

https://dspace.org/

Afrikaner nationalism, apartheid, and the conceptualisation of "race"

Dubow, Saul

1991-09-23
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8690

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

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

A F R I C A N S T U D I E S I N S T I T U T E

African Studies Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW 7003(7th floor) at
4.00pm MONDAY 23rd SEPTEMBER 1991

Title: Afrikaner Nationalism, Apartheid, and the conceptualisation of "Race".

by: Saul Dubow

No. 301

Afrikaner nationalism, apartheid, and the conceptualisation of "race"[1]

Saul Dubow, University of Sussex

I

In recent years our historical understanding of Afrikaner nationalism has been transformed. No longer is it possible to talk of Afrikaner nationalism in terms of an unchanging, timeless tradition. Nor can we speak of the Afrikaner nationalist movement as a socially undifferentiated entity, pursuing its own primordial ethnic agenda. We now have a much deeper understanding of the ways in which Afrikaner identity was forged from the late nineteenth century, and the means by which Afrikaner ethnicity was mobilised in order to capture state power in the twentieth century.

Gaps in our knowledge nevertheless remain. One such silence concerns the relationship between Christian-nationalism and the conceptualisation of racial difference. This omission partly reflects a general state of amnesia about the place of racist ideas in Western thought. In South Africa it has been exacerbated by materialist scholarship's fear of `idealism'. The ideology of race has therefore tended to be discussed in terms of its functional utility: for example, the extent to which racist ideas can be said to express underlying class interests.

My intention in this paper is not to dispute the ways in which race, understood as a sociological phenomenon, has been treated in the literature on Afrikaner nationalism. Rather, it is to consider the content and internal logic of racist ideology. The focus of this study is therefore on the conscious elaboration of race in the development of Christian-nationalist thought from around the 1930s to the 1950s. Specifically, it considers the extent to which an explicitly biological concept of race informed apartheid theory, and how this related to theological and cultural explanations of human difference.

The argument in this paper is that Christian-nationalism was flexible and eclectic in its use of racist ideas. In constructing an intellectually coherent justification for apartheid, Afrikaner ideologues frequently chose to infer or to suggest biological theories of racial superiority, rather than to assert these openly. Both for pragmatic and doctrinal reasons, the diffuse language of cultural essentialism was preferred to the crude scientific racism drawn from the vocabulary of social Darwinism.[2]

It is virtually a truism that racism has been, and remains, an inseparable part of the structure of South African society. Deeply encoded patterns of paternalism and prejudice are an essential part of the Afrikaner nationalist tradition. Notions of superiority, exclusivity and hierarchy have long existed as more or less conscious `habits of mind'. Together they comprise a folkloric amalgam of popular beliefs and traditions in which the idea of human difference appears as part of the natural order of things. Ideally, patterns of popular racism as experienced on the ground should be analysed in conjunction with theoretical racism. However, this cannot be achieved until such time as we have a fuller understanding of the extent to which theories of racial difference formed part of the ideology of white supremacy in twentieth century South Africa. In this connection - albeit in a different context - George Fredrickson has drawn a useful distinction between

> the explicit and rationalized racism that can be discerned in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century thought and ideology and the implicit or societal racism that can be *inferred* from actual social relationships.[3]

As Frederickson points out, the relationship between these two forms of racism is difficult to unravel. Ideological racism may be an intellectual response to, or formulation of, popular racist sentiment. It may at the same time help to construct and maintain such attitudes. In the case of apartheid, racist ideology both reflected and grew out of already existing notions of human difference. But in helping to systematise and rationalise such assumptions, it also worked to entrench them legislatively and ideologically.

The traumatic experience of the Boer War is generally regarded as having provided the vital stimulus for the development of Afrikaner nationalism as a mass movement. Confused and insecure in defeat, leading Afrikaner nationalist theoreticians sought above all to confront the power of British imperialism. They devoted their energies during the first three decades of the twentieth century to issues like republicanism, language equality, and the poor white question. The result was that Afrikaner nationalism was markedly slow to address directly the relationship between black and white South Africans. Despite their opposition to the political compromises inherent in the inter-war segregationist policies of Hertzog and Smuts, Malan and his followers failed to articulate an alternative, more complete, segregationist vision when the Native Bills were finally passed in 1936.

This situation changed dramatically with the onset of the second world war - an era in which the Afrikaner nationalist movement was effectively isolated from the

centre of political power and, perhaps for that very reason, became especially receptive to radical ideas. Concerted attempts were now made made by nationalist theorists to reorder systematically and permanently the existing framework of race relations. However, the process `which was to consolidate the common nucleus of their colour consciousness and policy of differentiation into a national idea or ideology was to take place only in the 1940s.'[4]

It is unlikely that apartheid ideology would have gained political purchase were it not for the great social ferment occasioned by the war years. Stimulated by the expanded needs of wartime production, secondary industry underwent rapid expansion. This resulted in a massive influx of African workseekers who came to be perceived as posing a major threat to the privileged position of largely Afrikaans-speaking unskilled and semi-skilled labour in metropolitan areas. The intensification of trade union activity and community struggles (of which bus boycotts, squatting movements and the 1946 mineworkers' strike are important examples) prefigured a new challenge to white power on the part of urban Africans. This was confirmed by the drafting of the seminal policy document African Claims in 1943 and the emergence of the radical Congress Youth League, which together heralded the transformation of the ANC into a popular movement with mass-democratic methods and aims.

It was under these circumstances that apartheid came to be formulated with particular urgency. Initial stirrings of interest in the apartheid idea from a specifically Christian-nationalist perspective were already apparent in the preceding decade. From 1933 a small group of young Potchefstroom-based Afrikaner intellectuals began to explore questions of race and nationality in *Koers* (direction), the influential theoretical mouthpiece of the Federation of Calvinist Student Associations.[5] Articles in this journal by the maverick politics teacher L.J.du Plessis and his missionary namesake H.du Plessis represent important early attempts to situate the idea of race within a neo-Calvinist framework.[6] Also notable was the establishment in 1935 of the *Suid-Afrikaanse Bond vir Rassestudie* which was created as a counter to the supposedly liberal South African Institute of Race Relations.[7] Rhoodie and Venter trace the first use of the word `apartheid' to the *Bond vir Rassestudie*. It was adopted as the organisation's political slogan in 1936 to distinguish the Afrikaner concept of total racial separation from the less rigorous notion of segregation. Henceforth `apartheid' began to seep into political discourse. But the word only came to enjoy common currency from 1943 when Dr Malan, the Nationalist leader, began to employ it with regularity in his speeches.[8]

In 1933 the executive council of the secret Afrikaner Broederbond formulated a document which recommended the introduction of `total mass-segregation' not just as an ideal, but as a matter of immediate practical policy. This called for the settlement of `different tribes' in separate areas which, over time, would assume an increasing degree of self-government under the supervision of the Native Affairs Department. In such areas Africans could live and develop themselves in the political, economic, cultural, religious and educational spheres. Temporary migrants would be permitted to work on farms or in towns. `Detribalised' urban Africans would be encouraged to move to their own areas and those who refused would be compelled to live in separate locations where they would enjoy no political or property rights. Though the emblematic word itself is not mentioned, key elements of apartheid are clearly anticipated in this document. Indeed, AN Pelzer, the Broederbond's official biographer, accords it great significance as an important statement of the organisation's creed - though he notes that it appears to have been forgotten since it was never referred to subsequently.[9]

The origins of apartheid have sometimes been linked to developments within the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) during the nineteenth century, in particular the Cape synod's sanctioning of divided congregations in 1857 and the creation of a separate mission church in 1881. But, as Johan Kinghorn argues, such developments represented more of a strategic concession to a growing sense of racial awareness amongst ordinary church members, than a belief in separation as a consistent principle.[10] Far from developing a clear position on the question of race, the Cape DRC remained in a state of considerable ideological flux as it became embroiled in a confusing conflict between the orthodox `countryside conservatism' symbolised by G.W.A. van der Lingen, and competing progressive, liberal or modernising tendencies within Cape Dutch society.[11]

The first extensive pronouncement on the `native problem' by the DRC was published in pamphlet form in 1921.[12] This discussion is noteworthy as the earliest attempt by the DRC to discuss the relationship between blacks and whites at an inter-synodal level. However, as Carl Borchardt points out, the statement displayed a rather ambivalent attitude towards segregation and it did not play an important role in church affairs.[13] Although preference for strict segregation was declared, it was also recognised that economic separation was an `unattainable ideal'. Unashamed support for the principle of white supremacy was mitigated by the injunction that `the European race must look upon the natives as a sacred trust'.[14]

Traces of explicit racism are evident in the 1921 DRC statement's reference to `the laws of evolution and heredity' which ensured that Africans could

not immediately `attain to the moral stature of those who have generations of Christian forebears behind them...'.[15] But the biological concept of race is not developed further. Taken as a whole, the content and style of the document resembles far more closely the pragmatic segregationist discourse of the 1920s than the zealous particularism of Christian-nationalism. In spite of general religious references, no attempt is made here to derive policy from scriptural injunctions and nor is there any evidence of external theological influences. The writers quoted approvingly are standard English-speaking South African paternalists (like M.S.Evans and C.T.Loram) who, in the context of South Africa's experience of rapid industrialisation, viewed segregation as a moderate and just compromise between the equally unacceptable extremes of `assimilation' and `repression'.[16]

Further evidence of the view taken by the Afrikaans churches on racial policies in the 1920s is given by the multi-racial and inter-denominational `European and Bantu conferences' which were convened under the aegis of the Federal DRC.[17] The extent to which these meetings were genuinely representative of the Afrikaans churches is questionable since they tended to be dominated by representatives of the Joint Councils of Europeans and Natives who adopted an acquiescent, if critical, attitude towards segregation at the time. The 1923 conference endorsed `the principle of the differential development of the Bantu, so far as such differentiation is based on Bantu traditions and requirements, and is not used as a means of repression'. However, segregation was understood in `its limited geographical sense', complete separation being regarded as `neither possible or desirable'.[18] These ideas were reiterated at the 1927 conference, although the uneasy relationship between the DRC and other delegates resulted in a failure to adopt a resolution on the issue of African franchise rights. Matters could not have been helped when JG Strydom (the Free State missionary who, in 1938, was responsible for the first use of `apartheid' within the church[19]) insisted that `differentiation did not imply repression' and went on to remind the conference that

> All natives were not as calm and as intelligent as those present. If they were, he would say, `Give them a chance.' But the I.C.U. and Ethiopian movement had a great majority, and he felt the few intelligent natives would never keep them down.[20]

In evidence to the 1927 parliamentary select committee on the Hertzog segregation bills, Prof. Johannes du Plessis of the DRC offered his personal view that `possessory segregation', albeit `highly desirable' in theory, was not feasible and that economic segregation was impossible. He himself favoured the retention of the

common franchise on an individual basis, though with higher educational and property qualifications in the case of Africans.[21] By the late 1920s, however, attitudes within the DRC were beginning to harden and there is evidence to suggest that its public association with non-Afrikaner churchmen and politicians was becoming increasingly uncomfortable. But, insofar as the DRC hierarchy could be said to have adopted a set of racial policies in the 1920s these remained consonant with the prevailing segregationist consensus. Borchardt points out that a concept of racial (as opposed to cultural) superiority had not yet come to the fore. The emphasis remained on the equivalence and rights of individuals in their relationship with God, rather than on the volk as a collectivity. Moreover, the tendency to `ideologise' had not become evident and there was continuing uncertainty as to whether segregation was practically attainable.[22]

This climate of opinion within the DRC was soon to change. A heresy trial involving Johannes du Plessis, the Stellenbosch theologian and missionary who had done much to shape the DRC's moderate attitude to segregation, led to his suspension as a professor in 1930. Du Plessis' racial views were not explicitly at issue in his trial, but the effect nonetheless served to strengthen the growing influence of a neo-Calvinist, fundamentalist element within the Church. This was achieved at the expense of the tradition of evangelical pietism within the DRC which stretched back to Andrew Murray Jr. in the mid-nineteenth century.[23]

The Federal DRC's adoption of a `Missionary Policy' in 1935 was decisively important in the process of crystallising views on the colour issue. Ostensibly framed to determine the relationship between the DRC and its mission affiliates, it also introduced some of the key elements of what was later to coalesce as apartheid. The concept of nationalism was invoked for the first time in a Christian context and the burden of emphasis upon man as an individual was shifted towards man as part of a collective unit. The Afrikaners' `traditional' fear of *gelykstelling* (equalisation) was said to have originated in their aversion to *rassevermenging* (miscegenation). Notably, separation was justified on `traditional' and historical rather than theological grounds.[24] Segregation, as Kinghorn points out, remained the concept within which the 1935 missionary policy was framed, but it could not be contained in that paradigm: the logic of its content pointed towards the altogether more systematic concept of apartheid.[25]

By 1935, therefore, key nationalist organisations like the DRC, the Bond vir Rassestudie and the Broederbond, displayed a converging interest in race relations and had come close to formulating apartheid policies. For the Afrikaner nationalist

movement as a whole, this was a critical period. Fears that newly-urbanised Afrikaners were being threatened by a vastly increased African presence in the cities were greatly heightened by the effects of the economic depression of the early 1930s. Detailed investigations undertaken by the 1932 Carnegie Commission revealed the existence of some 300 000 poor whites. The bulk of these were rural Afrikaners who had recently been displaced as a result of South Africa's rapid industrialisation process and the extension of capitalist relations into the countryside.

It was around this pressing social and political issue of poor whiteism that the growing nationalist movement coalesced. Concern over the plight of poor whites also provided a means by which Afrikaner ideologues could link criticism of the power of English/Jewish capital with popular anti-black sentiment. At the level of national politics, the creation of a coalition government between Smuts and Hertzog and the fusion of their parties in 1934 proved explosive. National Party hardliners left the ruling party for the opposition benches where they regrouped, under the leadership of Dr Malan, as the Purified National Party. In 1936 Hertzog's Native Bills were finally passed. The Malanites failed to suggest a coherent alternative to Hertzog's proposals, but the lengthy process of compromise leading up to the enactment of the Bills left them feeling that the segregationist solution was both inadequate and impermanent.

By the mid-1930s the Afrikaner Broederbond had been transformed into a Christian-national organisation which was deeply opposed to any form of *samesmelting* (amalgamation) between English and Afrikaners, as symbolised by the merger of Smuts' and Hertzog's parties into the newly-created United Party. Dedicated to the attainment of an Afrikaner republic, the Broederbond succeeded in establishing itself as the institutional and intellectual core of the resurgent nationalist movement. By operating through the Federation of Afrikaans Cultural Associations (FAK) and a myriad of other groupings upon which it exerted considerable influence, the Broederbond focussed attention upon the plight of poor whites, the economic dominance of English-speakers, and the centrality of Christian-nationalism as an organising creed. The return of intellectuals like Nico Diederichs, Piet Meyer, Geoff Cronjé and H.F.Verwoerd from studies in Germany and Holland provided Afrikaner nationalism with a powerful impetus.[26] A new spirit of confidence and militancy was evident, as exemplified in the hugely successful 1938 Voortrekker Centenary celebrations which

released an upsurge of Nationalist feeling, a sense of solidarity, a yearning for unity, pride in a heroic Afrikaner past and hope for the future, based on a renewed belief in the volk's divinely-willed destiny.[27]

II

South Africa's entry into the war on the allied side acutely exacerbated existing divisions within the Afrikaner nationalist movement and resulted in the collapse of the fusion government in 1939. While many sought to gain power constitutionally through the National Party, others placed their faith in extra-parliamentary action through mass organisations like the paramilitary *Ossewabrandwag*. Internecine struggle reached a heightened pitch between 1940 and 1942 with the Broederbond attempting to play a mediating role, despite being internally divided with respect to the warring factions. Afrikaner sympathy for the German cause translated into a marked receptiveness towards Nazi ideology and the concept of a totalitarian *volks* republic. In this highly-charged environment, explicitly racist ideas found a ready audience though, as we shall see, such notions were by no means automatically absorbed.

With the end of the war and the collapse of the *Ossewabrandwag*, disputes over Nazism and the nature of an exclusive Afrikaner republic receded. From now on it was the `native question' which came directly to the fore, an issue which was given added urgency by the resurgence of African nationalism. This change in emphasis was clearly evident in the *volkskongres* on racial policy which was organised by the FAK at Bloemfontein in 1944 and attended by representatives of some 200 church and cultural bodies. Coming after similar congresses on economic policy and Christian-National education (1939), mother-tongue education (1943) and the poor white question (1934), the 1944 *volkskongres* marked a major shift in political priorities and played a vital part in introducing the concept of apartheid to Afrikaner nationalist movement as a whole.

The 1944 meeting adopted a number of general principles relating to racial policy. In paraphrased form these were: i) that a policy of apartheid should be adopted in the mutual interests of the white and non-white population of South Africa, so that non-white volks-groups could each have the opportunity to develop in their own areas and ultimately to administer themselves; ii) that it was the Christian duty of whites to act as guardians over the non-white races until such time as they reached the level necessary to decide their own concerns; iii) that in the interests of all races no further blood-mixture should take place; iv) that the calling and duty of the white race in South Africa was to ensure that full control over all aspects of government in white

areas should be retained in white hands; v) that any policy which would result in the detribalisation or denationalisation of the individual, or his development in such a way that he would be cut off from his own group, tribe or *volk*, should be rejected; and vi) that the true welfare of non-white population groups should be sought in the development of the individual, in a Christian manner, of a feeling of worth and pride in his own group, tribe, or *volk*.[28]

A host of further resolutions in a similar vein were passed recommending specific economic, social, and political policies with regard to Africans, coloureds and Indians. There is no space here to discuss the content of these resolutions, but the principles upon which they were said to be based should be noted: the congress confidently asserted that that its policy was i) based upon the holy scripture, which taught that God willed the pluriformity rather than uniformity of nations, ii) reinforced by age-long experience in which the Afrikaner had, through close contact with the non-white races, come to understand them intimately, and iii) founded upon sound scientific knowledge.[29] These three claims, namely, that racial separation was based on scriptural injunction, the historical experience of Afrikanerdom, and the findings of science, lie at the heart of apartheid ideology. In order to understand it better, we need to look at each in turn rather more closely.

Scripture:

Critical discussion of the Afrikaans churches too often resolves itself into a debate about the extent to which neo-Calvinism in its South African form can be held responsible for the making of apartheid. This is something of a misconception. Christian-nationalism was never a static doctrinal creed providing a convenient blue-print for apartheid. Rather, it acted as a self-referential discourse, a coded vocabulary of imperatives and shibboleths and which could be, and were, constantly reinterpreted in the light of political realities. Within the framework of its own neo-Calvinist universe - in which individual conscience and an institutional separation between church and state remained important - a surprising measure of internal dissent was tolerated. In ideological terms this was a strength rather than a weakness, for it imparted a measure of flexibility to an otherwise highly restrictive creed.

The tentative approaches made by the DRC on the issue of race relations in the 1920s have already been discussed and we have seen how the statement of missionary policy in 1935 provided a justification of separation on pragmatic and historical grounds. From now on the search to provide a theological basis for apartheid within a neo-Calvinist framework began in earnest. An important initiative was the the strongly Kuyperian-influenced collection of writings entitled *Koers in die*

Krisis (Direction in the Crisis) which were published in three parts between 1935 and 1941.[30] Biblical proofs were first supplied in support of apartheid in 1942 by W.J.van der Merwe, writing in the theological journal *Op die Horison*.[31] Aside from these and other related efforts, the most crucial intervention came at the 1944 *volkskongres* in the form of J.D. du Toit's (Totius) keynote address on `The Religious Basis of our Race Policy'.[32] Coming as it did from a renowned Afrikaner poet and theologian, and delivered at such a high-profile event, this was a seminal moment in the creation of the `apartheid bible'.[33]

Du Toit adopted a wide-ranging approach, mixing biblical exegesis with a global conception of Afrikaner history and philosophy. At the core of his argument is the notion of God as `Hammabdil' - the Great Divider. Not only did God separate light and dark, heaven and earth, man and woman, he also ordained the separation of one nation from the other. The key passage for du Toit and for most subsequent apartheid theology refers to the story of Babel. Here, it is claimed, God intervenes to disperse the builders of the tower who wished to create a single nation by causing them to speak in mutually incomprehensible tongues. By contrast, the Boers who trekked away from the liberal Cape to create their own nation exemplify God's will. They ventured out into a `barbarous' black continent, the inhabitants of which are the accursed sons of Ham. Africa was a `black morass' which would swallow up the unwary. Yet, out of this darkness God was about to bring forth something wonderful: the Boer nation, a `new type', developed from a miraculous intermingling of (white) blood.[34]

This is the gist of du Toit's message and from it he derives two major conclusions: `first, what God has joined together, man must not separate. This is the core of our plea for the unity of the people (*volkseenheid*).' Second, `we should not bring together that which God has separated. In pluriformity the counsel of God is realised. The higher unity lies in Christ and is spiritual in character. Thus, there can be no equalising (*gelykstelling*) and no miscegenation (*verbastering*).'[35]

Du Toit cites a number of authorities in the course of his address, including Rev.J.G.Strydom and F.G. Badenhorst, whose doctoral thesis at the Free University of Amsterdam considered the South African race question in the context of reformed theology.[36] However, the chief inspiration and the source of most of his ideas was the Dutch theologian and statesman, Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920). It is from Kuyper that du Toit derived the notion of God as the Great Divider, as well as such central concepts as pluriformity, diversity, and the theological distinction between common and special grace.[37]

Kuyper assumed the leadership of the Dutch neo-Calvinist movement after the death of its founding figure, Groen van Prinsterer, in 1876. A fierce opponent of the ideas of the enlightenment and French Revolution, he sought to oppose the corrosive individualism and uniform internationalism which he associated with liberal secular humanist ideals. Kuyper's key slogan of *sowereiniteit in eie kring* (sovereignty in own sphere) was the means by which he distinguished between different levels of existence (eg. state, society, church). Each of these spheres was subject to God's overarching sovereign authority, but they enjoyed a certain autonomy within themselves. Thus, he was able to affirm the ultimate power of God in all aspects of life while at the same time maintaining the need for a separation between Church and State. This position made powerful sense given the Dutch neo-Calvinists' desire to guarantee their independence as a political, social and religious minority. Indeed, Kuyperian ideas contributed to the emergence in Holland of `pillarisation', the vertical divsion of Dutch society into discrete religious and secular blocs, each with their own self-contained organisations and social groupings.

The impact of Kuyperian ideas on Afrikaner nationalism was considerable in the formative years of the 1930s and 40s, though rather more so in places like Gereformeerde-influenced Potchefstroom University than Stellenbosch. The Free University of Amsterdam which Kuyper had helped to found attracted many Afrikaner students and served as an important forum for the dissemination of his ideas. It was through Kuyper's writings that the principle of `diversity', the idea of a national destiny and the concept of the nation as an `organism' were absorbed and adapted for use in the South African context. Kuyper's vision of an all-embracing Christian-national Calvinist community in Holland provided a practical model for the ordering of the social as well as religious aspects of society. His antipathy towards modernism and secular humanism struck an obvious chord amongst Afrikaner extremists, who equated liberalism with British imperialism. And his romantic understanding of Calvinist history (which was confirmed by positive ideological support for the Boer cause during the 1899-1901 war) helped Afrikaner ideologists to articulate a heroic mythology in which they portrayed themselves as God's `chosen people'.[38]

Kuyperian neo-Calvinism was present in its purest form in the Transvaal Gereformeerde Kerk, though it is questionable to what extent it was genuinely taken up by the DRC as a whole. Similarly, the problem as to whether Kuyper's ideas were correctly interpreted by Afrikaner neo-Calvinists remains a matter for debate.[39] However, he undoubtedly served as a dynamic and powerful symbol of Calvinist authority in general and as a useful repository of evocative slogans. Kuyper's views are themselves contradictory and can be used to sustain opposing viewpoints. As

Bloomberg points out, his teachings are `an intricate balance of paradoxes', whose legacy can be seen to be both authoritarian and libertarian, racist and anti-racist, elitist and democratic.[40] For example, in his 1898 Stone Lectures Kuyper advocated `the commingling of blood' as `the physical basis of all higher development', but in *The South African Crisis* he refers to `the Hottentots and the Bantus' as `an inferior race' and commends the boers for protecting themselves from `the danger of mixed liaisons'.[41] Kuyper's apparent enthusiasm towards racial intermixture - at least in the context of the Dutch East Indies - has, understandably, required delicate interpretation by Afrikaner nationalist adherents.[42]

Working in parallel with the Kuyperian inheritance - but not always entirely in sympathy with it - a distinctly Germanic set of influences should also be mentioned. Somewhat enigmatically referred to by Dunbar Moodie as `neo-Fichtean' - the term `volksnationalist' suggested by Schutte is preferable - this refers to the Romantic tradition of authoritarian nationalism which drew its inspiration from the writings of J.G.Herder, F.E.D.Schleiermacher and J.G Fichte.[43] It is marked by a strongly idealised view of the nation or *volk* as a collective organism with its own distinctive `genius' or soul. Such ideas were brought to South Africa from the 1930s onwards by the likes of Nico Diederichs, Piet Meyer and Geoff Cronjé, where they were skilfully adapted for local consumption. During the war years in particular, they did much to invest Afrikaner nationalism with a distinctly National-Socialist tinge.[44]

Kuyperian and German volksnationalist views share a common romantic inheritance in their cultural idealism and hostility to rationalist thought. Both lay stress on the organic link between culture and nationhood, the idea that the creativity of the individual is best expressed through the collectivity of the group, and the belief that nations are subject to divine historical destiny. In general terms, therefore, they tend to complement each other and they are not readily separable in the Christian-nationalist context. The oft-repeated description of society as an `organism' is a useful example of this convergence. Kuyper was one of the chief sources of this metaphor, counterposing the `organic' of which he approved, to the `mechanical' for which he expressed strong disdain. Beginning with Herder, the Romantic tradition of German thought which fed into into National Socialism also embraced an `organic vision', stressing the unity and worth of `national' or `volkish' characteristics.[45] Afrikaner nationalist ideologues constantly employed the organic metaphor in this collective sense, suggesting that the *volk* was a natural, pure and integrated entity, whose whole was more than the sum of its parts.[46]

However, the German tendency to idolise the `nation' or `volk' and to accord it primacy above all else, sits uneasily with the neo-Calvinist insistence on the ultimate

sovereignty of God. It was precisely this theoretical difference which led Kuyperians like H.G.Stoker and L.J. du Plessis to accuse Nico Diederichs in 1935-6 of subordinating the authority of God by deifying the nation.[47] The metaphysical sense in which Afrikaner nationalist theoreticians preferred to conceive of the nation or *volk* effectively provided an ideological justification for white supremacy without requiring recourse to crude biological racism. The notion that God had ordained diversity or pluriformity facilitated the claim that difference did not necessarily imply superiority or inferiority. Similarly, stress on the distinctiveness of different `cultures' meant that the burden of explaining human difference did not rest solely on race. This does not mean that culture and race were regarded as being unrelated: on the contrary, the categories of race, language and culture were used as functionally interdependent variables and the boundaries between them remained fluid. In practice, the essentialist view of culture which lay at the heart of Christian-nationalism was no less powerful as a means of dividing people than an approach based on racial determinism.

The disinclination on the part of some nationalist intellectuals towards relying too heavily on race as the source of human difference, is exemplified in Nico Diederichs' highly influential 1936 pamphlet on nationalism as a philosophy of life and its relation to internationalism. This treatise, by a man who ended his career as State President, represents a remarkable fusion of the German statist tradition with Dutch neo-Calvinist thought; it has been aptly referred to as `the first sustained statement of theologized politics to come from an Afrikaner.'[48]

Diederichs begins with a sustained attack on the liberal `cosmopolitan' outlook for its reliance on a false notion of human individuality. Instead, he argues that individuals are social beings who are called upon by God to become part of a nation. It is only through the nation, which Diederichs idolises as `the highest, the most all-embracing, the most total group', that individuals fulfil themselves.[49] Nations, in turn, cannot be understood as the product of human endeavour for they are willed by God himself. And just as God ensures that there is no `deadening uniformity' in the natural world, so the diversity and plenitude of nations enhances the richness and beauty of his creation.[50] Diederichs' evident attraction to an authoritarian state indicates his attraction to National-Socialism, but his exultant idealism leads him to deny that the nation can be defined in terms of outward characteristics such as race, land, colour and physiognomy. Differences between groups and cultures are therefore expressed in spiritual rather than material terms.[51]

> To make consanguinity or ancestry the test of nationhood would be to betray everything beautiful, elevated and noble in the nation. It would be a betrayal of the spirit by the flesh and the ideal to the natural.[52]

Other leading Christian-nationalists took a different view. Koot Vorster, theologian brother of the prime minister and a hard-line defender of apartheid orthodoxy, is a case in point. Writing in *Koers* in 1939, he argued that feelings of racial superiority could not simply be understood as the psychological response of a dominant group. Colour difference was `not just an external, skin-deep' matter. It was the `manifestation of a deep, radical physical and psychological difference', a natural `race-instinct' which could not be explained away. Reverting to the authority of scripture, he argued that the colour-line should be observed not just because it was natural or as a matter of self-preservation, but because God in his mercy had willed this in order to prevent sin.[53] Vorster was later to amplify these ideas in response to the 1960 Cottesloe conference's criticisms of discrimination in the church. Mixing Kuyperian theology with the findings of racial science, he maintained that racial groups differed in intelligence and that, because of physical and spiritual incompatibilities, miscegenation would inevitably result in great distress to individuals and a weakening of the *volk*. Boundaries could not be infringed with impunity, and the greater the difference, the more dire the consequences of intermingling would be.[54]

Likewise, A.B.du Preez, a strongly orthodox defender of the scriptural basis of apartheid (in particular, the Kuyperian-derived notion of `unity in diversity') went to considerable lengths to prove that race and culture were integrally linked and that racial difference was more fundamental than a simple matter of skin colour.

> Although much has been written of late to minimise racial differences and generally to level up the various groups of mankind, it is an undeniable fact that racial differences actually exist, whether we can explain them or not. The Bantu and White man in South Africa belong to two different racial groups with distinctive and immutable racial characteristics. Physical differences of skin pigmentation, hair and facial expressions are relatively unimportant where cultural adjustment is concerned... racial differences are always accompanied by differences in culture, civilisation, the general mode of living, and religion which constitute our problem.[55]

Diederichs' refusal to allow the concept of race within his idealistic framework provides a marked contrast with Vorster and du Preez's readiness to employ it to bolster apartheid theology from the late 1950s. Yet, in practice, both these positions

represent opposite poles of a shared discourse which reflected wider political debates. Within the DRC this dispute was played out in the form of a vigorous and highly technical dispute about the scriptural justifications for apartheid. Although Totius had expounded the biblical case for apartheid in 1944 it was only in 1957 that the DRC as a whole was able to agree on an `apartheid bible'.[56] In part, this delay was a result of the complex federal and synodal structure of the church which made it difficult to secure agreement on precise doctrinal issues. Apartheid theology was continuously being reconsidered and refined - a process which was not made any simpler in virtue of the inherently disputatious nature of professional academic theology.[57] The difficulty in reconciling the spiritual unity of the human race with its practical diversity was a particularly vexed issue.[58]

Even as theological justifications for apartheid were being devised dissident voices were heard from within the Church. In 1940 and again in 1947 Ben Marais, a professor of theology at Pretoria, attacked the biblical basis upon which apartheid was said to be founded.[59] His criticisms emerged in a fully-fledged form with the publication in 1952 of *Colour: Unsolved Problem of the West* which attempted a comparison of race relations in South Africa, the United States and Brazil. Notably, Marais begins his book with a lengthy discussion of racial `myths', as defined by prominent critics of racial theory like Ashley Montagu, Jacques Barzun and Gunnar Dahlberg. While recognising that modern science had proved that `much that has been said and believed about "race", rests purely on nonsense and myth', Marais was nevertheless unwilling to abandon altogether the salience of race as a meaningful biological concept.[60] A similar pragmatic caution informed Marais' theological discussion. He acknowledged that the biblical variety of nations was only `a temporary order of God in the era of sin', but he also denied that Christianity was opposed to `the existence of separate nations'.[61] And, whereas Marais accepted that one could not `adduce the division of peoples in the beginning as a prohibition of all racial crossing', he regarded racial mixture in the South African context as `*extremely undesirable and dangerous*'.[62] Thus, although Marais reiterates the view that there are no convincing scriptural grounds for a policy of racial segregation, he is equally concerned to show that separation is necessary for practical and historical reasons.

> *Our own position in South Africa presents, in my opinion, more than sufficient justification for a policy of separate development and separate church institutions, on condition that the further demands of Christian brotherhood are not denied and the policy concerned is inspired by Christian love and not by racial selfishness or a feeling of racial superiority.*[63]

From 1949 Professor Ben Keet of Stellenbosch joined Marais in rejecting the biblical foundations of apartheid. However, Keet like Marais failed to reject unequivocally the practice of racial separation. For although he succeeded in inverting pro-apartheid theological arguments by claiming that the Gospel taught the ideal of demolishing `walls of division', he nevertheless acknowledged that `this ideal would be difficult to realise in our circumstances'.[64] Marais and Keet were significant authorities in their own right but although their criticisms created a considerable stir within the DRC, they were unable to shift the entrenched orthodoxy in the short term. Loubser attributes this failure to the fact that Marais and Keet lacked a power base of their own and that their rational critique did not offer a sufficiently strong theological alternative to the power of Kuyperian philosophy.[65]

As an ideology Christian-nationalism was not restricted to whites. The Dutch Reformed mission church, which played a vital role in the conception of apartheid, insisted that Christian-nationalism was intended to apply to all nations - whether or not they wished it. This mission tradition rested heavily on a deep paternalism which spoke of the Afrikaner's `calling as guardian over the weaker peoples.'[66] As such, it helped to disguise racial superiority in terms of divine destiny and an ethical code of rights and obligations. Other traditions within reformed theology also served to militate against explicit racism. One was the discomfort with the indubitably secular connotations of nineteenth century evolutionary theory and the biologically-based theories of race which it spawned. Another was the enduring, if unfashionable, influence of pietism - the evangelical soul-saving tradition which held that all individuals were in principle of equal worth, whatever their external differences.[67]

Experience:

In recent years the orthodox nationalist version of Afrikaner history - amongst whose core symbols are the Great Trek, the triumph over the Zulu army at Blood River, and the heroic resistance to British imperialism in the first and second Boer wars - has come under concerted attack.[68] André du Toit's brilliant deconstruction of the notion of Afrikaners as God's `Chosen People' strikes at the heart of this romantic mythology. Afrikaners have often been portrayed in terms of an encapsulated seventeenth-century Calvinist community struggling to fulfil a divine mission in the isolated wastes of a hostile frontier. But du Toit shows that this view, far from being the self-perception of boers at the time of the trek, was in fact first articulated by the missionary David Livingstone in the mid-nineteenth century, and only later developed by modern nationalist intellectuals.[69] As a result of this and other work, the historical basis of Afrikaner nationalist mythology has been irretrievably eroded. Yet, in choosing to counterpose myth with the seemingly objective findings of empirical

research, some writers have not fully appreciated the power of Afrikaner nationalist history. Romanticism, with its emphasis on the subjective experience of organic communities and its celebration of an heroic past, is not necessarily susceptible to rational critique. Indeed, its conception of authenticity or truth appeals at least as much to emotion and intuition as scientific fact.

The idea that Afrikaner racial policies had been intuitively developed through a long process of struggle was an important aspect of romantic nationalist philosophy. For intellectuals and politicians seeking to introduce radical new ideas into popular consciousness, the appeal to tradition and experience was a powerful legitimising device. The sense of continuity and purpose which was achieved by seamlessly linking the present to the mythological past, helped to allay the anxieties of the moment and to direct action towards the future. Ideological innovation, which might ordinarily be considered new and therefore dangerous, was naturalised as the past confirmed its special authority on the present.

With respect to race, the notion of the `boer experience' functioned as the court of final appeal. Experience, like `common sense', might be validated by science, but it was not dependent on it. Racial policies are therefore frequently justified in terms of practical Afrikaner experience and tradition. This is nowhere more clearly demonstrated than in the case of Gustav Preller's writings. A prolific populariser of Afrikaner history and energetic champion of the Afrikaans language, Preller played a vital role in elevating the voortrekkers to pride of place in Afrikaner mythology. The idea of lived experience and a sense of collective memory strongly inform his understanding of national history.[70] Where necessary, Preller is happy to buttress the authority of folk wisdom with the claims of science. Thus his general account of South Africa from prehistoric times to the 1880-1 war of independence makes considerable use of contemporary anthropology and racial science to demean the status of its indigenous inhabitants. The chapter entitled `Science and Sentiment in Practical Politics' embodies this approach.

> Science is only now gradually discovering the remarkable physiological differences between the brain of the white man of European descent and that of the Bantu, - differences which are innate and constitute the measure of their respective intellectual capacities; but it is a striking fact that the Boers of a hundred years ago were aware of these natural differences... .
>
> In this respect the Boers have always been unique among the European peoples, that have come into contact with the natives in different parts of Africa. To-day science brings us proofs that the cerebral capacities of what we

> conveniently call the `native', are, when he has reached the age of puberty, distinctly inferior in comparison with those of the white children of a civilisation of 5,000 years. We know that many of the ganglion cells of the native's brain remain undeveloped; and we know, with some degree of certainty, that his intellectual development, - which before the age of puberty is more or less comparable with that of the normal white child, - comes to a standstill, as if it were not capable of further development. The Boers of three generations ago did not know this, yet they have been fully conscious of a difference so profound that it excluded any idea of equality.[71]

For Preller, then, science confirms that which has always been intuitively understood by Afrikaners. Similar views were expressed by racial theorists like C.W.Prinsloo and Geoff Cronjé, who followed Preller in arguing that the voortrekkers had an instinctive aversion to racial mixture.[72] Cronjé's stress on the need to maintain `blood purity' and his willingness to cite with approval the findings of racial science will be discussed presently. But although he is perfectly prepared to use the evidence of racial science to prove the inferiority of Africans, it is nevertheless significant that Cronjé's support for racial differentiation does not depend exclusively on scientific claims - which are for his purposes rather too cautious about the precise biological meaning of `race'. The Afrikaners' historical and traditional point of view

> is above all grounded in his experience of the racial differences in South Africa. In the racial conception of the Afrikaner the recognition and assumption of those existing and indisputable differences is natural.[73]

In the above cases it may be seen that appeals to traditional Afrikaner experience serve to reinforce the claims of racial science, or else to show that Afrikaners intuitively anticipated the later findings of science. In other instances, however, tradition functions rather differently as an ultimate court of appeal - permitting the defence of separation on grounds other than racist ones. Thus when G.B.A. Gerdener attempted to refute allegations in the early 1950s, identifying apartheid with Nazi ideas of racial superiority, he did so on the basis of culture and experience. Separate development and the preservation of white civilisation had nothing to do with foreign ideologies: `it grew out of our history and had already stood the test of time.'[74]

Science:

From the 1930s a distinct sub-tradition of explicitly racist thought can be discerned within Afrikaner nationalist ideology. This tradition was to a significant extent associated with, and encouraged by, Nazi ideas of race superiority. But it also drew freely on the large body of eugenicist literature which still attracted considerable attention within English-speaking intellectual circles in Britain and the United States (and in South Africa too). The leading Afrikaner exponent of eugenic views was the geneticist Gerrie Eloff who sought to graft the findings of modern racial science on to Christian-national thought.[75] Writing in *Koers* in 1933, he outlined ways in which the agencies of church and state could instil an awareness of `positive eugenics' by encouraging marriages between appropriate couples. Through the weeding out of inferior characteristics, the quality of the boer race as a whole would be improved.[76] In subsequent articles Eloff expanded on the principles of `racial biology' and warned against the dire consequences of intermarriage.[77]

With the publication of his book on racial theory and the *boerevolk* in the influential *Tweede Trek* series in 1942, Eloff's combination of environmental and biological determinism was given semi-official status within the nationalist movement.[78] The major thrust of this work was to define the *boerevolk* as a new and distinct biological type. As such, its purity had to be protected like a `sacred pledge' against `poisonous infiltration'.[79] In Eloff's view the divine destiny of Afrikaners was manifest in the special composition of their race. Anthropological statistics had proved that the nordic races fared poorly in the tropics where they were susceptible to degeneration. Although not quite sub-tropical, the climate of South Africa had a similarly adverse effect. Conversely, the French, Portuguese and Spanish races had made a great success of their tropical settlements. Boers - who were 53% Dutch, 28% German and 15% French at the time of the British occupation of the Cape - had benefitted from a unique combination of nordic (Dutch and German) and Alpine (French Huguenot) racial traits. Research had shown that boers were, on average, both taller and heavier than their ancestral races. They were also undoubtedly physically well-built. Eloff noted that the the boer complexion was darker than the pure nordic races. This characteristic derived from their Alpine forebears and provided natural protection from the sun. Moreover, the boers were relatively fertile in comparison with the pure races of the north.[80] Thus,

> Armed with a strong constitution, a tanned skin which afforded protection from the sun's rays, sufficient sweat glands for cooling in a warm climate, multitudinous offspring and a persevering disposition with most of the qualities of the Norse race, and an aversion to interbreeding (*verbastering*), a

volk took root in this land through adaptation and tradition stretching over 10 generations...[81]

Eloff was only able to define the unique qualities of the *boerevolk* by conceding that races were neither pure nor static categories.[82] The white races could therefore intermarry without difficulties. However, black and white mixtures were something else altogether. Citing the work the Witwatersrand zoologist and eugenist H.B.Fantham and his partner Annie Porter, Eloff argued that the descendants of white/black mixtures were prone to poor health and weak constitutions. Amongst these, susceptibility to pulmonary complaints and `physical disharmony' (eg.`large native teeth in small European mouths' or tall `hybrids' with small internal organs and deficient circulatory systems) were evident. Fantham had also demonstrated that mental and moral disharmony (eg. irrascibility, vanity and sexual instability) were frequently associated with such physical discord. Marriages between blacks and whites was therefore undesirable from the point of view of race hygiene. And the distaste shown by most whites towards such unions was based on the incompatiblity of racial temperament and social inheritance.[83]

In this connection Eloff quoted extensively from the major anthropological study of the `hybrid' Basters of Reheboth (Namibia) conducted by Eugen Fischer of Freiburg University and published in 1913. Fischer, whose work was already well-known to the international eugenist community, was also a highly influential figure in the German race-hygiene movement in his capacity as director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and Eugenics.[84] It was largely through his work that South African eugenists like Fantham and Eloff derived their arguments for the essential incompatibilities which resulted from black/white racial mixtures and the notion that `hybrids' were mentally, physically and morally inferior to their white progenitors. It should be noted that this depended on a selective usage of Fischer's analysis, for Fischer endorsed the notion of `hybrid vigour' - the idea that interbreeding (amongst similar races) could actually improve genetic health. Niceties such as these could, however, be ignored by the introduction of spurious aesthetic critera. Indeed, Eloff's detailed summary of Fischer's work on the physiognomy of Basters produced no evidence of their suffering from any genuine biological `defects'. He was merely able to assert that the blending of Hottentot and European features was `disagreeable' and `pathetic'.[85] Nevertheless, Eloff was able to assure his readers that the *`verbastering* problem' was grounded in science and that it was `in conflict with race-hygiene in South Africa.'[86] Thus, the old claim that Afrikaners were traditionally averse to racial intermixture was said to be supported by expert research.

One of the most bizarre features of Eloff's account is his concerted effort to define Afrikaners as a distinct biological race. Ironically, this notion was originally formulated by English-speaking writers who attempted - with a mixture of admiration and patronising contempt - to explain the special mental and physical characteristics of the Boer `type'.[87] There is a striking similarity between Eloff's claims and the evolutionist observations made by the late-nineteenth century anthropologist A.H. Keane in his book, *The Boer States*.[88] Given that he was writing at the time of the Anglo-Boer war and making due allowance for his patronising style, Keane is remarkably generous towards the boers: although he strongly condemns Kruger's republic, his sympathies are clearly with their struggle against the earlier Dutch and British administrations.

Many of the elements which recur in reworked form in Eloff's work can be found here: the notion that the boers are `a new race, the outcome of a blend of divers old elements of Caucasian stock' of European origin and `modified under the influences of a changed environment'; the `leavening' effect of Huguenot blood on the `somewhat heavy and certainly unrefined Dutch stock'; the boers' `unquenchable love of freedom'; and their exceptional physical size, strength and powers of endurance.[89] The similarities in these two accounts suggests that Eloff was able to appropriate such ideas for his own purposes - in a manner analogous to the way in which earlier Afrikaner nationalists developed the idea of themselves as God's chosen people from Livingstone. Once again, the capacity to continually recast stereotypes of human difference in the service of new causes, reveals the essential plasticity of racist ideology.

Eloff's eugenic ideas were soon endorsed by L.J.du Plessis, who repeated his breakdown of the percentages of various European races comprising the Afrikaner nation, noting that this mixture `combines Northern solidity and Southern adaptability'.[90] Yet, the person who did most to popularise Eloff's theories in a Christian-nationalist context was Geoff Cronjé, the Pretoria University professor of sociology. From 1945 Cronjé was responsible for the first systematic elaboration of apartheid theory by means of a series of influential books which were widely read and commented on.[91] Amongst his constantly recurring themes are the express requirement to protect the `purity' of the boer-nation's blood, God's injunction to respect the diversity of nations, and the Afrikaner's duty to act as a guardian over the non-white races. All these, it was claimed, could only be achieved through the adoption of a policy of total apartheid which would finally solve South Africa's race problem.

Cronjé's arguments are, for the most part, highly derivative and his style is direct and crude. What stands out in his work is a particularly virulent brand of racism which is consonant with his support for the Germans during the war and his membership of the *Ossewabrandwag*. Unlike many of his colleagues who tended to be rather more cautious on the issue, Cronjé boldly presented the South African literature on intelligence testing as proof that blacks were intellectually inferior to whites in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Blacks, he argued, were especially suited to repetitive work because of the concrete way in which they perceived the world. Apartheid therefore amounted to a recognition that races had to develop separately, in order that they could each fulfil their special tasks and callings in accordance with their own particular abilities.[92]

The concept of race purity and an abhorrence of any form of miscegenation is a central theme of Cronjé's work. Although confidence in the superiority of whites and their `instinctive' revulsion to miscegenation permeates his work, his sense that poorer whites are particularly vulnerable to racial intermixture remains a constant focus of anxiety.[93] André du Toit points out that the concern over inter-racial sexual relations which reached a peak in the 1930s and 40s far exceeded the degree to which these liaisions really took place: the actual occurence of mixed marriages was less important than `the possible new social order arising in the cites' which they symbolised.[94] Cronjé's fears bear out this observation. He insisted that only total apartheid could ensure the maintenance of race purity, relying heavily on the findings of Eloff, Fischer, and Fantham and Porter for scientific support. In his view, their work offered undeniable proof that

> the mixing of blood between the white and black races produces inferior human material in biological terms (physically and mentally). Miscegenation between whites and non-whites is therefore shown by biological research to be detrimental.[95]

Cronjé also rehearsed Eloff's account of African suitability to hot climates with reference to their dark skin, wide nostrils and ample sweat-glands. By contrast with the `northern races' who were ill-adapted to life in such conditions, the `boer-nation, with its distinct European racial origins and composition', was evidently biologically adapted to South Africa and therefore suited to the fulfilment of its special calling.[96]

III

The racially explicit language favoured by Eloff and Cronjé did not wear well in the post-war era - in spite of the coming to power in 1948 of Malan's National Party with its firm commitment to the implementation of `apartheid'. Precisely what this meant at the time was unclear because apartheid, far from being a systematic blueprint for the future, was still a somewhat inchoate set of intentions and slogans. Nevertheless, it was immediately apparent that a process of major ideological and political change was underway. The pace of urbanisation, which had been greatly advanced by the expansion of secondary industry during the war, engendered a new fluidity in social policy and practice. In this environment, reformist elements within the United Party were minded to relax racial segregation in certain respects. But the Nationalists, focussing instead on the threat of `oorstrooming' (the `swamping' of whites by blacks) were fully determined to reverse the processes of racial integration. Even if their ultimate objectives remained obscure, there could be no doubting that the Nationalists represented a tendency directly inimical to the democratic spirit which had emerged during the war. Moreover, the defeat of Nazism and the traumatic revelations of the extermination camps forced the world to rethink drastically the concept of race which was so deeply embedded in the European consciousness. Up to this moment South Africa's segregation policies had aroused scant concern beyond its borders. But the commitment to extend and intensify racial separation in defiance of the trend of international opinion, soon lead to South Africa acquiring the status of pariah within the world community.

Despite their history of anti-imperial propaganda, Afrikaner nationalist politicians and intellectuals proved sensitive to international criticisms. This led to a coyness about the use of explicit racist formulations and a withdrawal from the pro-Fascist sentiment which was evident during the war. Apartheid was often portrayed as a `positive' policy designed to minimise racial conflict by allowing Africans to develop themselves fully in their own areas without white interference. To this extent it was contrasted with existing segregation policies which were rejected as being inadequate, exploitative, and likely to perpetuate racial domination. Indeed, by the 1960s, prime minister Verwoerd was to defend apartheid on the grounds that it offered blacks similar opportunities to those in the newly-independent African states to the north.

In the 1950s the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs (SABRA) played an important role in the formulation and refinement of apartheid theory. Founded in 1947-8 as a Stellenbosch-based intellectual think-tank, SABRA maintained a discreet distance from the theological politics emanating from Potchefstroom and Pretoria. It also remained aloof from the crude racist populism of mass political discourse. Until the early 1960s, when it was purged by Verwoerd, SABRA was the natural home of

idealistic `visionaries' who portrayed apartheid as a morally just solution to South Africa's colour problems.[97] Amongst intellectuals and churchmen such as these, external criticisms of South Africa's racial policies was felt most acutely.

The increasing hostility displayed by the United Nations to South African racial policies from the late 1940s was especially significant in this regard. So too were the post-war series of UNESCO-sponsored pamphlets in which top scientific authorities were afforded the opportunity to destroy prevailing racial myths. An important lead was given by the SABRA chairman and Stellenbosch theologian professor G.B.A. Gerdener in 1952. Responding to Western criticisms of apartheid, he lamented the fact that a great deal of adverse commentary was influenced by fear of the Nazi ideology of racial superiority. The different stages of development reached by South Africa's `microcosm of races, languages and cultures' necessitated a policy of discrimination between different population groups. However, it was

> not colour but culture; not race, but the level of development which forms the the basis of discrimination between population groups.[98]

As a moderate proponent of apartheid, Gerdener reiterated that the concept of separate development and the maintenance of white civilisation had nothing whatsoever to do with `the latest ideology of Central-Europe' - ie Nazism. Reverting to the argument from experience, he insisted that separate development `has grown out of our history and has stood the test of time'. In 1955 Gerdener again emphasised that such policies were not based upon considerations of racial purity or superiority. On the contrary, he maintained that SABRA subscribed to separate development precisely because of its acceptance of potential racial equality and as a result of the desire to create conditions whereby the human dignity of blacks as well as whites could be fully realised.[100]

A similar position was argued by Werner Eiselen who, as Secretary of Native Affairs under Verwoerd, played a vital part in developing the theory and practice of apartheid. In an address to the 1953 Potchefstroom graduation ceremony he noted that there were objections to separate development both on theological grounds and from the perspective of modern anthropological science. With respect to the Unesco intervention, Eiselen commented sharply - and not without foundation - that anthropology had been inconsistent in its views on race. He denied that South African racial sentiment was based on the notion that darker skin pigmentation meant intellectual inferiority. Rather, it was founded on the notion that physical differences

between blacks and whites rendered it desirable that each group should develop, so far as practicable, within separate spheres. Eiselen acknowledged that the tendency to associate `backwardness' with racial characteristics was not surprising, given that the great majority of Africans were still undeveloped. Nor was it unnatural given the fact that influential anthropologists had supported such a connection in the past. According to Eiselen, the policy of racial separation was not based on value judgements and it placed no arbitrary limits on the capacity for development.[101]

It is both striking and ironical that throughout his career Eiselen remained reluctant to prescribe or proscribe racial abilities. As an anthropologist at Stellenbosch in the late 1920s he argued that scientific evidence for the inferiority of Africans was inconclusive. He preferred to base colour policy on a recognition of cultural differences, without the claim that culture was a function of race.[102] In his comments on the findings of intelligence tests in the 1930s, as well as in the Commission on Native Education which he chaired from 1949-51, Eiselen consistently maintained this position.[103] He was fully prepared to recognise racial and cultural differences, while at the same time refusing to commit himself to any statement supporting innate biological superiority.

Given that Eiselen dedicated most of his professional life both to theorising and bringing apartheid into existence, his caution on the subject of scientific racism is noteworthy. His preferred mode of argument was pragmatic: hereditary and cultural characteristics functioned as a `social barrier' and therefore had to be reflected institutionally.[104] This approach was similar to that taken by Nic Olivier, a SABRA stalwart, who later abandoned apartheid and joined the liberal parliamentary opposition. In a 1953 article on the practicability of apartheid, Olivier dismissed the scientific debate on the meaning of race, declaring himself unwilling to justify `a priori any form of differentiation based upon race or colour'. However, he followed this up with the assertion that the existence of `distinct and unalterable racial characteristics' was undeniable. Moreover, it was `only natural' that Europeans came to consider differences in colour and appearance to be `aesthetically disagreeable'.[105] Taken together with differences in culture, religion, way of life, etc., the evolution of South African racial attitudes was easy to understand. In Olivier's view separate development would, by recognising such attitudes, facilitate a general improvement in race relations and `goodwill' between black and white.

The relationship between race, culture and national identity continued to inform debate as apartheid ideology developed. These terms suffuse the 1955-6 Tomlinson Commission which attempted, rather clumsily, to provide a dispassionate sociological justification for apartheid. The published summary report enters directly

into the paradigm of race typology. It describes the physical characteristics of `the South African Bantu' in some detail, explaining that they are the genetic product of `fusion' between `Negro, Bushmen and Hamitic elements'.[106] The concept of biological differentiation plays a vital role throughout. It functions as a justification for apartheid, as the basis of an unbridgeable gap between black and white and, most confusingly, as a correlate of cultural or `spiritual' difference. Fear of biological intermixture is central to the Tomlinson message, reinforcing its metaphorical description of society as cultural organism. Drawing on a range of anthropological sources and the writings of R.F.A.Hoernlé in particular, the report purports to prove that, in the absence of racial separation, cultural assimilation would inevitably be `followed by economic assimilation, thereafter social assimilation accompanied by political assimilation and finally biological assimilation'.[107] This inexorable process is regarded with horror; and the refusal of whites `willingly to sacrifice their right of existence as a separate national and racial identity' is therefore presented as an unchallengeable fact.

> ...over the past 300 years, the European population of the Union has developed into an autonomous and complete national organism, and has furthermore preserved its character as a biological (racial) entity. There are not the slightest grounds for believing that the European population, either now or in the future, would be willing to sacrifice its character as a national entity and as a European racial group.[108]

The confusion of biological and cultural properties on the part of Christian-national theorists is borne out in the differing ways in which the relationship between race, *volk*, and culture was conceived. This problem was directly addressed as early as 1931 by J.Albert Coetzee, then a young member of the Potchefstroom Calvinist Student Organisation. Coetzee was interested in the psychological aspects of `nation building'. He was much concerned by the problem that the struggle to create an Afrikaner nation free of British domination could not be divorced from the overriding struggle to preserve white civilisation as a whole. Indeed, the defence of white supremacy on racial grounds was a prerequisite for the survival of the Afrikaner *volk*. Coetzee's solution to this problem was to counterpose the British `mind' to the Afrikaner `soul', arguing that the two groups belonged to different *volke*, while nevertheless remaining members of the same Caucasian race.[109]

This form of argument was echoed by Totius' son, the theologian S.du Toit, when he distinguished between questions of race and *volk* in 1949: Afrikaners derived from the same basic teutonic racial stock as their English-speaking counterparts, even

though they were not members of the same *volk*. Amongst the factors which constituted the identity of a *volk* were communality in land, blood, culture, religion and language.[110] A similar point of view was articulated by the anthropologist J.P.Bruwer in 1953.[111] But such definitions were not universally accepted. According to the eugenist G.Eloff it was inaccurate to describe race as a biological, *volk* as a cultural, and nation as a political, concept. The difference between race and *volk*, he argued, was only temporary. Through a process of isolation and consanguinous intermixture, a *volk* would in time achieve an organic unity which was physical as well as spiritual in nature.[112]

The ability to present whites as belonging to the same racial group - even if they were incompatible in cultural terms - was of obvious political advantage to Afrikaner nationalists: it legitimised their struggle against the dominance of English-speakers, while at the same time underlining the need for white racial solidarity in the face of African nationalism. However, the analytical distinctions which were drawn between race and *volk* were somewhat artificial and in practice they were often deliberately confused. (This is particularly evident in the case of the DRC which, from the 1950s, as Kinghorn points out, steadily replaced the concept of `race' with `nation', `group' or `*volk*' in official church documents.[113]) The notion that race, *volk* and culture were inextricably interlinked was a natural conclusion to be drawn in a situation where outward physical characteristics largely coincided with social categories. Such common-sense views were themselves shaped by intellectual ideas with a long pedigrees.[114]

IV

Despite recent academic research Afrikaners continue to be stereotyped as the `white tribe of Africa'. They are portrayed as hardy creatures of the frontier whose political views were shaped by an unrelenting struggle against British imperialism and a fierce commitment to the maintenance of white supremacy in all its forms. This view was especially influential during Apartheid's heyday in the late 1950s and 60s, when Afrikanerdom appeared to have gained total command of the South African state. Keen observers have always detected important divisions within the seemingly monolithic power of the Afrikaner state, but it was only in the aftermath of the 1976 uprisings that the unity of the state and the ideological coherence of apartheid began to fragment visibly. Today it is all too evident that Afrikaner nationalism is in retreat, that the South African state (though immensely powerful) is riven by internal contradictions, and that apartheid ideology no longer serves the class interests which underlie continued white domination. Once regarded as the stubborn legatee of a

fundamentalist Calvinist tradition dating back to the earliest days of white settlement, the Nationalist government is now seen - with rather more justification - as a canny practitioner of real politik, which may be prepared to surrender its abstract commitment to the unity of the *volk* in the broader interests of defending white power and privilege.

This view accords far more closely with historical reality than the mythologised notion of God-fearing Afrikaners engaged in an unrelenting pursuit of an unrealisable vision. Indeed, seen in these terms, the zealous fervour associated with the construction of Christian-national philosophy in the 1930s and 40s appears as an exceptional episode in Afrikaner history. The important work of O'Meara and others has done much to demystify the rise of Afrikaner nationalism by discussing this process in terms of class formation.[115] But it would be mistaken to view Afrikaner nationalist ideology purely in instrumental terms. Christian-national theory can only be fully understood within the terms of its own cognitive reality and by reference to its internal logic. To this extent it contains a certain irreducible ideological element which seems to defy interest-group or class analysis.

Confronted with this irreducible quality, there has been a tendency amongst some writers either to wish it away or else to resort to the unsatisfactory claim that Afrikaner nationalism is fundamentally irrational. It is, however, dangerous to dismiss apartheid theory in these terms - not least because of the demonstrable capacity that supposedly irrational ideologies can have when it comes to influencing human behaviour. Within the terms of its own internal discourse, Christian-nationalism was based on a coherent, if contradictory, intellectual framework. Its power as an ideology was related to the ability of its adherents to hold together contradictory ideas, while maintaining an overall appearance of consistency.

Despite its essential rigidity, the discourse of Christian-nationalism was sufficiently malleable to adjust to different circumstances. Indeed, the theologians and academics who participated in the construction of apartheid ideology were often highly sensitive to political realities, and they constantly sought to test the limits of their doctrine's flexibility. One notes, for example, that the high-point of support for an Afrikaner *volk* state was reached at around the time when a victory for the axis-powers during the war seemed possible. Likewise, it was during the late 1930s and 40s that explicit biological explanations of human difference were expressed most stridently. In the 1950s and 60s, when attacks on the *herrenvolk* ideology of apartheid gathered force, it is clear that many Afrikaner nationalist intellectuals were pushed onto the defensive. This can be seen in the severe unease generated by the United

Nations' attacks on apartheid, the Unesco criticisms of racial myths, and the 1960 Cottesloe rejection of apartheid within the churches. Faced with this onslaught, one of the favoured responses was the disavowal of any connection between apartheid and notions of innate racial superiority.

Far from being a simple, dogmatic ideology, Christian-nationalist thought contained a number of tendencies, reflecting differences of approach, emphasis, and political conviction. It also reflected a marked degree of intellectual eclecticism: Dutch neo-Calvinism, German National-Socialism, and the already existing framework of inter-war segregationist ideology are amongst the most important sources. The idea of race, whether latent or explicit, was a constant motif. This is especially evident where the fear of racial contamination or miscegenation arose. Such dangers were highlighted by reference to scriptural injunction, historical precedent, as well as biological degeneration.

If race figured as a deeply ambiguous concept within religious thought, this was partly because of the equally ambiguous notion of *volk* with which it was closely associated. Conceived of both in biological and cultural terms, these concepts were shrouded in a quasi-mystical language and reinforced by the influence of a brand of Romanticism which openly distrusted rational thought and the universalistic ideas associated with the Enlightenment. The portrayal of the voortrekkers as the embodiment of Afrikaner virtues was deeply influenced by such ideas. Their heroic pre-industrial past, their connection with the soil, and their wisdom born of experience, were all essential elements in this construct. Experience, instinct and tradition were key validating principles, and they were often accorded more significance than the authority of empirical knowledge. When it suited their purposes, ideologues were pleased to quote the findings of racial science in support of the idea of white superiority, but only rarely did this constitute the basis of their arguments.

The metaphysical terms according to which Afrikaner nationalism construed its purpose, meant that a full-blown racist explanation of human difference was seldom articulated. In the main it was neither necessary nor convenient to do so. The Kuyperian language of `diversity' and the sovereignty of separate `spheres' was highly conducive to the affirmation of a form of cultural relativism. Here, the idealist conception of nation, *volk* and culture functioned as a useful substitute for a biological view of race. It was therefore possible to speak about the `national character' or `soul' as if such qualities were capable of being transmitted from generation to generation - but without the difficulties associated with biological theories of racial inheritance.

This subtle mixture of cultural relativism and racial determinism was an important aspect of Christian-nationalism's strength and appeal.

Idealism, in the other sense of the word, also convinced many adherents that apartheid was a genuinely just way of solving South Africa's racial conflict. For, unlike partial *ad hoc* segregation which was held to be intrinsically exploitative, it was believed that total segregation would provide Africans with full opportunities to develop according to their own cultural norms. To the extent that the success of ideologies depend to a large extent on the degree to which they are genuinely accepted by their advocates, a belief in the moral rectitude of apartheid was crucial to the relative cohesiveness of Afrikanerdom during the 1950s and 60s. That coherence has since been shattered, both politically and ideologically. But even today, as a new South Africa is struggling to be born, the coded language of `groups', `nation' and `cultural identity' retains a ghostly resonance. Together, they alert us to the residual salience of an ideology which, though wholly discredited, continues to exercise a significant influence over events.

1. This paper forms part of a broader investigation into the `idea of race' in twentieth century South Africa. I have benefited from the written comments of André du Toit, Johan Kinghorn and John Lazar, as well as those of the anonymous readers of the *JAH*. Earlier drafts of this paper were presented at seminars at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London, and the 1990 African Studies Association conference in Baltimore. Translations from Afrikaans are my own.

2. This argument ties in with the broad, inclusive definition of racist ideology which I have adopted. This embraces both the idea of biologically determined superiority and inferiority, as well as the notion that culture is in some strong sense an expression of genetic constitution.

3. G.M.Fredrickson, *The Arrogance of Race. Historical Perspectives on Slavery, Racism and Social Inequality* (Connecticut, 1988), 189.

4. N.J.Rhoodie and H.J.Venter, *Apartheid. A Socio-Historical Exposition of the Origin and Development of the Apartheid Idea* (Cape Town, [1960], 113.

5. *Ibid.*, 145.

6. L.J. du Plessis, `Rasverhoudinge', *Koers*, October 1933; H.du Plessis, `Assimilasie of Algehele Segregasie', *Koers*, June 1935. The latter article made a strong case for total separation (though without using the term `apartheid') - as opposed to the `neo-liberalism' of Brookes, Rheinallt Jones and Macmillan which was inevitably assimilationist. It also purported to show that racial diversity was biologically and historically determined by God.

7. Rhoodie and Venter, *Apartheid*, 170. The *Bond* lasted for a brief time only. Its first chair was Mrs E.G.Jansen, wife of the Minister of Native Affairs from 1929-33 and 1948-50. The secretary was M.D.C. de Wet Nel who served as Minister of Bantu Administration from 1958-61.

8. Rhoodie and Venter, *Apartheid*, 171-2. Hexham documents an even earlier use of `apartheid' in the context of a lecture on Calvinism at Potchefstroom in 1914. See I. Hexham, *The Irony of Apartheid* (New York and Toronto, 1981), 188.

9. A.N.Pelzer, *Die Afrikaner-Broederbond: Eerste 50 Jaar* (Capt Town, 1979), 163-4. Given the close links between the Broederbond and the Bond vir Rassestudie it is quite possible that the *Bond's* pronouncement of `apartheid' after 1935 stemmed from the Broederbond's 1933 document. This may also account for the "definite lead" taken by the Cape nationalist organ, *Die Burger*, from 1933 in rethinking Hertzogite segregation. See Rhoodie and Venter, *Apartheid*, 145.

10. J.Kinghorn, `The Theology of Separate Equality: A Critical Outline of the DRC's Position on Apartheid', in M.Prozesky (ed), *Christianity Amidst Apartheid: Selected Perspectives on the Church in South Africa* (London, 1990), 58-9.

11. J. du Plessis, `Colonial Progress and Countryside Conservatism: An Essay on the Legacy of Van der Lingen of Paarl, 1831-1875' (MA thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 1988); A.du Toit, `The Cape Afrikaner's Failed Liberal Moment, 1850-1870', in J.Butler *et.al.* (eds), *Democratic Liberalism in South Africa* (Middletown, Connecticut and Cape Town) 1987.

12. J.du Plessis (convenor) *The Dutch Reformed Church and the Native Problem* (Stellenbosch, 1921)

13. C.Borchardt, "Die `Swakheid' van Sommige en die Sending", in J.Kinghorn (ed), *Die NG Kerk en Apartheid* (Johannesburg, 1986), 80.

14. Du Plessis, *The Dutch Reformed Church*, 20,12.

15. *Ibid.*, 11.

16. The mechanics and ideology of segregation is explored at length in my book *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa 1919-36* (London, 1989).

17. The Dutch Reformed Church Federal Council hosted the conferences of 1923 and 1927. Subsequent conferences were organised by the held by the South African Institute of Race Relations.

18. T.Karis and G.M.Carter, *From Protest to Challenge Vol.I*, 232. This resolution was proposed by Edgar Brookes. It is not clear whether it was formally adopted by the conference.

19. Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*, 90.

20. *Cape Times* February 3, 1927.

21. Union Government, SC 10-'27, *Report of the Select Committee on the Subject of the Union Native Council Bill, Coloured Persons Rights Bill, Representation of Natives in Parliament Bill, and Natives Land (Amendment) Bill* (1927), 359. See also 347ff.

22. Borchardt, `Die "Swakheid van Sommige"', 82.

23. J.A.Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible* (Cape Town, 1987) p27-8; T.D.Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom* (Berkeley and London, 1975) 62.

24. Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*, 87-90; Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*, 29-31

25. Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*, 90.

26. Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*, 154; W.A.de Klerk comments on the basis of his personal experience: `Of these Diederichs spoke in words of passionate oratory, Meyer in blunter, but equally

effective, rhetoric. Cronjé, in a dry-as-dust style, expounded the most thorough-going analysis of the new political sociology with deep theological overtones.' See his *The Puritans in Africa* (London, 1975) 203.

27. C.Bloomberg, *Christian-Nationalism and the Rise of the Afrikaner Broederbond in South Africa 1918-48* (London, 1990) 122.

28. *Inspan*, October 1944, 21.

29. *Ibid.*

30. See Bloomberg, *Christian-Nationalism*, 105-7; Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*, 35-8.

31. Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*, 53-4

32. The full address is published in *Inspan*, December 1944.

33. The term is Loubser's.

34. *Inspan*, December 1944, 7-11.

35. *Ibid.*, 13.

36. F.G.Badenhorst, *Die Rassevraagstuk veral Betreffende Suid-Afrika in die Lig van die Gereformeerde Etiek* (Amsterdam, 1939). Discussion here is largely focussed on the different European races.

37. Kuyper's ideas were first brought to South Africa by Totius' father, S.J. du Toit, who is chiefly responsible for creating the first Afrikaans Language Movement of the 1870s and 80s.

38. This discussion of Kuyper has been drawn from Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*; Moodie, *The Rise*; Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*; Hexham, *The Irony of Apartheid.*

39. See Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*, 62; G.J.Schutte, 'The Netherlands, Cradle of Apartheid?', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, X,iv,(1987); H.Giliomee and L.Schlemmer, *From Apartheid to Nation-Building* (Oxford, 1989), 43-4

40. Bloomberg, *Christian-Nationalism*, 9.

41. A.Kuyper, *Calvinism. Six Stone Lectures* (1898*), pp.37,38; A.Kuyper, *The South African Crisis* (London, 1898), 24.

42. Bloomberg, *Christian-Nationalism*, 8.

43. Moodie, *The Rise*, 154; Schutte, 'The Netherlands', p412 fn22. The philosopher J.G.Herder (1744-1803) is widely regarded as the first European thinker to articulate a comprehensive philosophy of nationalism. He was responsible for developing the idea of nationality in terms of a cultural organism sharing common features - principally language. Herder's conception of culture was relativistic and was not defined in terms of race. J.G.Fichte (1762-1814) gave Herder's essentially humanistic and pluralist view a more exclusivist and narrow political emphasis by concentrating on the historical mission of the German people. He has also been seen as an early progenitor of the *fuehrer* concept.

44. Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk*, 66-8.

45. R.Proctor, *Racial Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988) chap.8.

46. The organic metaphor of society was also stressed by the evolutionist tradition of thought which, in the guise of Social Darwinism, was used to endorse the survival of the fittest (whether constituted as individuals or aggregates of individuals).

47. Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*, 159-60; Schutte, 'The Netherlands', 411.

48. N.J.Diederichs, *Nasionalisme as Lewensbeskouing en sy Verhouding tot Internasionalisme* (Bloemfontein, 1936); De Klerk, *Puritans in Africa*, 204.

49. Diederichs, *Nasionalisme as Lewensbeskouing*, 24, 17.

50. *Ibid.*, 22-3.

51. *Ibid.*, 37.

52. *Ibid*, 31.

53. J.D.Vorster, 'Die Kleurverskil en Kleureerbiediging', *Koers*, February, 1939, 11,15,17.

54. J.D.Vorster, 'Etniese Verskeidenheid, Kerklike Pluriformiteit en die Ekumene', in *Grense*, (Stellenbosch, 1961), 65-9.

55. A.B.du Preez, *Inside the South African Crucible* (Cape Town and Pretoria, 1959), 41. (Simultaneously published in Afrikaans as *Eiesoortige Ontwikkeling tot Volksdiens*) For du Preez's biblical justifications for apartheid see his *Die Skriftuurlike Grondslag vir Rasseverhoudinge* (Cape Town, 1955).

56. The complex process according to which theological justifications for apartheid were formulated and endorsed by the DRC is discussed in detail by Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible* and Kinghorn, *Die NG Kerk.*

57. I owe this point to André du Toit.

58. In 1956 the Federal Council of the DRC decided: 'The Dutch Reformed Church accepts the unity of the human race, which is not annulled by its diversity. At the same time the Dutch Reformed Church accepts the natural diversity of the human race, which is not annulled by its unity.' See DRC, *The Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa and the Problem of Race Relations* (n.d. [1956]), p13. The apartheid bible finally emerged in its most sophisticated and definitive form as *Human Relations and the South African Scene in the Light of Scripture*, and was presented to the DRC General Synod in 1974. This landmark document demonstrates a sensitivity to criticisms of apartheid by declaring itself opposed to racial injustice and discrimination. The concept of race itself is avoided through the use of its surrogate term - nation. Nevertheless, the concept of separate development is endorsed in terms of the ethnic diversity willed by God in his creation ordinances.

59. Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*, 53, 71-3.

60. B.J. Marais, *Colour: Unsolved Problem of the West* (Cape Town, 1952), p24 fn.18.

61. *Ibid.*, 295.

62. *Ibid.*, 295.

63. *Ibid.*, 298 [emphasis in original].

64. Cited in Loubser, *The Apartheid Bible*, 74. See also B.B.Keet, *Suid-Afrika - Waarheen?* (Stellenbosch, 1955).

65. *Ibid.*, 75. For an illuminating discussion of the interventions by Marais and Keet in the context of Afrikaner church policy, see J.Lazar, 'Conformity and Conflict: Afrikaner Nationalist Politics in South Africa, 1948-1961', D.Phil thesis, Oxford University, 1987, chap.6.

66. A.B.du Preez, *Die Skriftuurlike Grondslag*, 26.

67. This point is developed by Kinghorn in *Die NG Kerk*, 8-9.

68. See eg. L.Thompson, *the Political Mythology of Apartheid* (New Haven, 1985)

69. A.du Toit, 'No Chosen People: the Myth of the Calvinist Origin of Afrikaner Nationalism and Racial Ideology', *American Historical Review*, vol.88, 1983.*

70. On Preller, see Isabel Hofmeyr's outstanding article, 'Popularizing History: the case of Gustav Preller', *JAH*, XXIX, 3, (1988).

71. G.S.Preller, *Day-Dawn in South Africa* (Pretoria, 1938), 149-151 [my emphasis]. Also published in Afrikaans as *Daglemier in Suid-Afrika.* Similar ideas occur in Preller's history of the trekker leader, *Andries Pretorius* (Johannesburg, 1937), 157ff.

72. See their articles in the first [1940?] issue of the journal *Rassebakens.*

73. G.Cronjé, *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag* (Stellenbosch, 1945), 9, 22.

74. G.B.A. Gerdener, 'Die Buiteland en die Naturellevraagstuk in Suid Afrika', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, III, 2, (1952), 6.

75. Eloff began his research at the University of the Witwatersrand and ultimately became head of the department of Genetics and Breeding Studies (*Telingsleer*) at the University of the Orange Free State. A leading member of the Ossebrandwag, he was interned at Koffiefontein during the war, where he discussed his ideas on eugenics with fellow inmates - including the future prime minister B.J.Vorster. I am grateful to Professor Bruce Murray and Christopher Marx for this biographical information.

76. G.Eloff, 'Rasverbetering deur Uitskakeling van Minderwaardige Indiwidue', *Koers*, December 1933.

77. G.Eloff, 'Drie Gedagtes oor Rasbiologie Veral met Betrekking tot Suid-Afrika', *Koers*, April, 1938.

78. G.Eloff, *Rasse en Rassevermenging. Die Boervolk Gesien van die Standpunt van die Rasseleer* (Bloemfontein, 1942). The editors of this series were J.de W.Keyter, N.Diederichs, G.Cronjé, and P.J.Meyer.

79. *Ibid.*, foreword & 104.

80. *Ibid.*, 51-6.

81. *Ibid.*, 61.

82. *Ibid.*, 26.

83. *Ibid.*, 75-6.

84. *Ibid.*, 76ff. For a discussion of Fischer in the context of the German race hygiene movement, see Proctor, *Racial Hygiene*, 40ff. See also E.Fischer, *Die Rehebother Bastards und das Bastardierungs Probleem bein Menschen* (Jena, 1913)

85. Eloff, *Rasse en Rassevermenging*, 87.

86. *Ibid.*, 101.

87. See eg. G.M.Theal, *History of the Boers in South Africa* (London, 1887), 59-60; A.Pratt, *The Real South Africa* (London, 1913), 82,89; J.T.Burton, *Who are the Africaners?* (Cape Town, 1927).

88. A.H.Keane, *The Boer States. Land and People* (London, 1900).

89. *Ibid.*, 145,161-2,189-90.

90. L.J.du Plessis, *Problems of Nationality and Race in Southern Africa* (London, 1949), 6.

91. G.Cronjé, *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag* (Stellenbosch, 1945); *Afrika sonder die Asiaat* (Johannesburg, 1946); *Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid* (Stellenbosch, 1947); *Voogdyskap en Apartheid* (Pretoria, 1948).

92. G.Cronjé, *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag*, 12-19. I have discussed the topic of intelligence testing in greater detail elsewhere. *

93. Cronjé, *Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid*, 75-8.

94. A.du Toit, `Political Control and Personal Morality', in R.Schrire (ed), *South Africa: Public Policy Perspectives* (Cape Town, 1982) 63.

95. Cronjé, *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag*, 74.

96. *Ibid.*, 31.

97. The term `visionary' was coined by John Lazar. My analysis of SABRA is influenced by the discussion of this organisation in his thesis, `Conformity and Conflict'.

98. G.B.A. Gerdener, `Die Buiteland en die Naturellevraagstuk in Suid Afrika', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, III, ii, (1952), 5-6.

99. *Ibid.*, 6.

100. J.P.Bruwer, `Prof.Dr. G.B.A. Gerdener. Ons Huldig sy Leierskap en sy Lewe', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, VII, ii (1956), 51.

101. W.M.M.Eiselen, `Ons Jeug en ons Rasse-aangeleenthede', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, IV, iii, (1953).

102. W.M.M.Eiselen, *Die Naturelle-Vraagstuk* (Cape Town, 1929).

103. See Eiselen's foreword to M.L.Fick's *The Educability of the South African Native* (Pretoria, 1939), iv; Union Government (UG 53/1951), *Report of the Commission on Native Education 1941-1951* p13 para.60. But note the dissentient remarks of A.H.Murray on p165 para.2.

104. W.M.M. Eiselen, `Is Separation Practicable?', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, I, ii, (1950), 18.

105. N.J.J.Olivier, `Apartheid - A Slogan or a Solution?', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, VI,ii, (1954), 24-5.

106. Union Government, UG 61-1955, *Summary of the Report fo the Commission for the Socio-Economic Development of the Bantu Areas within the Union of South Africa* (1955-6) p2 para.12. In the full 17-volume Tomlinson Report, which is untranslated and available only in mimeograph form, the race paradigm is even more strongly evident. So is the academic basis from which the distilled conclusions of the published version are drawn.

107. *Ibid.*, p9, para.71.

108. *Ibid.*, p20, para.20

109. J.Albert Coetzee, *Nasie-Wording in SuidAfrika. 'n Sleutel vir die Politieke Probleem van SuidAfrika* (Potchefstroom, 1931).

110. S.du Toit, `Openbaringslig op die Apartheidsvraagstuk', *Koers*, August 1949, 14.

111. J.P.Bruwer, `Grondbeginsels i.v.m. Fisiese en Kulturele Verskille', *Journal of Racial Affairs*, IV,iv,(1953), 41-2; *Verslag van die Kommissie vir die Sosio-Ekonomiese Ontwikkeling van die Bantoegebiede Binne die Unie van Suid-Afrika Vol.1* (p67 para.122).

112. Eloff, *Rasse en Rassevermenging*, 26,27.

113. Kinghorn, `The Theology of Separate Equality', 67.

114. For example, the assumption that language and culture were expressions of race, was an essential element in post-enlightenment anthropological thought. Similarly, the notion that that non-physical characteristics (eg. culture) are capable of absorption and transmission from one generation to the next, derives in large part from Lamarck's theory of the inheritance of acquired characteristics.

115. D.O'Meara, *Volkskapitalisme. Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934-48* (Cambridge, 1983)