

## Apartheid

*JG Strijdom [link to recap - years in power, what best known for: hot potatoes, multiple choice etc]*

[p147] The change in leadership from Malan to Strijdom resulted in little change in policy for the Blacks.<sup>1</sup>

"As early as 1930 Strijdom had concluded that total separation between white and black was impossible.<sup>2</sup> A more limited segregation, resting upon the *baaskap* (mastership) of whites, was, however, imperative." Strijdom firmly believed that Blacks were visitors to the white cities and that they could therefore be replaced with poor whites and other whites coming in from the farms.<sup>3</sup> *what does this paragraph tell you about Apartheid in terms of separate development? How does this information impact on your existing knowledge*

"His biographer summarises his views thus:

He was also in favour of the native population in the cities being gradually reduced. The unemployed must be transferred either to the native areas or to the white farms where they would feel more at home. The natives were basically agriculturalists who experienced difficulties in adjusting to the town. On the farms, however, there were plenty of job opportunities for those who were prepared to work. Often farm labourers were presented with a falsely romantic view of the city, but after leaving the farms found themselves in miserable conditions. Strijdom repeatedly maintained that the native in the countryside represented no danger to white civilisation. The main reason for this is that he has maintained respect for his tribal membership there, and has not tried to become an 'imitation white man'.

*The questions which immediately spring to my mind are 'didn't the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts try to move blacks off the farms? so what is Strijdom implying? They move to farms in the homelands? You don't have access to material which can resolve the innuendos in this summary. All you can do is try and make sense of it knowing what you do and reworking your interpretation as your knowledge increases.*

[p 148] In 1956 Strijdom boasted about the government's achievements in implementing 'negative' apartheid: the separation of trains and residential areas, "the removal of so-called 'black spots' (African-owned freehold land situated away from the homelands) [...]. He repeated also his view that total territorial apartheid was an unattainable ideal." [footnote - House of Assembly

---

<sup>1</sup> I changed this sentence from: 'Malan's retirement and his replacement by Strijdom made little impact on the apartheid policy as far as Africans were concerned.' If I were to use my version of it in an essay, it would have to be referenced as it is not my own thought – I have taken it from someone else.

<sup>2</sup> In the original text there is a footnote at this point. It reads:

J.L. Basson, *JG Strijdom: Sy politieke Loopbaan van 1929 tot 1948* (Pretoria: Wonderboom, 1980), p.581

The purpose of this footnote is to tell me that the author of this chapter got his idea for this sentence from the above book. So, if you could read Afrikaans and had access to this book, you would be able to double check his interpretation by turning to p.581 and reading it. This is why you need to reference when you take ideas from someone else – so that if your reader is interested in what you've said, they can find out more but also, if they have a different view to your statement, they can trace it back to test its validity.

<sup>3</sup> Footnote after original text: Although I have changed the words from the original text, I would still need to reference this section. In this case, I would not put the original footnote reference but the book I have used.

debates, 90, 1956, col 43; use of quote marks] *If Strijdom is referring here to 'negative' apartheid, what do you think 'positive' apartheid would be? What do you think the significance of his reiterating that 'total territorial apartheid was an unattainable ideal'?*

[p 149-150] Verwoerd seems to have been given freedom to introduce legislation and affect policy without always getting the cabinet or party caucus to agree. Examples include being able to ban blacks from attending white church services in 1956, his rejection of the Tomlinson Commission recommendations and his introduction of Black education policies which were disastrous. He saw himself as implementing the recommendations of the Sauer Commission which Cillé asserts on p 61 in *Baanbrekers vir vryheid*. He suggests that rather than being the 'architect of apartheid', Verwoerd was the 'indefatigable executor of apartheid policies'. [*why include the source for you? problem of dealing with texts in Afrikaans/language you don't understand*]

*HF Verwoerd*

[p 152] As when Strijdom became PM, so when Verwoerd became PM there was no major change in the Apartheid policy. His portfolio of Native Affairs had been split into two and the ministers he appointed to the two positions were very similar in outlook to himself. Disagreeing with Verwoerd was regarded as treason and members were either forced out of the party or not included in important deliberations if they were business or church men. [*two different references substantiate this paragraph: WP Esterhuysen and AH Luckhoff - what is the significance of two different sources claiming the same point?*] These claims continue over the page with further examples of people excluded from decision making because they disagreed with Verwoerd. On one occasion, Verwoerd later adopted a recommendation he had previously reprimanded a clergyman for making but never acknowledged him or brought him back into the fold - this was to do with the the idea of independent homelands. [*what does this tell us about Verwoerd and policy making?*]

[p 155] Verwoerd had realised that "white South Africa was on the eve of making a crucial choice: either to integrate, which in Verwoerd's view must inevitably lead to 'Bantu control' (ie black majority rule), or to follow the separate nations route of separate development. Even before Harold Macmillan reminded him in 1960 in the 'wind of change' speech, Verwoerd was well aware of the decolonisation process in Africa and its implications for South Africa. Increasingly he would try to assimilate his own policies with those of the colonial power in its heyday." *What is significant about this paragraph? choice facing Verwoerd. What does it say about the route he took SA? Link Macmillan to British module. what does the last sentence suggest about SA and colonialism. can you think of what implications independence in Africa could hold for SA?*

Verwoerd said the following about black farm labour because it presented a flaw in the logic of apartheid:

We say that when a Native drives a tractor on a farm, he is not economically integrated... Merely because he helps the farmer to produce, is such a Native who operates a tractor

integrated into the farmer's life and community? Of course he is not, because the concept of integration relates to people, and here we do not have people whose activities are becoming interwoven. They will only become interwoven in this way if the other forms of integration, namely equal social and political rights, result from these activities. I therefore repeat for the umpteenth time that we dare not succumb to this confusion... When a factory is reorganised, certain labour can be reduced or removed. If automation is introduced into a factory manual labour can in many instances be eliminated. But if the Native who was previously employed in that industry has been absorbed into one trade union with the Whites, and has acquired a share in the industrial and capital assets of the country, he cannot easily be removed at a later stage from the economic industrial entity. This is the difference between labour which we can remove and labour which has become interwoven in so many other ways into the White community that it cannot be removed, even if we want to. (Pelzer, *Verwoerd speaks*, p 183)

According to Verwoerd, economic integration could only happen when people of different races treated each other as equals. *What does this say about Apartheid - economically, socially and politically? Think of the essay question asking if Apartheid was purely a policy of social segregation - what does this speech imply/suggest? (using quotes<sup>4</sup> in your essays - always give the significance/reason for using it to show you have understood the message/concept you are wanting to convey)*

[p 156] Voster used this idea to claim that the number of blacks within South Africa was not important - it was the relationship between them and the whites which was. He differed to Verwoerd on this matter as the latter felt that Apartheid should result in fewer blacks staying in South Africa. Verwoerd predicted that 1978 would be the year when the flow of blacks to the homelands would increase.

On page 155, the author (David Welsh) mentioned that Verwoerd 'would try to assimilate his own policies with those of the colonial power in its heyday'. He explains on page 156 one of the ways in which he tried. This was to do with the European Community. He equated the blacks working in white South Africa with migrant workers from Turkey, Algeria, Yugoslavia and others employed in the Western Europe. *Do you think this comparison is plausible? Another comparison he used was the commonwealth. Can you see how he would argue this?*

[p 157] In introducing the independent homeland policy, Verwoerd had to justify his change in policy. In 1965 he said:

We would rather have seen the old position maintained, but in the circumstances of the post-war world that was obviously not possible... Years ago the position prevailed where nobody doubted the White man's supremacy. The old British colonial policy itself was one of White supremacy over other states, and particularly the Black states. We had this policy in South Africa under Generals Botha [Prime Minister 1910-19] and Smuts [Prime Minister 1919-48], and even thereafter. The position was always to regard him as his guardian. For obvious reasons I said that we all wished that all these post-Second World War changes had not come about, because then surely the world would have been very comfortable for us... But.. in the light of the new spirit and the pressures exerted and the forces which arose after the Second World War it is clear that no country could continue as it did in past years. The old

---

<sup>4</sup> When you see a quote in a book, you need to ask yourself what the author's purpose or reason for including it was. It's most likely because they couldn't say what the original said in any shorter way while still giving some flavour of what was implied. As I would reference when I quote someone, so this quote is referenced. If you were doing a piece of research on related topics, you could find the book the quote is from and see if it contains more information on your specific topic.

traditional policy of the White man as the ruler over the Bantu. who had no rights at all, could not continue. (House of Assembly debates, 9, 1964, col 627) *[have you noticed there is a discrepancy in the dates? I have double checked my typing and this is how it appears in the book. What should I do if I want to make sure I have the correct info? There is another error in this text, can you find it? (Smuts PM-1919-48] why are some sections of this document in smaller font?*

*BJ Vorster*

[p 163] Vorster was not the NPs first choice as replacement for Verwoerd. He was elected unopposed because the other two contenders withdrew from the contest. *What does this imply about Vorster's relationship with the party? Reminder about use of abbreviations in text*

[p 165] In 1967 Vorster reassured the Senate that "blacks would never be represented by blacks in parliament: 'it will never, under any circumstances, take place because it is wrong in principle.' He defended separate development as a policy that 'can be tested against the requirements of Christianity and morality'." Privately he was saying that 'separate development was a method, not a dogma.' "Dirk Richard quotes him as telling a group of NP MPs shortly after his election:

No chaps, you have got it all wrong. The cardinal principle of the NP is the retention, maintenance and immortalisation of Afrikaner identity within a white sovereign state. Apartheid and separate development is merely a method of bringing this about and making it permanent. If there are other better methods of achieving this end, then we must find those methods and get on with it. (Richard, *Moedswillig die Uwe*, pp 134-5) *This is the way the footnote is given in the text. It's not very helpful as it doesn't give the year of publication or who the publisher was. Why can this be a problem? why would I want to know this? You can find out by looking in the bibliography (description o how a bibliography is set up).*

[p 166] In 1967 four ultra right MPs broke away from the NP and formed the Herstigte Nasionale Party (HNP). They complained about Vorster developing links with African countries and the possibility of black diplomats being sent to South Africa. They felt the same about English speaking South Africans being included in the South African rugby team as this diluted national unity amongst Afrikaners. Another complaint was the amount of money being spent on the development of blacks.

[p 167] "In 1972, [...] CP Mulder [...] could defend separate development as the only policy yet devised that could meet the requirements of the South African situation, but insist that 'the policy is not based on ideology but on pragmatism.'"

[pp 170-171] Following a series of strikes from 1973 for which he did not blame any one, Vorster appointed a commission of enquiry to investigate labour legislation. "This Commission's recommendations formed the basis of momentous legislation in 1979 that recognised African trade unions and brought them within the scope of the industrial conciliation machinery for the first time. [...] Mobilised worker power represented leverage, both economic and political, and previous administrations had not tolerated that." [*Compare*

*this move with Verwoerd's comment about black farm labourers. What do you think the significance of this change in policy was and what did it mean for Black-White relations in South Africa? Dealing with 'big' words in a text - dictionary, work it out, more you read the more you build vocabulary.]*

[p 174] In November 1976 the Broerderbond reported Vorster's views which he had given at a secret meeting:

He stressed with great determination that his profound analysis of the recent trying months and weeks had convinced him anew that there is no way to handle race relations but the way of separate development. He added that the greatest legacy of Dr Verwoerd was his vision of separate homelands which could be developed to full independence. Without the homeland policy, he said, we would now have been in the same position as Rhodesia. He called on the [Broerderbond] to take stock and throw everything into the battle to maintain and promote this policy. *What is significant about the reference to Rhodesia? 'white' country going through independence struggle*

[pp 174-175] "Vorster's premiership ended in humiliating circumstances in September 1978. He was a victim of the Information Scandal, but in a significant sense the scandal arose out of circumstances that he himself had perpetuated. First, the unorthodox activities of the Bureau of Information stemmed directly from efforts to counter the growing international hostility to apartheid; secondly, the irregularities that occurred stemmed from an abuse of ministerial power that might not have occurred in more tightly controlled cabinet. The latitude that Vorster allowed his ministers led ultimately to his downfall." *[If this is the first you have heard of the Information Scandal, what can you deduce it was about?]*

[p 175] In 1977 Vorster announced that urban Blacks would be able to acquire their own homes in urban areas on a 99-year lease basis which they could sell, inherit or mortgage but not own them in freehold because that was "in conflict with the policy of the NP." Blacks could also now own more than one business.

[p 178] "Verwoerd's mania for ever-increasing separation was not easily compatible with any form of multiracialism. Moreover the term 'multinationalism', which came into increasing use as a description of policy under Vorster, implied that there were distinct limits to the extent of separation envisaged. [...] Writing of Vorster's last years, F.A. van Jaarsveld says: The Afrikaner leaders had to become reconciled to the fact that they were a minority group, who, in the new circumstances, could no longer act as a white elite government and make laws for the whole population without their consent, or take unilateral decisions on behalf of 'all the people' of the country."

*What are the new circumstances? Growing interdependence between the various racial groups within South Africa.*

*PW Botha*

Botha's "hawkish stance and his belief in the so-called total onslaught theory did not suggest strongly reformist tendencies. Botha, however, surprised his critics. [...] he did a great deal in his early years, to eliminate apartheid's ideological pillars. In 1986 he finally killed off the separate nations thesis.

Botha, in major respects, laid the foundations upon which F.W. de Klerk was able to build."

[p 179] He disliked the word apartheid and avoided using it. Apartheid was 'never an end in itself; it was an instrument'. He "favoured separation measures, on the principle that 'good fences make good neighbours', but he did feel that in some respects the NP had gone too far. He regretted that the Tomlinson recommendations had not been implemented and that Verwoerd had not allowed white investment in the homelands. He undid the ban on white investment in the homelands and changed the law which prohibited adding land to the homelands.

[p 181] The 12 Point Plan of October 1979 was Botha's first major programme. "This was based purely on the conception of South Africa as a society of minority groups and the acceptance of 'vertical differentiation with the built-in principle of self-determination of constitutional structures on as many levels as possible' (point 2). It provided for the creation of constitutional structures or black peoples to achieve maximum possible self-government in those homelands whose fragmentation had been reduced as far as possible by means of consolidation. Regarding the political relationships between whites and the coloured and Indian people, the plan proposed both a division of power and co-responsibility that foreshadowed the distinction between own (group-specific) and general affairs in the future Tricameral Constitution of 1983." Job reservation was repealed in 1981