F.A. van Jaarsveld: Afrikanerhistorikus en vernuwer", Historia, 27, 1982, pp.57-58; A. van Jaarsveld, "Dr.T.S van Rooyen (1922-1967) en die historiese geleerdheid", Historia, 30, 1, 1985, pp.56-58; F.A. van Jaarsveld, "Geskiedenis en lewe: 'n metodologiese-kritiese opstel", Standpunte, June 1953, pp.17-33; F.A. van Jaarsveld, "Geskiedenis en politiek", Standpunte, December 1953, pp.66-74; T.S. van Rooyen, "Filosofie en Geskiedenis: 'n antwoord op die jongste metodologiese veronderstellings van dr. F.A. van Jaarsveld", Standpunte, December 1953, pp.52-62; F.A. van Jaarsveld, "Onrypheid in ons geskiedwetenskap", Standpunte, June 1954, pp.40-44; T.S. van Rooyen, "Jan Romein in Suid-Afrika", Hervormde Teologiese Studies, August 1953, pp.249-270; J. Stoop, "Oor die metode van ons kerkgeskiedskrywing en oor die kritiek daarop", Hervormde Teologiese Studies, August 1953, pp.282-287; Kotze (ed.), Thom, p.28; Interview with Prof. C.F.J. Muller, Pretoria, 31 October 1989; USL, Thom Papers, 21/A/1, Van Jaarsveld - Thom, 2 May 1953 and 14 August 1953 (The quotation which has been translated is from the first letter).
45. The phrase is from G.Myrdal, Objectivity in social science research (Middletown, 1983), p.4.
46. For an analysis of Van Jaarsveld's position in later years see Du Bruyn, "Van Jaarsveld", Historia, 27, 1982, p.59.
47. Garson, "South African historians and the call for objectivity", p.4.
48. J.H.Barnard, "Persoonlike ondervindinge in verband met die ontwaking in Duitsland", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1934, pp.23-24; R.W.Wilcocks, "Kulturelle und wissenschaftliche beziehungen zwischen dem deutsche reich und der Universität Stellenbosch, Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1934, pp.24-26; S.M.Naude, Duitsland voor en na 1933: enige indrukke tydens 'n onlangse besoek", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1937, pp. 29-33; C.G.S.de Villiers, "Die annale van die universiteit", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, September 1937, pp.8-9; C.G.W. Schumann, "Hier en daar in Duitsland", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, September 1938, pp.22-24.
49. F.J.du Toit Spies, "Die uitwerking van enkele Europese geestestrominge op ons geskiedskrywing", Historia, September 1960, p.226. (Translation).
50. G.Iggers, "The image of Ranke in American and German historical thought", History and Theory, 2, 1962, p.18.
51. Novick, "Objectivity" question, p.23.
52. A.R.Sims, "Those who stayed behind: German historians and the third reich" (Unpub.Ph.D.thesis, Cornell University, 1979), p.33.

53. A.R. Sims, "Intellectuals in crisis: historians under Hitler", Virginia Quarterly Review, 54, 2, 1978, p.253. See also A. Gallin, Midwives to Nazism: university professors in Weimar Germany, 1925-1933 (Macon, 1986), pp.6-7, 107-114.
54. H.B. Thom, "Afkoms van die Kleurlinge: 'n 'wetenskaplike' studie wat soms baie subjektief is", Die Huisgenoot, 5 April 1940, p.41, and subsequent defence by J.S. Marais and Thom's reply in edition of 10 May 1940, pp.31, 75.
55. Thom, "Historiese navorsing", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, April 1943, p.17.
56. Compare H. Slater, "Notes on the production of historical knowledge", Utafiti, 6, 2, 1984, p.161.
57. CAD, National Coucil of Social Research (NRSN), 69/6/490, Report of history committee on an application for a grant by C.J. Uys, 17 February 1959.
58. D.J. van Zyl, "Prof. F.A. van Jaarsveld se benadering tot die algemene geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika," Historia, 27, 1982, p.27.
59. The phrase is from Novick, "Objectivity" question, p.60.
60. Novick, "Objectivity" question, p.51.
61. J. Brown, "Professional language: words that succeed", Radical History Review, 34, 1986, p.39.
62. H.B. Thom, "Jaarboek vir Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedenis", Suid-Afrika, November 1947, p.36 (Translation). For the establishment of the Archives Yearbook see also J.L.M. Franken, "'n Jaarboek vir Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedenis," Stellenbosche Oudstudent, September 1938, pp.9-11; CAD, ARH 157/22/A, Minutes of a meeting of the Archives Commission, 22 March 1938; H.B. Thom, "Argief-Jaarboek vir Suid-Afrikaanse geskiedenis", Stellenbosche Oudstudent, September 1939, pp.7-8; Van Jaarsveld, Ander opstelle, p.256.
63. For Coolhaas' views on which this analysis is based, see Zuid-Afrika, February 1959, pp.20-23; Zuid-Afrika, June/July 1971, pp.106-107, 122-123; Zuid-Afrika, January 1973, p.27; Zuid-Afrika, July/August 1979, pp.107-108; Zuid-Afrika, September 1979, pp.124-125; Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis, 1953, pp.125-128; Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis, 1958, pp.278-282; Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis, 1961, pp.139-140, 467-469.
64. American Historical Review, April 1941. (Cutting in CAD, ARH 171/10 16).
65. American Historical Review, April 1943. (Cutting in CAD, ARH 171/10/16).
66. USL, Thom Papers, 5 (b), J.H. Breytenbach - Thom, 8 April 1949 (Translation). See also CAD, ARH 170/10/2, Minutes of a meeting of the editorial board, 22 April 1949. The thesis was that of J.F. Midgley, "The Orange River Sovereignty, 1848-1854", Archives Yearbook, 1949, II.
67. CAD, ARH 167/17/3/1, Thom - A. Kieser, 25 October 1953 (Translation).
68. CAD, ARH 168/17/3/2, W.B. van der Vyver - Chief Archivist, 2 February 1960 and P.J. van der Merwe's report on the thesis, 11 October 1960 (Translations).

69. CAD,ARH 171/17/4/5, Chief Archivist - Secretary of Education,Arts and Science,24 May 1956 (Translation).
70. For recent analyses of Preller see P.J.du Plessis, "Die lewe en werk van Gustav Preller" (Unpub.D.Phil., University of Pretoria,1988); F.A.van Jaarsveld,"Gustav Preller:Sy historiese bewussyn en geskiedbeskouing" (Unpub. paper,1989) and especially I.Hofmeyr,"Popularizing history: The case of Gustav Preller", Journal of African History, 29, 1988, pp.521-535.
71. In 1962 L.M.Thompson noted that despite the fact that "Afrikaner historiography has become more scientific ..., national-minded historians have tended to preserve the pattern created by their predecessors,bringing it up to date and providing it with footnotes and bibliographies... (Journal of African History,III,1,1962,p.129).Writing some 26 years later Ken Smith also came to the conlusion that "there was not all that much difference between men like Preller and the topics researched by academic historians". (K.Smith,The changing past:Trends in South African historical writing,Johannesburg: ,1988,p.70.).
72.J.J.Oberholster,"Die neerslag van die romantiek op die geskiedskrywing - Gustav Preller",Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe,December 1966,p.321; Van Jaarsveld, Historiese verkenninge ,p.209;USL,Thom Papers,Thom - Muller, 16 June 1966.
73.C.Saunders and B.le Cordeur,"The South African Historical Society and its antecedents",South African Historical Journal,18,1986,p.10.
74.For the tensions between the two organisations see P.H.Kapp," 'n Kwarteeu oud:Die Historiese Genootskap van Suid-Afrika,1956-1981",Historia,25,2,1980,p.53; Saunders and Le Cordeur,"Historical Society",South African Historical Journal,18,1986,p.9.
75.W.M.Freund,"Past Imperfect",South African Review of Books,December 1988/January 1989,p.9.
76.John Wright has remarked on the implicit consensus which "has allowed the majority of academic historians,whether liberals or Afrikaner nationalists,to work without being forced to ask to many discomforting questions about their own frames of reference." ("Book Review," South African International,19,2,October 1988,p.106.).
77.A.Grundlingh,"Sosiale geskiedenis en die dilemma in Afrikanergeskiedskrywing",South African Historical Journal, 19, 1987,p.41.
78.Grundlingh,"Dilemma",South African Historical Journal, 19,1987,pp.31-49.