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ABSTRACT

This thesis seeks to define the relationship between Nazi ideology and the ideology of Afrikaner Nationalism as represented by the Nationalist party of South Africa during the war years between 1939 to 1945. It addresses the two separate problems, what fascist ideology is, for it is necessary to define fascism before one can understand Naziism, a species of fascism, and whether the ideology of the Nationalist party of South Africa was fascist or Nazi during World War II, a period of time when international events exercised a considerable influence on domestic politics in South Africa.

These two problems have been approached by examining authorities on the subject dealt with in this thesis, and by looking at statements of leading Nationalist politicians' documents and Nationalist party platforms, as well as the overt political behaviour of the Italian fascists, the German National Socialists, the Nationalist party, as well as other related fascist organizations. The framework into which this data has been inserted includes a historical overview of Afrikaner history in South Africa, and history of the Nationalist party, an examination of the South african political situation during the period under question, followed first by an 8 point definition of fascism and a 2 point definition of Naziism, and then by a comparison of Nationalist ideology with fascism and Naziism on each characteristic. The
definition of fascism offered in this thesis is premised on the fact that a political party's ideology comes out in its overt behaviour, and is not merely a recapitulation of its stated party platform.

The conclusions arrived at show that the Nationalist party was influenced by fascist and Nazi ideology on some points, notably in its attitudes towards Communists, Jews and democracy. Dissimilarities arise when one compares the Nationalists to the Nazis in the social composition of their respective movements, and when one discovers the contrast between the nationalist party's religio-traditionalist conservatism and the Nazi's revolutionary nihilism. The Nationalist party can be shown to be a party that was open to Nazi influence but not completely swamped by it during the period in question.
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CHAPTER 1

Two particular problems for the political scientist are the difficulty in gaining a clear definition of fascism, and whether or not the Nationalist party/regime in South Africa might be considered fascist, or Nazi. This thesis is an attempt to deal with both of these questions; and in fact, the latter requires that the former be resolved. Heribert Adams, in his book *Modernizing Racial Domination*, questions the entire validity of any attempt to fit Afrikaner Nationalism into a model of fascism. According to Adams, the specific circumstance of apartheid the flexible and pragmatic domination over a racially separated majority are not included in most definitions of fascism. Yet there are similarities and influences which can be isolated and should not be ignored. One should be able to devise a model of fascism which can at least be tested against the system of racial separation that has been developed in South Africa. It occurred to me that one way to approach this problem would be to look at the Nationalist Party at a crucial stage in its history, when the influence of a form of fascism, National Socialism, would be most obvious. Any sign of specifically Nazi policies or views, such as anti-Semitism, emerging in Nationalist party policy or propaganda in the 1930's is evidence worth examining as to the influence upon or similarity of fascism or Naziism to Afrikaner Nationalism in the late 1930's and early 1940's.
Now, to define fascism and Naziism, one has to set some sort of plausible guidelines that will include some movements and exclude others; for a definition that is indiscriminate is not worth very much, particularly in the case of a term like fascism, which is often thrown about liberally. It seemed that the simplest thing to do was to see what characteristics were common to the most obvious, indeed prototypical, versions of fascism -- Italian Fascism and German Naziism -- and use these qualities as my definition. From there, one can determine the distinctive features of German Naziism, which is after all the point of comparison used here: the yardstick, so to speak, against which Afrikaner Nationalism, in the form of the Nationalist Party, is being examined.

However, since there are forms of fascism other than "classic" fascism, the definition offered here will differentiate between the classic variety and those movements or regimes which offer varying diffuse examples of fascism. They show fascism characteristics in modified or more dilute forms. The Nationalist Party will then be tested by my definition of fascism, in order to see to what extent it falls under the definition. The relationship between a party's ideology and its social base will form a part of the discussion.

The influence of Nazi ideology on the South African Nationalist Party during World War II was not minimal, but did
not determine the party's opposition to South African participation in the war. It seems that the primary factor conditioning the Herenigde Nasionale Parij's (HNP's) opposition to the war was the traditional antipathy that a large percentage of Afrikaners (White South Africans of Dutch, German and French descent) felt for Great Britain.

The British had conquered the original Dutch Cape colony in 1795. Many Afrikaners rejected British rule in 1838 by fleeing into the interior, to maintain their cultural independence and position as slaveowners. The British had conquered the two Boer republics in the Boer war of 1899-1902. Milner's policy of Anglicization before Union in 1910 further contributed to a strong current of resentment and hostility to Britain during the 20th century among the Afrikaners. The superior economic and political position of the British within the Union in the post-1910 period continually stoked the fires of Afrikaner resentment.

Yet the emergence of the Nationalists as an anti-imperialist, republican-nationalist movement was gradual. The personalities and outlook of the Nationalist leaders in the early years of union indicated that many different views of nationalism existed during this period. Afrikaner Nationalism was in a process of redefinition and change, and no one ideological framework ever encompassed it. National Socialism was not the only ideological current within Afrikaner Nationalism during the war years; and while events may have
propelled it into a more central position within a common Nationalist worldview, it never did totally dominate the outlook of most of the Nationalist Party leadership during that period.

Nationalist opposition to the war was largely pragmatic. It reflected the feelings of most Afrikaners and most Nationalist politicians. Nationalist ideology, before 1935, was rather ill-defined beyond certain fundamentals. These fundamentals -- severing the Imperial connection; protecting and advancing the Afrikaans language and other folk traditions; and the continued subjugation and segregation of the non-White races of the Union -- were basic to the Nationalist outlook, and shared by virtually all Afrikaners.

Opposition to Britain opened the door to Nazi influence within the Nationalist party and throughout Afrikanerdom, after the Nazi advent to power in 1933. In many cases, Nazi ideology, itself rather hazy and diffuse in nature, was poorly understood by the Nationalists and by Afrikanerdom in general. National Socialism was viewed with sympathy by many Afrikaners because of its overall racist tone, but the degree to which most anti-war Afrikaners adopted it varied, and full-blown National Socialism, as advocated in Germany, was espoused by very few Afrikaners. It would probably be as hard to isolate any anti-war sentiment in South Africa between 1939 - 1945 that was completely untainted by Nazi ideology, as it would be to discover many pure Nazis in the German mold, completely
uninfluenced by wholly indigenous forms of Afrikaner Nationalist ideology.

The Nationalist party wavered between the two aforementioned extremes. A study of Nazi ideology and its influence on the HNP is of necessity a historical study, piecing together speeches of politicians, policy resolutions at party conventions, and looking for traces of Nazi thought within these declarations. Afrikaner history, and in particular the history of the Nationalist party, must be examined in order to show the setting which allowed a certain degree of Nazi sentiment to rise, but yet contained the growth of that sentiment.

This thesis will give a ten-point definition of Naziism. It will be based on and include an eight-point definition of exclusive fascism, which will be contrasted with inclusive fascism. If too inclusive, any regime or movement of vaguely right-wing authoritarian tendencies could be described as fascist, semi-fascist, Nazi or semi-Nazi. If too exclusive, then no fascist or Nazi type could be discussed; no characteristics common to fascism or Nazism could be found. This thesis will offer a definition of fascism (as the base of Naziism, which is a distinct species of fascism), then of Naziism, for fascist characteristics are a necessary condition of Naziism, but not a sufficient condition. Italian fascism and German National Socialism will serve as the classic models of 20th century classic fascism. The Nationalist party will
then be measured by how closely its rhetoric and positions on the issues, and its ideology during the war years, matched the most distinctive features of the most notable classic fascist movements, particularly the Nazis. Ideology will not be considered as just the stated party platform of a political movement, but the actual practical implementation of those beliefs. In other words, the ideology of a movement will be distilled from the movement's practices, in power and out, and the patterns that emerge from those practices will be said to reflect the actual ideology of the movement or the regime. Finally, the Nationalist Party's relationship to Nazi ideology will be analyzed. After this, the conclusion follows.

First, I shall give a very brief description of Afrikaner history, from Jan van Riebeeck's landing until the end of World War II. Then, I shall describe the development of the HNP during that same period. This will be followed by a discussion of the fall of the Hertzog government in 1939 and the subsequent Nationalist opposition to the Smuts government's war policy. The opposition of the HNP to the war will then be contrasted with the attitudes of other anti-war Afrikaner political movements towards the war. This will be followed by a description of fascist and Nazi ideology, and then by an analysis of the Nationalist Party during World War II based on the foregoing definition.
CHAPTER II

Political history in South Africa did not begin in 1652, with the landing of Jan van Riebeeck at the Cape of Good Hope. What is now Cape Province, and most of present-day Namibia, had been settled by the San and Khoi-Khoi peoples for thousands of years, while the eastern part of the modern Republic of South Africa had been inhabited by Bantu-speaking tribes for at least half a millennium. The descendants of the Khoisan peoples, by virtue of their forebears' sexual liaisons with some of the original Dutch settlers, are the 3-million-strong mixed-race Coloured community of the Cape. The descendants of the Bantu-speaking tribes are the 24-million-strong Black community in South Africa today.

This paper, however is an analytical description of crucial political options faced by Afrikanerdom at an important juncture in its history. At no time did a common culture unite the peoples of South Africa. Even within a Marxist framework, it is proper to study various components of the overall pattern of social relations; and if one adopts an eclectic approach, then South African history easily lends itself to the study of its component parts. The knitting-together of a common culture within a united society may really only be happening today.

Afrikaner history, then, does begin in 1652. Riebeeck landed to found a resupply station for the Dutch East Indian Company, and their ships bound for Java and Timor. It
conducted its own military affairs, including the right to declare war and make peace.¹ "For all practical purposes, the VOC was as an imperium within a state. It maintained its own Christian standards. Its Calvinism was that of the Synod of Dort (1618), which had been as much a scene of political conflict as theological argument."² Calvinism, a stringent variety of the Reformed tradition, stressed the sovereignty of God; the inadequacy of unaided man to achieve salvation; and a rejection of works, including the sacerdotal function of the church. The Calvinism of the original Dutch and German settlers, as well as of the French Huguenots (refugees from religious persecution in Catholic France) who arrived in 1688, combined with a sense of total alienation from other aspects of Dutch culture, and a contempt for the Capoid peoples, formed the basis of Afrikaner cultural development. The original settlers, free Burghers after 1657, when they acquired the right to own land, quickly lost themselves in the valleys of the Cape, also losing their allegiance to the VOC and to commercial Dutch culture in the process.

The emergence of the Trekboer in the early 18th century really accentuates the Afrikanerization of the original Dutch-German settlers. The Trekboers, the nomadic Boers who gradually moved further from the Cape during the 18th century, should be distinguished from the Voortrekkers, the Boers who fled British rule in the Cape and moved into the interior in 1838. The Trekboers were individual families or small groups
of Dutch settlers who moved, following routes to where there was water. A process of Africanization ensued, marked by the development of Afrikaans from Dutch. The European population, almost all of whom were descendants of the first waves of Dutch, German and Huguenot settlers, who arrived in South Africa before 1688, grew very slowly from several hundred settlers in 1652 to 26,000 by the beginning of the 19th century -- subjugating the surviving San and Khoi-Khoi, or driving them deeper into the interior.

The frontier Afrikaner thus emerged as a slave-owning, "Africanized" nomad, cut off from most of the traditional props of European civilization. Imbued with a feeling that his nomadic lifestyle was divinely ordained -- in the Old Testament, particularly in the Pentateuch, patriarchs held slaves, wandered freely, and mercilessly combatted the heathen inhabitants of the Promised Land -- the Afrikaner retained little of European civilization save stern Calvinist theology and a simplified form of the Dutch language, Afrikaans. Commercial pragmatic urban Dutch culture was lost for the Trekboer; and even, to an extent, for the wine-producers of the Cape valleys, who were now independent farmers, not Company employees.

The Afrikaner encountered two new enemies, the Bantu and the British, in the 18th century, both of whom were to further define through their antagonism, the national identity of the Afrikaner. By this time, the San and the Khoi-Khoi had been
absorbed into the Coloured population, formed by early liaisons between the Afrikaners and Capoid peoples, or had been exterminated or reduced to slavery, or had retreated far into the Kalahari desert, which extended into northern Cape Province and Namibia. The trekboers, through their nomadic wanderings as Trekboers, had by the middle of the 18th century ranged as far east as the Fish river and as far north as the Orange, where they ran into the remnants of the San.

The Bantu-speakers were not as easily subdued as the Capoids. Peoples of negroid physical character have occupied much of South Africa south of the Limpopo since the early first millennia A.D. Cattle keeping was a mainstay of the negroid inhabitants of South Africa (unlike the hunter gatherers indigenous capoids like the San) since the later Iron Age. Archaeological evidence indicates that the present day Bantu-speakers share a considerable degree of cultural continuity with the original negroid inhabitants of South Africa, although some groups probably entered South Africa at a relatively late date. At the time of the first clashes between the Afrikaners and the Bantu-speakers in 1779 at the Fish river in the eastern cape, the Bantu-speakers populated the Transvaal, the OFS Natal, the Transkei and the eastern cape in the interior. It is important to note here that white rule has, since 1652, been based on the political subjugation of the non-white peoples of South Africa, and that the South
African economy has always been based, from 1652 to the present, on the exploitation of cheap black labour.

The movement from the British administration at the Cape in 1838 was, in the view of many Afrikaners, caused by liberal British missionaries who pressured the colonial government to adopt a more liberal policy towards the blacks. The Great Trek also brought the Afrikaners into conflict with the Black states of eastern South Africa. In wars against the Ndebele and the powerful Zulu states (the latter led by the great Zulu chieftains Chaka and Dingane), the Voortrekkers eventually prevailed and established two republics: the Orange Free State between the Orange and Vaal rivers, and the South African Republic of the Transvaal, north of the Vaal. A third state, Natalia, put itself under British protection in the 1840's, and became a British colony. The Zulus, though not completely subdued (they were completely subdued by the British, in 1879) were decimated by Boer firepower at the Battle of Blood River in 1838. In this historic battle, some 3,000 Zulus are said to have been killed. The establishment of the Boer republics followed. Blood River was later to become an important element of Afrikaner civil religion.

The rest of the 19th century saw, with some interruptions, the consolidation of the two Boer republics, and of British rule in the Cape and Natal. The Bantu were either displaced onto native reserves as European hegemony was secured, or they were retained as tenants on Afrikaner farms,
while others formed a migratory labour pool for the whites. They were not exterminated or completely culturally swamped as were the Capoid peoples, or the aborigines of North America and Australia. To the Boers in the 19th and early 20th centuries, they were a source of cheap agricultural labour. The British, however, were the immediate threat to Boer independence in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The latter half of the 19th century, in fact right up until the union in 1910, saw the Afrikaners struggle against British imperialism to maintain their hard-won independence. At the behest of the colonial office in London, "A new British governor agreed to the Sand River Convention of 1852, which recognized the independence of the Boers beyond the Vaal River, and to the Bloemfontein Convention of 1854, by which British sovereignty beyond the Orange River was abandoned. The Boer republics were left to develop along their own lines for the rest of the 19th century, interrupted by a three-year British occupation between 1877 and 1880, and annexation of Griqualand West where the Kimberley diamond field developed. Here, Calvinist dogma and Biblical interpretation flourished. At the time of the Sand River and Bloemfontein Conventions, some 15,000 Afrikaners resided in the Orange Free State (OFS) and another 22,000 in the Transvaal. The independent boer republics had a somewhat more illiberal tradition that the Cape Colony, where the majority of Afrikaners who remained behind in the Cape Colony gradually
accepted the British system of law, order and equality before the law.\textsuperscript{15} There was a non-racial franchise in the Cape, which received self-government in 1872, but sexual, age and property qualifications effectively disenfranchised most Blacks, as well as many Whites -- mainly women and poorer males. This contrasts with the practice of the South African Republic, whose 1858 Constitution forbade equality between whites and non-whites, in church and in state.\textsuperscript{16} Cape practice also contrasted with Natal, where detribalized Africans who were outside of tribal law had theoretical, but not practical equality.\textsuperscript{17}

The Boer republics at first developed in an insular manner. The temporary British occupation of the South African Republic between 1877 - 1880, and the influx of uitlanders (outlanders) into the SAR after gold was discovered there in 1886, put new strains upon the Boer republics, however. The invasion of financiers like Barney Barnato and Cecil Rhodes and thousands of miners bent on attaining a fortune through exploiting the riches around Johannesburg severely stressed Afrikaner society in the Transvaal. An industrial revolution started in the 1890's in the SAR, and soon eclipsed the few large-scale farms owned by the more prosperous Afrikaner burghers.\textsuperscript{18}

Nonetheless, the Afrikaners, led by President Paul Kruger, retained political power by filling empty state coffers with revenues derived from taxing the mines. The
Transvaal government also pursued a strategy of economic nationalism granting monopolies to companies supplying the mines and building its own railway link to the sea by way of neighboring Mozambique. Fearing the rise of the Transvaal state threatened its interests in Southern Africa the British government challenged its integrity. Kruger refused to grant uitlanders political rights demanded by Sir Alfred Milner, the British High Commissioner and sent his well armed commandoes into Natal anticipating a British ultimatum. Hostilities commenced in October 1899. The Boers gave a good account of themselves at first, blocking the initial British thrusts into their territories, but by the end of 1900, the major towns in the S.A.R. and the O.F.S. were occupied by British forces. Kruger fled to Europe. Two years of bloody guerilla warfare followed, with mobile Boer commandos that lived off the land striking Imperial forces at will. British scorched-earth policy hurt the agricultural production of the Boer republics, while over twenty thousand Afrikaner women and children died in British concentration camps. These conditions forced the Boers to surrender to the British in 1902 on the conditions that their language rights in court and school would be protected, that political autonomy would eventually come, and that there would be no native franchise.

Dominion status under a unitary rather than federal structure was granted the four colonies in 1910. The period between 1902 and 1905 saw Milner's attempt to crush the Dutch
or Afrikaans language by forbidding its use in the schools. This spurred Afrikaner nationalism across South Africa. In May 1904, the Afrikaner political organization *Het Volk* was established in Pretoria. A similar impulse to establish an organization that would air Boer grievances against the peace settlement led to the founding of *Orangia Unie* in the OFS in July 1905.21 Both parties were outlets of Afrikaner frustration, and both held political meetings for disgruntled Afrikaners to air their grievances.22 These groups united, together with *Die Afrikanerbond* in the Cape, and the *Voksvereniging* in Natal, to form the South African Party, or SAP, under General Louis Botha (first Prime Minister of the Union) in November 1911. The SAP was the first voice of political Afrikanerdom in the new Union.

Union in 1910 effectively meant Afrikaner domination of the exclusively white political system then established for the Cape, the OFS, the Transvaal and Natal. Within a unitary state the framers of the South African constitution, led by Smuts, opted for a unitary polity based on the British system, parliament governed the Union from Cape Town, although Pretoria was established as the administrative capital, where the ministers ran the various branches of the executive arm of the government. Free adult male universal suffrage confined to members of the white race over 21 (save in the Cape, where those few Coloureds and Africans able to meet both stringent educational and property qualifications were on the voters'
(rolls) meant Afrikaner domination of the parliament and the provincial councils, except in Natal, for those of Dutch descent were over half of the White electorate of the Union of South Africa. The constitution allowed rural constituencies which were heavily Afrikaner, to have more voters than urban ridings. Throughout the Union, Romano-Dutch civil law prevailed instead of English common law. This was balanced by English domination of industry and finance, and by the powerful, jingoistic Unionist party, led at Union by L.S. Jameson and after 1912 by Thomas Smartt, which favoured the closest possible Imperial bonds. Prime Minister Botha's Afrikaner-dominated SAP ministry soon split, however, on Barry Hertzog's challenge, from within the SAP, to Botha's educational and constitutional policies. Hertzog believed in a two-stream language policy, with separate schools for English and Afrikaners, and strict linguistic equality upheld between the two languages in the Union, inside and outside government. By this, Hertzog hoped to prevent the Anglicization of the Afrikaner.23 Hertzog's statement at DeWildt on Dec. 12, 1912, where he denounced Smartt's Unionists and asserted the primacy of South African interests over those of the empire, heralded his break with L. Botha, and the creation of the Nationalist Party, which was formed in January 1914.24

The outbreak of World War I immediately threw the Union into crisis. Hertzog's Nationalists in Parliament opposed the
war, but the primary threat to the pro-British, pro-war policy of the SAP government came from a rebellion of Boer War Afrikaner generals, Kemp, Beyers, Manie Maritz, DeWet and De La Rey. This revolt aimed at ousting the British and establishing an Afrikaner republic, totally free of Imperial control, throughout South Africa. P.M. Botha, and his chief deputy, Armed Forces Chief of Staff and Minister of Justice Jan Christiaan Smuts, future South African Prime Minister, former Cambridge scholar and one of the leading Afrikaner generals of the Boer War, crushed the rebellion by the end of 1914. De La Rey was assassinated, Beyers drowned, and most of the other rebel commanders were quickly rounded up.

South African troops, primarily Afrikaners, served in the campaigns to seize the German colonies in Africa, notably South West Africa [1915] (which became South African-controlled under a League of Nations mandate after the war), and Tanganyika [1915-1918]. South African troops also served in France, where they distinguished themselves at the battle of Delville Wood [1917].

In the 1915 election, the Nationalists increased their seat total to 26 by capturing many rural ridings; the SAP, however, continued to govern with Unionist support.25 The election of 1920 gave the Nationalists 44 seats to the SAP's 41.26 This fractured parliament led to the merger of the SAP and the Unionists under Smuts (Botha died in 1919 and was succeeded by his remarkable lieutenant, surely the greatest
South African statesman of this century), who won the next election of February 1921 handily, although the Nationalists gained more seats.27 The ensuing Smuts regime was perceived by the Nationalists to be the tool of English-dominated financial and industrial capitalism in South Africa, and to be the loyal henchmen of British imperialism, by both the agriculturally-based Afrikaner Nationalist Party and the industrial, largely English Labour party, though the latter stood firmly in favour of the British connection. The Smuts government's brutal suppression of the miner's strike in 1922 was one factor that may have caused it to lose a great deal of popular support. The fact that the really important swings were towards the Nationalists in country districts in the 1924 election and that the Labour party received a smaller share of the vote, even with Nationalist support, than in the 1921 election indicates that Afrikaners were ready to support the most vociferous champions of their ethnic interests, and that this was the primary factor in their abandoning the SAP in 1924.28 Most Afrikaners turned against the SAP, and in the election of 1924, the Nationalist-Labour alliance won a majority.29

The Nationalist-Labour coalition increased the already significant role of the state in the economy and in the society as a whole. The South African state had traditionally had a greater role in managing the economy than most of the other advanced capitalist states due to a number of factors.
D. Yudelman argues that the early maturation of the state-capital relationship in South Africa was due to the concentration and homogeneity of capital resulting largely from the peculiar nature of the mining industry, the concentration of political power in the hands of a minority group, the Afrikaners, who where relatively impermeable to direct infiltration by capital, and the racial division of the working class, itself composed largely of migrants. This combination of circumstances meant that neither state nor capital could dominate the other, nor that the white or black working class nor the black peasants could present an effective challenge to the state-capital axis that dominated South Africa.

The coalition government that came to power in 1924 built upon the relatively high state involvement in the South African economy. It made an effort to implement the Nationalist Party's 'civilized' (white) labour policy, but did not do too much to actively aid organized labour otherwise. It continued and accentuated the efforts of earlier South African party governments which had conducted their own policy of sheltered employment for white labour on state projects such as irrigation works and railway lines, many of which were designed solely to employ white labour.

The period after 1924 saw the successful co-optation of the white working class while limiting their militancy and rewards. Real white wages actually declined in the interwar
years after 1924. This combined with the continued and increased repression of non-whites (the Hertzog United Party government enacted a bill in 1936, first proposed by the original Nationalist Party, to remove Black voters from the common roll the same year that the government pegged black landownership), highlights the continued, in fact accentuated development of state capitalism in South Africa under the Nationalist party dominated coalition.

The Nationalist-Labour coalition remained in office until 1933, when the Nationalists went into coalition with the SAP, and a year later fused with them as the SAP had with the Unionists in 1921. The first Hertzog government moved on a number of fronts. Maritz was released, Afrikaans gained official status, and the Union flag gained equal status with the Union Jack. Hertzog also attended the Imperial Prime Minister's Conference in 1926, which resulted in greater independence for the Dominions and the Irish Free State within the framework of the Empire. Afterwards, Hertzog finally seemed to give up the idea of secession from the Empire, believing he had attained, with Mackenzie King and the other Dominion heads, effective, full independence.

The coalition was returned over the SAP at the 1929 general election. The economic collapse of 1929, and the British decision to go off the gold standard in 1931, coupled with the subsequent Nationalist refusal to do the same (until 1933, when they reversed their position) because Hertzog
believed that full independence had been "effectively" attained by his administration, left South Africa in desperate economic straits. This led the Nationalists to seek a coalition, and then complete fusion, with the SAP, in order to deal with the severity of the economic crisis. Extreme Republicans, led by Hertzog's chief lieutenant, Daniel Malan, found fusion unpalatable, and 19 of them hived off to form the "Purified Nationalist Party" (Gesuirde Nasionale Partij/GNP). Colonel Stallard and other jingoistic die-hards broke with Smuts to form the Dominion Party, which stood for the closest links with the Empire. Hertzog and Smuts (the latter served as Hertzog's Minister of Justice) governed South Africa with a huge parliamentary majority, reaffirmed in the 1938 general election (although the Nationalists increased their strength to 27 members), until the United Party majority broke apart over the issue of war in 1939.

The Nationalist Party grew with the Union of South Africa. From its birth in Jan. 1914, it proved itself to be a remarkably adaptable, and even opportunistic, political organization. It is important to highlight the "unformed" character of early Nationalist ideology, tracing the evolution of the Nationalist Party from a less dogmatic form of nationalism at Union in 1910 to the dogmatic quasi-fascist brand of nationalism that the HNP had adopted by the late 1930's.
The Nationalists did not initially advocate a republic free of the Empire, at least not openly, but they did start as a national party of the Afrikaners, ready to advance the Afrikaner in all areas. The original Dominion status of the Union in 1910, with the high degree of English influence within, and Imperial control from without, was unsatisfactory to many Boers, among them Barry Hertzog. Hertzog, one of the senior members of Louis Botha's government, formed a "ginger group" in the SAP caucus of 7 members, who thought the Botha ministry too pro-imperialist, and not forceful enough in pushing Afrikaner rights forward in both state and society. In foreign affairs, Hertzog favoured absolute independence for South Africa within the Commonwealth.\(^{38}\) He wanted South Africa to be a fully sovereign state within the Commonwealth, and he also wished to preserve Afrikaner culture. Hertzog was a constitutionalist, unlike some Afrikaner Nationalist extremists.\(^{39}\) Hertzog's discontent with the SAP grew. Botha resigned in 1912 to form another cabinet without Hertzog, and the Union congress of the SAP confirmed Botha's leadership.\(^{40}\) Many members of SAP held a special congress in Bloemfontein in January 1913, where they formed the Nationalist Party.

Hertzog's position, and hence that of the Nationalist Party, was a difficult one during the rebellion of 1914, following the outset of World War I. Hertzog, and the leading nationalists such as Steyn, sought to distance themselves from the illegality of the rebellion and the pro-war foreign policy
of the government, without openly backing the rebels. The immediate post-war era helped the Nationalists further develop their political thinking, while they took political advantage of the new social climate. The end of the monarchical era in much of Europe, Wilsonian idealism, the shattering of old ideals in World War I and the Bolshevik revolution created conditions where socialism and anti-imperialism found fertile ground in much of the world, including South Africa. It was under these conditions that Hertzog led a non-governmental delegation of Afrikaners to argue for self-determination for South Africa at the Versailles peace conference in 1919. The Nationalist leaders even made pro-Bolshevist statements in the immediate post-war years, with their anti-imperialist stance. When the White Rand miners went to strike against the Chamber of Mines in 1922, the Nationalists backed the strike in collaboration with the Labour Party. The Smuts government brutally suppressed the strike, killing many miners and hanging some strike leaders. Public revulsion against the SAP government swept them from power in the 1924 general election, in which the Nationalists won 63 seats and Labour 18 to the SAP's 53.

The coalition government moved to segregate the Native franchise in the Cape and peg Native land ownership throughout the Union. Whether or not the coalition government actually enhanced the interests of the white underclass is open to question. Dan O'Meara argues that the thrust of the
legislative program of the coalition government served to enhance NP standing amongst the white working class.\(^4^4\)

David Yudelman, on the other hand, argues that the coalition continued a State agenda that had been advanced by the SAP. Yudelman states that both the SAP and the coalition government extended the executive's control over key industries in South Africa while undercutting the power of the judiciary and legislature.\(^4^5\) He argues that while the past government paid more attention to the concerns of white labour, particularly outside the mining industry, it in the main continued the SAP policy of strengthening the state's control over white labour and solidifying its alliance with South Africa capital.\(^4^6\)

The economic crisis of 1929 threw the NP into disarray. The flight of Blacks and poor Whites into the cities increased, as many small holdings went bankrupt. Britain's decision to go off the gold standard in 1931 caused a crisis within the NP government (reelected in 1929 with increased Nationalist but decreased Labour representation, though Hertzog maintained the coalition). It is also interesting to note the increased NP majority was the result of an effective "Black Peril" campaign, based on an ill-timed remark by Smuts to the effect the Union government should work for a "United States of Africa", a remark interpreted by the NP as possibly leading to a "Kaffir" State. Tielman Roos, Minister of Justice in the first Hertzog government, broke with Hertzog
when the latter, with his finance minister, Havenga, refused to go off the gold standard with Britain in 1931. South Africa was badly hit by the depression. Three products which played an essential role in economic life -- gold, diamonds and wool -- were particularly affected by the fall in prices that had started in 1929. This Nationalistic posturing made no sense to Roos in a time of economic catastrophe. Roos pointed out that the too-highly valued currency was making South Africa's balance of trade position impossible, and threatened to campaign in the next election on a platform of seeking a government of national unity, to restore sensible economic policies to tackle the depression.

Hertzog met this threat by entering into a government of national unity with Smuts' SAP. In 1933, in the election in May, 136 seats out of 150 went to the Hertzog-Smuts coalition. South Africa went back on the gold standard, and Hertzog and Smuts both decided to fuse their two parties. Hertzog believed that South Africa's independence had been fully secured by the Statute of Westminster (1931), and that membership in the Commonwealth was a formality that no longer impinged on South African independence. Both he and Smuts believed that the time had come to forge a common, white South African nation, though Hertzog wanted a "twin stream approach" which secured the linguistic, educational and political rights of Afrikanerdom. On 5 December 1934, the followers of Smuts and Hertzog met in Bloemfontein, and formed the United South
African National Party, better known as the United Party. For the Nationalist diehards, this was too much, and Dr. Daniel Malan and his 18 followers in Parliament, including J.G. Strijdom and Eric Louw continued to sit as Nationalists, in opposition to the United Party government.

The Nationalist extremists, at this point, were aiming for ethnic unity and, through that, ethnic supremacy, in an independent Afrikaans-dominated South Africa.Ironically, the bulk of the Nationalist parliamentarians who remained in opposition were from the supposedly more liberal Cape Nationalists. Dan O'Meara argues that most of the rurally based Cape Nationalists remained in opposition because they supported strong State measures to support their export-based markets. They wanted State support for the creation of new extra-imperial markets, something that might have been threatened by the SAP component of the new coalition government, with their economic anti-interventionism and their pro-British orientation.

Now both prior to and after fusion, the NP party organization was characterized by the virtual total provincial autonomy of each of its four branches. The loyalty of the traditionally more reactionary OFS and Transvaal branches could be explained, in the case of the former, by the fact that Hertzog had been for a long time the virtual dictator of the OFS provincial organization. His stature and power there were virtually unquestioned. In the Transvaal J.G. Strydom
was the only NP left in opposition. The loyalty of the Transvaal Nationalist MP's to the coalition could be explained because their popular base, the poorer farmers of the Transvaal, remained loyal to Hertzog. They opted for a stable government pursuing "rational" economic policies. In the 1938 general election, the Nationalists gained 8 seats for a total of 27, but the UP still won a commanding 111 seats.

It was at this stage that the influence of fascist and Nazi ideology began to make itself felt in South African politics, both within the NP and within the UP, among supporters of Hertzog such as Kemp, Pirow and Grobler (ministers in the UP government). The growing strength and aggressiveness of Nazi Germany already found an echo in the NP and amongst some of Hertzog's followers. Anti-semitism began to emerge in the utterances of NP leaders in the late 1930's. At a rally to protest Jewish immigration into South Africa in July 1938, future Nationalist cabinet minister T.E. Donges stated that "The Jew is an insoluble element in every national life."52 Dr. Hendrik Voerwoerd, the future Prime Minister of South Africa, also spoke at the rally. It is interesting to note here that he was not an Afrikaner, for he was born in Holland. His later rise to prominence indicates his remarkable leadership abilities and his capacity to integrate himself into Afrikaner society, for leadership was usually reserved for men with some Voortrekker ancestry.53 As editor of the NP newspaper, Die Transvaler, he "proposed a quota
system for Jews in all occupations and pressed that the Jews should be refused further trading licenses until every section of the population had its proper share.\textsuperscript{54} Dr. Malan uttered similar comments during this period, even openly appealing for support in the 1938 elections from the Nazi Greyshirt movement (one of the number of Nazi organizations that began to sprout up at this time), "and afterwards acknowledged the help that his party had received from the Nazi Greyshirt movement under Weichardt".\textsuperscript{55}

The Hertzog government was toppled in September 1939 because the Prime Minister and his supporters in cabinet and caucus opposed South African participation in World War II, a view which a majority of the house did not share. The parliamentary majority, 80 to 67, including the majority of the UP caucus, supported Justice Minister Smuts in leading South Africa into the war on the side of Great Britain. Smuts saw Germany as a dangerous expansionist power.\textsuperscript{56} He also saw Naziism as an assault upon the fundamentals of Western civilization.\textsuperscript{57}

Hertzog resigned as Prime Minister and he and his supporters in the UP ministry and caucus crossed the floor and joined with the Nationalists in denouncing both the government and the war.\textsuperscript{58} This left Smuts and his colleagues in sole control of the government ensuring South African participation in the anti-Nazi Allied coalition, for the duration of the
war. Smuts found the Union totally unprepared, even for a defensive war. Smuts blamed much of this lack of preparation on former Defence Minister Oswald Pirow, one of Hertzog's most ardent supporters, who was later to lead an anti-war opposition group called the New Order.

During the course of the war, Smuts, in line with Imperial and Allied war strategy, concentrated South Africa's war effort in Africa. South African troops took part in the campaign against Italian East Africa in 1940-41, and served with British and other Commonwealth troops in the campaigns in Libya and Egypt in North Africa from 1941 to 1943. In this latter theatre of war, South Africa paid a heavy price, when on June 21, 1942, Tobruk in Libya fell, and with it South Africa lost the best part of a first-rate division of thirteen thousand men. South African troops also participated in the Italian campaign. All told, over 3,000 South Africans lost their lives in World War II. In all of these campaigns, Smuts had to rely on volunteers only. They would be required to sign a special attestation to that purpose. To distinguish them from other soldiers, they had to wear a special red tab on the shoulder strap. This had its advantages, but at the same time, it placed those men who refused to take the oath in the unenviable position of being marked out as against the war as such.

The country as a whole was split on the war issue, and hence upon support of the government. The English-speaking Whites almost unanimously supported the government and its
pro-British, pro-Allied, pro-war policy. Afrikanerdom was split on the issue, with a majority opposed to the war, but with a substantial minority behind Jan Smuts. In July 1943, with an Allied victory becoming more likely, the South African government held an election. The Nationalists increased the ratio of voters voting for them from the 1939 election. The UP won 85 seats, Labour 9 and the Dominionites 7. The Nationalists won 43 seats. The percentage of Afrikaners voting for the government, however, dropped from forty to thirty-two.62

Nationalist support amongst Afrikaners increased for a variety of reasons. Many Afrikaner farmers doubtless suffered from the higher wages they had to pay their help, caused by the rural exodus of non-White farm labour to the war-generated prosperity of the cities. The increased influence of Jan Hofmeyr, the béte-noire of Afrikaner segregationism, probably also accounted for a hardening of support for the NP in the mid- and later war years. Hofmeyr was, from his fight against his own government's Representation of Natives Act in 1936, which limited Native Representation in Parliament, until his death in 1948, the leading liberal politician in South Africa.63 He was a brilliant child prodigy who was devoted to his mother, and a devout Christian who, early on, recognized the need for a slow, but gradual alleviation of the condition of the Blacks in South Africa. He was Smuts' Minister of Finance during World War II, and as second man in the state
during the war, he had Smuts' full confidence (although he did not have the confidence of many of the conservative members of his own party, or Stallard's Dominionites). He ran the economy while Smuts ran the war, and was widely tipped as Smuts' successor. This prospect was viewed with more than a little apprehension by the Nationalists, although they used it to great effect in the 1948 election. Just before the 1943 elections, the Afrikaner NP daily, "Die Burger, said that Hofmeyr was a liberalist without following in his party." The spectre of some moves toward racial integration, personified by Hofmeyr, frightened even many of Smuts' supporters. It was, however, the issue of the war which polarized the country, and highlighted the political and ideological opposition of the NP and other anti-war groups to the Smuts government during the war years.

The opposition groups in South Africa from September 1939 on were one antipode of a South Africa political system polarized by the war issue. Until the closing years of the war, when Allied victory seemed assured and domestic issues came to the forefront of South African political debate, the war issue was almost the sole focus of political debate in South Africa.

In the September 4 debate, Hertzog had argued that to enter the war as a belligerent on Great Britain's side would make a mockery of South African claims to independence. In
effect, it would be a repudiation of his work as Prime Minister, which was to secure more power for South Africa until she had attained full sovereignty within the Commonwealth. He also claimed that Germany had just grievances against the Treaty of Versailles, and that its attempts to correct these grievances such as remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936, the annexation of Austria in 1938, the Sudetenland, the occupation of Czechoslovakia in March of 1939 and finally the military invasion of Poland, were no warrant to get involved in a war against Germany that was no concern of South Africa's. These views coincided with those of the Nationalists, but were not enough to bring about any lasting unity between the Malanites and Hertzogites. After several abortive attempts to reach agreement on a platform of common principles upon which both groups would unite, Hertzog and Malan united their two caucuses in January 1940, under the title Herenigde Nasionale Volkspartij (HNP). The "unity" did not last long. The Malanites wanted to work towards achieving a republic with or without the consent of the English, with no constitutional links whatever with the United Kingdom. Hertzog felt that Afrikaner-English unity was a prerequisite for the establishment of a republic. At the Orange Free State congress of the Nationalist Party, which opened on Nov. 5, 1940, these divisions came to a head when the Federal Council (Federale Raad) of the HNP passed a programme prejudicial to the interests of English-speaking
South Africans. "In a dramatic speech he [Hertzog] pointed out the programme of the Federale Raad did not guarantee full equality for the English-speaking section of the population, a principle to which he was pledged to adhere." Hertzog resigned as leader of the HNP and with his closest collaborator, Havenga, also gave up his seat in Parliament, quitting public life altogether.

The splintering of the opposition which occurred after this point highlights the different attitudes prevalent amongst Nationalist Afrikanerdom towards the war, and towards Naziism. Many volksorganisies, such as the Broederbond, the Nationalist Party, the Reddingsdaadbond and others, were connected and were led under the auspices of the Broederbond. Others, while Broederbond-inspired organizations, later rose to challenge the Broederbond-designated champion in the party political field, the Nationalist Party. This challenge can be described as a civil war within the net of Afrikaner Nationalism. The Afrikaner Party and the New Order were also in opposition to the Broederbond policy of support for the Nationalist Party, and were also outside the net. Some of those who had followed Hertzog into opposition left the Nationalists and under General Conroy, one of Hertzog's ministers, formed the Afrikaner Party. The Afrikaner Party never really amounted to very much. Ten of Hertzog's followers in Parliament joined it, but in the country few HNP supporters joined them. The Afrikaner Party tried to put
forward a moderate "Nationalist Afrikaner" position on most issues. General Conroy stated in Parliament that he thought it was

a crime against the people to tell them that the freedom which we enjoy, and which was once so highly praised by these same people, means nothing under the present form of government. We are as free as any people in the world. We were dragged into this war not because we are not free, but because the only constitutional authority which could speak for the people took a free decision. It was not England that declared this war for us. We did it ourselves through our free Parliament.\(^1\)

In saying this, the AP seemed to be distancing itself from some of the more extreme anti-war Afrikaners, who were denouncing the parliamentary system itself, praising the fascist states of Europe as possible models. On the issue of war itself, the AP put forward a genuinely neutralist position.\(^2\) This view did not have much support in the bitterly divided country, though. The AP polled only about 14,000 votes in the general election of 1943, and lost all its seats in Parliament.

Those Hertzogites (including 17 within the caucus of the HNP) who did not join the AP, did not redefect back to Smuts (there were a few), or did not wholeheartedly accept Malan's leadership in the HNP, found their political home in the New Order faction of the HNP under the leadership of Hertzog's defence minister, Oswald Pirow. Pirow had done little to build up South Africa's defenses during the late 1930's, as
the world drifted towards war. Perhaps this is not so surprising in the light of Pirow's political outlook. As minister of defence, Pirow had travelled throughout Europe on government business during the late 1930's, including Germany. He was favorably impressed by what he saw there, and later expressed his attraction for the national socialism of Salazar, who was the fascist dictator of Portugal. Pirow, for reasons of either ideology or political jealousy, could not get along with Malan, who had a firm grip on the extra-parliamentary political machinery of the HNP. In August 1941, Die Transvaler, the Nationalist daily newspaper in the Transvaal, attacked Pirow for his Naziism. The New Order separated themselves from the Parliamentary caucus of the NP without leaving the party. They backed the Ossewa Brandwag (OB) in the struggle with the NP, and put up no candidates in the July 1943 elections, which they scorned as decadent parliamentarianism. Thereafter, they rapidly faded as a rival to Malan's Nationalists.

The Ossewa Brandwag (Ox Wagon Sentinel), formed as an Afrikaner cultural organization just after the 1938 centenary celebrations of the Great Trek and covenant at Blood River, was open in its Nazi sympathies. It was probably the most potent republican rival to the NP during the war years, claiming a membership of 200,000 by November 1940. It was attacked by the government during the war as a pro-Nazi terrorist organization. J.J. van Rensburg, second
commandant-general of the OB, openly disavowed democracy. The OB put up no candidates in the 1943 elections.

OB member Reverend J.D. Vorster (brother of the future Prime Minister Johannes Vorster, then a General in the OB) claimed that the OB was a selective organization, carefully choosing the country's future ruling elite. In a reproduction of the OB 1940 draft of a constitution for a future South Africa, citizenship was to be restricted, Afrikaans was to be the official language, and the president was to have unlimited powers. In a speech in 1942, Johannes Vorster stated that "We stand for Christian Nationalism which is an ally of National Socialism ... You can call this anti-democratic principle dictatorship if you wish. In Italy it is called fascism, in Germany German National Socialism, and in South Africa Christian Nationalism."

The Nationalist Party, particularly between the years 1939 and 1943, was engaged in a dual campaign of both opposing the government's war policy and fighting other Republican groups for political supremacy over Nationalist Afrikanerdom. The Nationalist Party, the HNP after 1940, remained firmly in the hands of Dr. Malan and his followers because they retained their grip on the party apparatus and the Nationalist press, and because they pursued a policy of unremitting opposition to the war, but following Gen. Hertzog's example in World War I, from a totally constitutional position.
The Malanites had strong roots in and connections with most facets of Nationalist Republican-minded Afrikanerdom throughout WORLD WAR II. These links served them in good stead to emerge by 1943 as the sole or primary representative of Nationalist Afrikanerdom. Through groups such as the Afrikaner Broederbond (AB), a group composed of elite NP politicians, Nationalist academics, Dutch Reformed Church clergymen, and other Afrikaner Nationalist notables dedicated to achieving Afrikaner supremacy in South Africa, the NP had a powerful base in the Boer community. Other such volk groups with strong links to the NP were the three Dutch Reformed Churches, Nationalist Trade Unions such as the Spoorbond (the Railway workers), the Afrikanse-nasionale Studentebond (ANSB), and the Reddingsdaadbond (Rescue Action Society), an AB group to promote the development of Afrikaner private capital and business.

The Hertzogites were seen by the AB, NP, and most of their affiliated organizations, including the leadership of the three Dutch Reformed Churches, still a dominant force amongst the volk, as renegades and traitors to the cause of Afrikanerdom since fusion in 1934. Hertzog denounced the AB in 1935 in a speech to Parliament as a divisive force in the country. Hertzog, himself a member of the AB since its founding in 1918, correctly identified the Afrikaner supremacist aims of the Bond. In opposing it and breaking with it, he cut himself and followers off from organized
Afrikanerdom, for the Bond's influence was wide, and virtually all of the Malanite MP's in all of the parliaments elected from 1933 were members, as well as most prominent Afrikaners in whatever field. This greatly hampered the activities of both the moderate Afrikaners in the AP, under Havenga and Conroy (Hertzog died, in retirement, in November 1942) and the more Nazi-inclined New Order under Pirow. Both had cut their links with much of the Afrikaner community by the early 1940's.

The Nationalist position on the war was non-interventionist; but their attitude towards National Socialism itself was ambivalent, a reflection of the multitude of conflicting pressures they had to face during the war. It is a fact that the Nationalist Party, and this means the Malanites, were much more critical of Western democracy before 1943 and that their leaders made more favorable comments about Naziism and fascism in general before this date. In particular, the Nationalists had to worry about the popular and well-organized Ossewa Brandwag eroding their support amongst Afrikanerdom. Malan knew it and therefore for a time curried favour with the OB. Later, however, Malan proved his strength and tenacity of purpose when he smashed van Rensburg's Ossewa Brandwag movement on the wheel.84 At first, Malan tried to coopt the OB, allowing it supremacy on the cultural front while the NP carried the political fight through.85 Clearly, Malan did not see the relationship
between the NP and AB as necessarily adversarial. When the final break came, in mid-1941, it is clear that pragmatic considerations as much as any dictated subsequent denunciations of "National Socialism" by Nationalist leaders such as Voerwoerd and Strijdom.

The extremist Afrikaner volksorganisies, such as the OB, the Greyshirts and the New Order, put pressure upon the Nationalists to, in effect, limit their freedom of action. By calling for the establishment of an authoritarian republic free from the Empire, in many ways modeled after the various fascist states of Europe, the effect of groups like the OB was to accentuate political polarization that had split South Africa on the issue of the war since September 1939.

The Nationalist Party was not necessarily opposed to the adoption of a fascist or Nazi-style constitution for South Africa. The draft constitution, approved by a Broederbond-instigated Provisional Committee of National Unity which included representatives of the RDB, OB and the three Dutch Reformed Churches, was announced by a declaration of the committee in mid-1941, and accepted by the Nationalist Party at its Union Congress on June 3, 1941. H. Voerwoerd, editor of Die Transvaler, claimed that the event showed the desire of Afrikanerdom to break with "British-Jewish democracy." The declaration indicated the principles upon which the draft constitution was based:
(1) A Christian-National republican state, based on the word of God, along the clear lines of our people's history, adapted to modern conditions ... not cast in the mould of a foreign model; ... (3) an education system based on Christian Nationalism, with the preservation of mother tongue education guaranteed; (4) the entrenchment of the Afrikaner 'as the original settler' ... and his protection against domination by those who do not owe full allegiance to this country; (5) the strongest emphasis upon an effective disciplining of the people.

The draft constitution itself espouses a form of "Führerprinzip". Malan opposed the publication of this document by the OB, which moved to publish the draft constitution after it was adopted by the NP, as clear violation of the Cradock agreement of October 1940, delimiting the NP to the political and the OB to the cultural sphere.

Malan wanted to exclusively dominate anti-war Afrikanerdom in the political field. The OB and the other volksorganisies rapidly faded after the Nationalist Party's strong showing in the 1943 election, where it won 36 percent of the vote and gained a total of 43 parliamentary seats (leaving it the sole political force represented in Parliament opposed to the Smuts government and the war). Malan had left his parliamentary option open. While Malan certainly toyed with the idea of coming to power as a result of a Nazi victory over Britain and her allies in World War II, he did not tie the fate of the NP to it. The political sympathies of the OB, Weichardt's Nazi Greyshirts, the New Order and other groups was absolutely clear; they desired a Nazi victory and the
establishment of an authoritarian, possibly Nazi regime in South Africa. The Nationalist party played a cagier game. Like Hertzog during World War I, they opposed the war but did so constitutionally. They flirted with fascism and Naziism, but they drifted away from these ideologies as the tide of the war turned in favour of the Allies, and as they felt their preeminent position as the spokesman for political Republican Afrikanerdom no longer threatened by openly fascist authoritarian groups such as the OB or the New Order.

If the early part of the war highlights the openness of the NP to Nazi and fascist influence, the latter part of the war shows the influence of the pragmatic, purely nationalist strain in the party. After 1943, the strains inside South Africa brought about by the war began to ease. Stalingrad, Tunisia, the Allied invasion of Italy in July 1943, confirmed in the eyes of nearly two-thirds of the South African electorate, the inevitability of an Allied victory, and hence the wisdom of Smuts' foreign and war policy. There came a slackening of effort along with the reduced internal tensions. 89

The facade of unity, which held together the socialist Labour Party, the United Party of Smuts, and the racially reactionary but solidly jingoistic Natal-based Dominion Party of Col. Stallard, began to crack. The latter party represented English White Natal, long leery of the Indian community there. 90 The general prosperity of the war helped
Indian business interests as well as stimulating the flow of Black labour to the plentiful jobs in the cities. To satisfy the demands of the Dominion Party, the Government in 1943 reluctantly sponsored the Pegging Act, by which Indian encroachment in European residential and business areas in Durban was stopped for two years. The Dominion Party was on a collision course with the blatant liberalism of Hofmeyr and the implicit liberalism of Smuts, and their anxiety on the colour question was part of a growing mood of anxiety amongst Whites in general in South Africa over the status of non-Whites in the Union.

The Nationalists were quick to see where their future lay. In all respects, Dr. Malan and his Party began to act as a normal Opposition acceptable to the electorate as a possible alternate government, but never for a moment departing from the Party's declared Republican ideal and exploiting the Indian and Communist issues, not without visible success. The approaching victory of 1945, which seemed to many in the world, and to many liberal supporters of Smuts and Hofmeyr in South Africa, as the herald of a new age -- of the "Four Freedoms" and a worldwide "New Deal" -- created a climate in South Africa that frightened many conservative Afrikaners. The Nationalists began to bandy about the idea of apartheid, or separation of the races, a concept which fell upon many willing ears in South Africa, who were more than a little skeptical of the "Brave New World" in store for them in what
was already seen as the more liberal domestic and international climate that was coming after the war.

At a byelection in the Transvaal rural constituency of Wakkestroom (in 1947), which had been held by a United Party minister, the Government candidate was badly beaten. The Government press belittled the result, but it was an ominous sign of what the National party was capable of, now that it was rid of its Ossewa-Brandwag and New Order incubus.
CHAPTER III

The concept of ideology usually implies something more rigid and dogmatic, less questioning, more "closed" than "open", than critical philosophy, and certainly science. An ideology quite often entails a specific programme, a commitment to stated principles or values that borders on religious commitment. This position of "science against ideology" is common to Western positivist thought (so-called "value-free" Anglo-American analytic philosophy). J. Larrain quotes Leszek Kolakowski in defining the broad positivist spectrum as "a collection of prohibitions concerning human knowledge, intended to confine the name 'knowledge' or 'science' to the results of those operations that are observable in the evolution of the modern sciences of nature." Larrain further outlines the position by arguing that it claims that all beyond the factual world is ideological. Science is distinguished by empiricism, and commonly accepted procedures to ensure accurate gathering of evidence. These two criteria ensure verifiability. Karl Popper, a critic of positivism from within the analytic tradition, substitutes falsifiability for verifiability. A theory must be falsifiable to be considered scientific. Larrain states that "post-modern" philosophers such as Kuhn and Feyerabend think it not possible to distinguish the "scientific" component of discarded past observations from error or myth.
The Marxists take a different tack, that has a parallel path. Marx starts out with some of the same assumptions that the Logical Positivists did. Ideology is superstructural phenomenon resting on a material class base, in fact often obscuring that base and its actual relation to it. Neo-Marxist scholars, such as Lukacs, Adorno, Marcuse and Horkheimer duplicate the extension of the "irrational aspect" of ideology into the domain of science itself. Lukacs points out the "relative irrationality of the whole process", speaking of the entire bourgeois process of rationalization. With Adorno and Horkheimer, the irrationality becomes of paramount importance and is not related to any particular class thinking; scientific rationality appears as an alienating ideology disconnected from class analysis. Marcuse is the final stage in this demotion of science. For him the very concept of technical reason is perhaps ideological. Not only the application of technology but technology itself is domination of nature and men—methodical, scientific, calculated, calculating control.

Ideology as a belief system can be understood as involving some notion of praxis. Praxis is a Marxist notion that holds that theory, political ideology, is conditioned, as both theory and implementation, by radical necessity. Concrete material needs bring about a theory, and its modification by practice. Praxis also involves the idea that theory in itself is inoperable. Praxis is the unity of
theory and practice, or ideology made manifest in action. Political ideology is laid bare, brought to fruition, in political practice. In this view, fascist ideology, or at least its essential characteristics, can be fully explained by examining its philosophy as realized and determined, in government and society. Fascist ideology can be seen as the rationalization of that class, or classes in society, that would benefit most from the establishment of a controlled capitalism under the aegis of a right-wing, authoritarian regime. The urban petit bourgeoisie provides the core of the social base of fascism, and hence its interests are rationalized in fascist and Nazi ideology. In the ensuing discussion of fascism and fascist ideology, the role of this social class will be demonstrated as a key component in the rationalization of interests which take the form of fascist and Nazi ideology.

A satisfactory description of fascism, and fascist ideology, is a difficult problem for the political scientist. Even the Communist states of the 20th century have been described as practicing what is essentially "Red Fascism". Communism, however, emerges in this century as a distinct governmental, social and economic system, with similarities to fascism no doubt, but definitely apart from it. One possible definition of fascism is simply any form of non-Communist authoritarianism. This seems an absurdly inclusive definition
of fascism because, being the socio-governmental system of most countries throughout recorded history, it tell us very little about what type of government a society has, other than being non-democratic and non-Communist.

Right-wing, in a fascist context, means a certain form of socio-economic order which goes hand in glove with political authoritarianism. Most currents of fascism seem to be able to live with, or settle down with, a wide disparity of wealth between classes in a society based on private ownership of the means of production. The Nazis and the Italian fascists both left private ownership of property and wealth very much intact after they came to power. Whatever socialist tendencies existed within fascist movements (the social reformism of José Antonio Primo de Rivera, pre-1936 leader of the Spanish Falange, or Ernst Röhm's and Gregor Strasser's National Socialism) are always sublimated in an acceptance of the predominance in society of private property. S.J. Woolf claims that fascism was the European bourgeoisie's reaction to the economic crisis after 1918, their political fear of a new, powerful Communist movement that could feed off the economic dislocation caused by the war. It is this violent, defensive reaction on the part of the bourgeoisie that Woolf argues is the essence of dynamic, what I call "classic", fascism.
Fascism could be narrowed down to any form of right-wing authoritarianism. This again is not really less inclusive a definition. It is too inclusive because most regimes in history have been "right-wing" authoritarian regimes. So, while right-wing authoritarianism (or advocacy thereof) is a necessary precondition of fascism, it is not sufficient, and the definition must be refined.

Fascism is a reaction to certain aspects of modernity. It seems to involve a reaction by threatened groups or classes to some of the pressures of modern society. These pressures include those caused by industrialization and urbanization, with their concomitant shaking-up of traditional society and its established beliefs and economic organization. Of course, socialism too is a reaction to modernization (in Third-World countries, at last, a reaction to modern ideas and the style of life these ideas produce), but with the exception of the Luddites or, nowadays, the extreme Greens, it seems to involve the acceptance of industrial society, with its consequences, such as secularization. Socialism also accepts notion of socio-economic equality, feminism and internationalism, all ideas which have come into their own since the Enlightenment. Fascism is unique in that it reacts against and adapts itself to modern society, setting it apart from both socialism and feudalism.
S.J. Woolf highlights this peculiar aspect of dynamic fascism, that it uses the democratic process created by modern liberal society to protect its mass base, and its claim to privilege and property. He buttresses this point by stating that the bourgeoisie, particularly in the highly-industrialized states, had absorbed a sinking aristocracy or landed class, while acting as a magnet to the petit-bourgeoisie, who aspired to bourgeois status and values. The depression following World War I, and the Great Depression, energized these petit bourgeois elements to defend their position against further "proletarianization"; and the fascist movement born out of this acted as a magnet to a declining aristocracy, anxious to defend its threatened status. Fascism thus emerged as a coalition of threatened bourgeois and aristocratic interests, using the tools of the modern democratic electoral process to buttress their privileged positions.104

Fascists like to claim that their movements represent "the nation" or the group, but in this case their ideology differs to an extent from their practice. This thesis has support from a number of sources. Palmiro Togliatti, a leader of the Italian Communist Party, wrote in 1928 that fascism draws its initial support from the petit bourgeoisie in the town and in the rural areas.105 Seymour Lipset also supported this view, although he broadened the claim to state that
fascism was a movement of all of the propertied middle class.106

This last contention, although valid, must be qualified. Big business or the aristocracy hardly shy away from supporting fascism. Hjalmar Schacht and Fritz Thyssen owe their fame to the fact that they acted as the links between German big business and the Nazionale Socialitsische Deutsche Arbeites Partei, when it was clear that party was the strongest anti-Marxist popular force in the country. The German nobility, landed aristocracy and army, came onside when it was clear that Hitler had no socialist intentions.

Party membership in the NSDAP during the 1920's and the early 1930's was national in the sense that it was drawn from virtually all sections of the population, yet its leadership cadre was overwhelmingly lower- and middle-class, reflecting its core support base.107 This tendency of fascism to spread, in terms of both party membership and general popular support, from the lower middle or middle class, to aristocrats or peasants, was also noticeable in Eastern Europe during the inter-war period.108 Students, mainly of middle-class origin, civil servants, small business owners, priests, seminarians, white-collar employees, almost always seem to be the core of support for movements such as the Croatian Ustasi, the Hungarian Arrow Cross, the Slovak Hlinka Guard, and the Rumanian Iron Guard.109 The fusion with the upper class and the peasants came later, although in the case of the Hlinka
Guard or the Iron Guard, some peasant support was more forthcoming at an earlier stage. Fascism in Eastern Europe, though, began as an urban phenomenon, rooted in the urban middle class in the cities and towns, as in the rest of Europe. The pure nature of classic fascism is manifest here, even in movements which should be considered as more inclusive, or infused with more traditionalist elements.

The Italian court, army and aristocracy backed Mussolini for 21 years before ousting him. South African big business has, on the other hand, maintained a muted though legal and loyal opposition to the NP regime. Their favoured party was, first, the United Party of Smuts and his successors, and then to an extent, the Progressive Federal Party. On the other hand, Spain under Franco and Pinochet's Chile afford examples where the upper classes -- in Spain the feudal elite and the Roman Catholic Church, and in Chile big business -- were, in conjunction with the military, the instigators of fascist uprisings against left-wing governments. Classic fascism does have its base amongst the urban lower middle classes, but often comes to power and maintains it by forming close ties with certain classes of peasants, and the traditional elites.

In the case of Germany and Italy, the upper classes and traditionalist ideology seemed to have had less influence on the regime; in the case of the Eastern European movements and of Spanish Falangism after 1936, traditionalist ideology and the old ruling elite had rather more influence. In both
cases, the controlled capitalism advocated by fascist movements fit the interests of the social groups or classes that supported them. Indeed, class interest determined ideology.

Fascism, in addition to being right-wing, authoritarian, and based on a defensive reaction by the middle and upper classes to the threat of socialist or communist movements, is usually associated with racism, ethnic chauvinism, and hyper-nationalism. Nationalism can be defined as love of or belief in one's nation, or national group. Ethnic chauvinism is love and belief in one's ethno-linguistic group. One's ethnic group can have a nation-state of its own, be an accepted component of a multinational nation-state, or be repressed by the nation-state or states in which they reside. One can also be nationalist about a polyglot, multi-ethnic state like Canada or the U.S. Hypernationalism is the exaggerated love of country, often taking the form of chauvinism, racism, xenophobia or political and cultural isolationism. All of the Fascist parties and regimes of Europe between 1918 and 1945 were, to one extent or another, hyper-nationalistic to the point of chauvinism. Naziism, Italian Fascism, and the fascist movements of eastern Europe, the Iron Guard of Rumania (later used by Marshal Atonescu), Szalasi's Arrow Cross of Hungary, the militantly anti-Serb Croatian Ustasi led by Ante Pavelic, all emphasized extreme nationalism. Pavelic's
Ustasi wanted an independent Croatian state, and when he achieved it with Hitler's help in 1941, he proceeded to massacre many Orthodox Serbs within his jurisdiction, so Croatia would be exclusively Catholic Croat.\(^{113}\) (The Germans massacred Croatia's Jews with Ustasi compliance and approval.) Antonescu, who first crushed, then used Rumania's fascist Iron Guard, was militantly anti-semitic, in practice if not in theory, for he massacred many of Rumania's Jews, and he eagerly joined Hitler's anti-Bolshevist crusade against Soviet Russia in 1941, with the promise of obtaining territory in the Ukraine.\(^{114}\)

While most of the European fascists were anti-semitic, it is interesting to note that the original prototype for fascism and the fascist state, Italy, was not originally anti-semitic and had no real trace of anti-semitism in its ideology until it came under Nazi German influence in the late 1930's.\(^{115}\) Overt racism and anti-semitism are not absolute, essential components of fascism; but these attitudes rarely feel completely out of place with it.

In addition, one other feature, common to both Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, but not necessarily followed by any but the most extreme in other fascist movements, is a sharp break with the traditional ethical and spiritual norms of Western, liberal, Judeo-Christian society. Ernst Nolte, in his *Three Faces of Fascism*, states that "Fascism is at the same time resistance to practical transcendence and struggle
against theoretical transcendence." Transcendence, for Nolte, seems to consist of adhering to Enlightenment ideals of social equality, political freedom, and rule of law. Nolte sees practical and theoretical transcendence as the fundamental characteristic of modern liberal democratic society. The gradual extension of the electoral franchise in the western European states in the 19th and 20th centuries to include previously excluded groups, such as the lower socio-economic classes and women, would be one example of practical transcendence. Some other examples would be the growth of socialism, with its stress on economic equality, and the emancipation of the Third World from European colonialism in the last forty years. Yet "fascism pursues its resistance to transcendence from within that transcendence and at times in the clear consciousness of a struggle for world hegemony." Dynamic fascism is a product of modern industrial society. It is, in its classic form, a mass popular movement. The German Nazis used democratic freedoms to mobilize millions of Germans to support their political program in the late 1920's and early 1930's. Yet Naziism was a popular movement which led a struggle against parties that stood for economic equality. Though Naziism was a modern political ideology, it opposed, on a theoretical level, the idea of common human rights, by its uncompromising racism.
The cult of the leader was an integral feature of both Italian fascism and German Naziism. To begin with, Italian fascism had "no strong organization, no noticeable leadership, no impressive style." The original fasci or party sections were at first organized from "below", according to democratic principles the members elected their commanders. By October 1922 the Regolamento di disciplina per la Milizia fascists ... laid much greater stress on rank and eliminated elective status entirely. By the time the leadership constitution of the fascist party was laid down on statute by October 12, 1926, Mussolini had eliminated or brought under strict control all his competitors within the party, (D'Annunzio, Grandi, Turati, De Bono) and was unchallenged leader. A strict chain of command was in operation in the party, which totally controlled the state. The Duce appointed the party secretary, who summoned the provincial secretaries, who in turn appointed the secretaries of the individual fasci. The leadership principle was thoroughly entrenched in both party and state.

Nazi Germany exalted the leadership principle (fuhrerprinzip). From a very early stage Adolf Hitler was given a dictatorial position from which to guide the Nazi Party. He faced a leadership challenge in 1921, from the old guard of the Nazi Party, in 1926 from the Strasser brothers who were concerned Hitler was leading them into collaboration with conservative circles and was diluting the
party's socialism, and in 1934 when Rohm and the SA voiced reservations of Hitler's alliance with the conservative forces in German society. Hitler was not only effective dictator of the party, and after 1933 (particularly after the Rohm affair of 1934) dictator of Germany, he was also the focal point of the cult of leadership in the NSDAP and in Germany after the Nazis seized power. Hitler's birthday (April 20th) was a day of celebration by Nazi party members. His teetotal vegetarian nonsmoking asexual public persona gave the impression of a man immune to the ordinary temptations of life, totally dedicated to his country. Hysterical worship of Hitler was common, and was carefully fostered by the party. The leadership principle permeated all sections of society in the Third Reich, and hierarchy, blind obedience to leadership (a virtue, in Hitler's eyes, that the SS possessed but the SA did not) were core values of Nazi ideology.

The cult of the leader in Italy and Germany went along with a militaristic stance. Militarism was glorified as the highest ideal to which a society could aspire. In Italy, the fascist party itself was divided at its most basic level, before its rise to power, into fasci, themselves divided into squadri, military units designed to establish fascism as a military force to be reckoned with in the struggle for power with the Marxists. Even when the squadri were dissolved after the fascists came to power, Mussolini referred to the fascist
militia, the sole bearer of arms of all party formations at that point, as "the aristocracy of fascism." War was glorified in Mussolini's statements and official propaganda. "Even as a socialist Mussolini's use of language was replete with military allusions. He stated 'War alone ... brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon those peoples who have the courage to meet it.' The avanguarditi, the fascist youth organization were organized upon military lines with the object of giving young boys premilitary training. Warfare and heroic military values were stressed in official propaganda, in the educational system the military glory and virtues of ancient Rome were constantly stressed. Fascist formations and youth organizations were organized on military lines. This aspect of fascist ideology meshed well with Italy's expansionist foreign policy in the 1930's, the conquests of Ethiopia and Albania being the apogee of the thrust of Italian fascist militarism.

Nazi Germany also emphasized, in both theory and practice, a militaristic vocation for society. Only a vigorous race was fit to survive in the struggle for existence that characterized the Nazi view of relations between states. Hitler states in Mein Kampf that it "was an absurdity to believe that with the end of the school period the state's right to supervise its young citizens suddenly ceases ... the folkish state will have to look on post school physical
training as a state function ... this education in its broad outlines can serve as a preparation for future military service."129 The inculcation of militarism and attitudes of ruthlessness towards other states and peoples was a core component of Nazi ideology and propaganda. Nazi party formations such as the SA, SS and Hitler Youth were all organized along militaristic lines. Nazi militarism was a key element in its racial ideology. Hitler stated in Mein Kampf that only by superabundance of national will-power, thirst for freedom and the highest passion would Germany gain the strength to smash the post World War One world order. In Naziism, as well as in Italian fascism, revolutionary dynamism bred militarism.

The creation of a mass movement, culminating in an all powerful party in a one-party state, with the means and the will to use the media and the educational system to propagandize the public was a characteristic of both Italian fascism and German Naziism. The transition from marginal politico-military force, through mass party operating within the despised parliamentary system, to totalitarian all pervasive presence and guide to Italian society was fairly rapid in Italy. In fact the second state was almost eclipsed. The fascist movement was still a quasi military formation when it formed its alliance with the traditional power centers in Italy, the Court, the Army, the landowners and the
bourgeoisie. The development of the fascist party itself mainly took place when it was already in a position to be the guiding force in society. This lack of party structure contributed to the fact that Italian fascism never failed to completely dominate Italian society, as other totalitarian movements of this century have done (the Soviet-Chinese Communists, and to a slightly lesser extent, the German Nazis). Mussolini's failure to liquidate the traditional Italian power structure, brought about by his early alliance with traditional Italian conservatism which made Italian fascism, and his failure to integrate the masses into the fascist state led to, in Cassel's opinion, the demise of the Fascist revolution. Nonetheless, the party controlled education, the press, the cinema, and was the director of the police and the army as well as the economy. By the late 1920's, it had become a mass party with membership in both the party and its affiliated organizations reach over millions. Whatever the depth of its support, its control and presence was more than obvious.

The Nazis had more time to develop an intricate and large party organization, in other words to develop as a mass party before they came to power in 1933. Like the Italian fascists, the Nazis passed through their baptism of fire with its street warfare with German Socialists and communists in the 1920's and 1930's, and the concomitant development of the quasi-military arm of the NSDAP, the SA. Unlike the Fascists, the
Nazis had time to develop their Political Organization (or PO). In the rough and tumble of democratic electoral warfare, they had already elected about a sixth of the deputies to the Reichstag in the 1930 elections. The Nazis already had a powerful party structure, as well as a mass base from which to conquer, then dominate and permeate state and society once they achieved power. As in Italy, the party, as well as an array of party affiliated organizations, the SA, SS, National Socialist Womens League (NS-Frauenschaften, NSF), the Winterhelp (Winteruliwerk, WHW), and the National Socialist Welfare Organization (NS-Volkswohlfart, NSU) as well as the Nazi controlled trade unions (under Robert Ley) were able to control the state and dominate society, after the party attained power.133 Party members controlled and staffed the bureaucracy, set government policy, controlled education and enrolled millions of Germans as members in the Party and Party affiliated organizations. The tighter control the Nazis had over Germany relative to the control the Fascists had in Italy may have stemmed from the higher development of the party structure when the Nazis came to power, as well as on Germany's more efficient (relative to Italy) bureaucracy and technology.

Two elements of Nazi practice, reflected in Nazi ideology, must be added to the eight aforementioned elements of classic fascism. These are radical totalitarianism and
anti-semitism. A fascist movement or state in the classic sense must have the five characteristics. A Nazi movement or regime must have the other two.

The totalitarian nature of the Nazi regime became more evident the longer it was in power, but was foreshadowed by some of the early statements by Hitler and the party. Certainly the idea of Führerprinzip, or the leadership principle, is stressed repeatedly in all of the early documents of the NSDAP, including Mein Kampf. Many of the methods of government were similar to those of Fascist Italy. Labour unions, trade and commercial and industrial organizations, fraternal organizations for social purposes or for adult education or mutual aid, which had existed on a voluntary basis and were self-governing, were either wiped out or were taken over and restaffed. In the purely economic sphere, both labour and business were regulated to the extent that in Germany and Italy, party officials controlled the organization of industry on behalf of the party. Their decisions generally reflected a bias towards management, whose support they needed to build and maintain a controlled war economy.

National Socialism revealed its radical totalitarian tendencies, which set it apart from the authoritarian or "mild totalitarianism" or Italy, its use of mass terror (including genocide) to achieve its aims. Acts such as the extermination of the Jews, the murder of almost 4 million
Soviet prisoners of war during World War II, and the murder by the Nazi authorities of millions of Soviet and Polish civilians, indicate how extreme the Nazi program was; how sharp a break it was from any form of traditional conservatism or even any sort of fascism practiced at that time. To remold Europe racially along biological lines, Hitler, Himmler, Heydrich and their followers were willing to exterminate entire races of people, even at the expense of immediate tactical military considerations. This genocidal hyper-racism entailed a considerable ideological discontinuity with either Weimar or traditional monarchical Germany. The final breaking of the officer corps -- the backbone of the Junker class and the last counterweight to the party -- after the July 20th plot; and the Nazi plans to substitute Aryan paganism or National Socialist ideology for Christianity, enunciated by Bormann and Rosenberg, highlighted the direction that the Nazi state had taken by 1944, into radical totalitarianism.

Ideological anti-semitism, brought to an apogee by the Nazis in the 20th century, differed from traditional Christian anti-semitism. The latter opposed the Jews as Christ-killers, a race cursed by God for their failure to accept Christ as the Messiah promised by the prophets. The former emphasized their rootlessness and their supposed mercantile spirit. Right-wing anti-semitic groups and parties proliferated in the latter part of the 19th and early 20th centuries, in the Austro-
Hungarian Empire (in Vienna - Karl Lueger's Christian Social Party); in France (Mauras's Action Francaise and the anti-Dreyfusards), and in Czarist Russia (the Black Hundreds). The Nazis may have gained much of their initial impetus in 1919 from the association of Jewry and Bolshevism that arose in the minds of many Bavarian rightists after the overthrow of the revolutionary socialist Soviet regime, then led by Kurt Eisner, who was Jewish, along with several of his well known associates.

The Nazis were not just anti-semites, but their anti-semitism and racism in general stemmed from a crude, virtually Darwinian "biologism" that reduced the Jews in particular, and also the Slavs and Gypsies and other "non-Aryan" races or groups, to the status of planetary bacilli, an infection that they had every right to cleanse from the face of the earth. In Mein Kampf, Hitler states that the Jews -- always pictured as bent upon world domination through both international finance capitalism and international Communism -- if successful, would destroy humanity, because they are such a life-destroying force. This absolute dehumanization paved the way for the extermination camps, and carried Hitler far beyond the theory or practice of any fascist nation up until then. (Antonescu's Rumania butchered Jews in large numbers in World War II; Rumanian anti-semitism under Antonescu's regime was a compound of traditional Christian anti-semitism, and German pressure. Antonescu bargained with the Western Allies
to curry favour with them, and used Jewish lives as the currency.)

Fascism must thus be further defined as inclusive or exclusive. What is meant by exclusive fascism is the classic fascism of Germany and Italy, which includes the five aforementioned points. Inclusive fascism -- the fascism, for instance, of Pinochet's Chile, where dictatorial power is not built on one party, or the role of the state is downplayed by the economic libertarians of the Pinochet regime (the question of state capitalism and the reality of the market is one that should be left aside) -- need not have all of these traits. "Inclusive" fascism could include all of the characteristics of exclusive fascism, but usually mutes one or more. It is often tied to more religious conceptions of existence, and often allows the old ruling class to exercise more influence. The fascist movements of the Eastern European states in the inter-war period manifested these inclusive characteristics.\textsuperscript{138} So did the later Falangism of post-1936 Franco-ruled Spain.

Naziism went beyond Fascist practice. Classic fascism of the Italian model included several features: (1) an authoritarian, leader-centred orientation, (2) a right-wing, anti-Communist position, (3) a base of support amongst the middle class, with the coopting of the traditional elite, (4) extreme ethnic or nationalist chauvinism (sometimes with an
imperialistic flavour), and (5) an ambivalent reaction to modernity. It also included 6) the cult of the leader, 7) militaristic structure and vocation for society, and 8) the creation of a mass movement and all of its attendant paraphernalia were also characteristics of classic fascism. Naziism added radical totalitarianism and pseudo-scientific anti-Semitism to the mix. Any movement or government that lays claim to the first eight beliefs or characteristics could be properly described as fascist; any party or regime that adhered to the two associated with German National Socialism, as Nazi.
CHAPTER IV

There have been a great many movements and governments in this century that have been called fascist. The German Nazis certainly qualify as fascist, by the five-part test adumbrated earlier, and in fact they go beyond classic fascism of the Italian mold in their extreme totalitarianism and in their distinctive anti-semitic racist ideology. The Nationalist Party, however, cannot be described as fully fascist or fully Nazi; and yet can be called fascist, and somewhat open to Nazi ideology. This ambiguous relation to fascism of the HNP masks more than mere opportunism, although this accounts in part for the HNP's shifting views on National Socialism. The HNP's ambivalence about Naziism may also reflect the lack of understanding of Naziism by leading Nationalist politicians, and brings to light certain core fundamental beliefs of Afrikaner Christian Nationalism unique to that ideology.

The Nationalist Party clearly seemed to envisage during the war years a more authoritarian regime for South Africa. The Unity Committee (headed by Du Plessis) drew up a "Declaration on Behalf of Volksorganisies", which was accepted by the Nationalist Party and passed at its Union Congress in 1941, and had strong authoritarian overtones. A great deal of Nationalist rhetoric during these years definitely indicated the need for some sort of authoritarian regime for South Africa, once the republic was achieved. From B.J. Vorster, who equated Christian Nationalism with National
Socialism or fascism, to Dr. Malan himself, who stated at Stellenbosch in March 1941 that "when the republic is established, you can only give a say in affairs to people who have identified themselves with the volk, and who have had enough time to do so," 140 NP and other Afrikaner republican leaders identified themselves with authoritarian principles. The same month Malan spoke at Stellenbosch, the Federal Council of the NP put out a brochure, Die Republikense Orde, which stated that "the British parliamentary system as applied in our country must be swept away, because it has been a failure ... Is not the time ripe for us to base our national way of life upon another foundation by breaking away from democracy." 141 Clearly the NP, along with the rest of Nationalist Afrikanerdom, was drifting towards favouring an authoritarian system in the early years of World War II, when it looked as though a fascist world was about to emerge. It must be kept in mind, however, that there were different currents within the NP on this issue and others, with men like Strijdom, Voerwoerd and Eric Louw adhering to more extreme positions than Dr. Malan. Malan was more comfortable with the parliamentary process than Voerwoerd and Strijdom, who were more ideologically driven, as many of the "young Turks" of Afrikaner Nationalism were in the 1930's, and less trusting of democratic means of persuasion than Nationalist politicians of the older generation, such as Hertzog and Malan, who were more guided by expediency and compromise. 142
There was fascist and Nazi influence on the NP during this time, which predisposed many NP leaders and rank and file party members to favour the creation of an authoritarian Afrikaner republic. There was, however, a strong, largely indigenous tradition predisposing loyal sons of "the volk" towards authoritarianism as well.

The Afrikaner population had been almost exclusively Calvinist in their religious orientation since the Dutch started to settle South Africa. Adherents of the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort (1618), the Afrikaners reshaped Calvinist theology, which emphasizes the sovereignty of God in the individual's life, into the absolute sovereignty of God, and his anointed the elect, in the nation's life. John Calvin, the French Protestant reformer, viewed salvation, which came only through Christ, as the act of God alone. Through God's grace, certain individuals, the elect, were divinely preordained by God for salvation. "God's election is gratuitous; human beings can do nothing toward salvation on their own, and election is in no way dependent on one's actions, good works, or the possibility that God can foreknow one will be faithful and hence elect that person accordingly. On the other hand, that certain individuals are not elected is not a negation of God's mercy and kindness, but reflects deserved punishment for their own willful sinning." The three Dutch Reformed Churches of South Africa, to which over ninety percent of the Afrikaner population have always
adhered, have always upheld this strict predestinarianism, which rejects sacraments and other human actions as a means to grace.

This "Christian" half of Afrikaner Christian Nationalism was modified by South African circumstances. The Afrikaners began to see themselves as an elect group, or race, as time went on; and the concept of God's absolute sovereignty in the individual's life, while it continued to exist in the theology of the three Dutch Reformed Churches, was transferred to the political and social sphere. They believed they were fulfilling a Christianizing, civilizing role in Africa, bringing light into the heart of the "dark continent." At least this is the myth of contemporary Afrikaner Nationalist ideology as it has developed from the 19th century until now. This view saw the subjugation of the non-whites of South Africa not as the result of a condition of white lawlessness, present amongst the Trekboers and later the Voortrekkers, but as a divinely ordained 'clearing' of heathens to secure the 'promised land' for Afrikanerdom. This romanticized view of the spread of Boer domination may not reflect the original intentions or self appraisal of the Trekboers or Voortrekkers, but may be a product of Afrikaner Nationalist ideology as it has developed from the 19th century onwards. Hierarchy, a divinely instituted principle amongst the races, whose rigid stratification was a divinely preordained condition, also became a guiding principle amongst the Afrikaner Nationalists
of the 19th century, as well as the 20th. As the Boers established their republics after the Great Trek, they began to see their triumph as proof of God's divine election of their people, not just of themselves as individuals, as Calvin had intended. Those on top were on top because of God's will; their position indicated their social election.

The Afrikaner "Christian Nationalist" philosophers of the 20th century, particularly from the 1930's on, carried the principle of divinely ordained hierarchy, society resting on God's sovereignty, to a logical conclusion. Under the influence of the rising tide of fascism in the 1930's and the early 1940's, Afrikaner Nationalist thought, both within and outside of the NP, called for an authoritarian state structure once the Afrikaner state was established. As the absolute sovereignty of God in the individual's life, which was evident in the individual's election, had given way to the election of the community, with God sovereign, so the elect community had given way to the elect leadership within the male community. Dr. N. Diedrichs, a professor of political philosophy at Grey University College of the Free State, published a study of nationalism as a world-view in 1936. Diedrichs, as a member of the Broederbond, expressed the final evolution of theoretical nationalism, as propounded by the Broederbond.

Diedrichs' nationalism saw the individual as the servant of the folk community; the individual man was an abstraction that did not exist, for man was called to be a member of the
nation. The necessary link between religion and organicist, authoritarian nationalism is made explicit by Diedrichs:

The highest order, that nation-transcending territory where nations meet other in a complementary way, cannot be seen in any other than a religious light. In religion every human life, every nation, discovers its grounding and meaning. Without a religious point of relationship and an ultimate object, the universe, the nation, is incomprehensible, senseless and purposeless ... The nation contains the essence of being human. It is the form of the individual's spiritual realization and perfection.

For Diedrichs and his Broederbond colleagues, the individual was absolutely subordinate to the nation, a view which was a total repudiation of political liberalism. This organicist view of state and society reflected the Afrikaner Broederbond's deep conviction that the Afrikaners had to be led and directed like an army, to achieve Afrikaner dominance in South Africa, where they would dominate a Christian National Republic. The Broederbond would control, through Christian National indoctrination in the schools, through supervision of "Die Volk" in the various volksorganisies (the RDB, the churches, etc.), through rigorous segregation of the races and control, and by the elimination of imperialist influence in South Africa, all aspects of South African life. The Afrikaner elite was itself to be closely monitored and guided. The NP during the war was grooming Dr. Malan for near-dictatorial powers if power fell to them. This shift
towards political authoritarianism, against British liberalism, away from the political equality of adult, white, male Protestant Afrikaners, was the key change from 19th century Afrikaner political thought and practice.

While authoritarianism clearly had its roots in Afrikaner political and religious culture and thought, it was not a necessary development. The authoritarian tendencies of the NP in the 1930's and 1940's were a logical development of the Afrikaners' history, but not the only possible one, for the old republics had included many democratic practices. The rise of fascism and Naziism in Europe, however, clearly reinforced the NP's authoritarian drift.

The HNP drifted towards advocating authoritarianism in the later 1930's, completing the shift from republican democratic thought, although they continued to operate as a democratic party. The NP would not have been precluded from setting up an authoritarian state in South Africa merely because of their continuous participation in South African politics as a democratic party from 1913 on. The German Nazis sat in the Reichstag as an independent group from 1928 on, (although they sat with other Volkisch deputies as part of a far-right grouping from 1921 until 1928), and operated within democratic rules to the extent of collaborating with the Communists to bring the Papen government down on a motion of no confidence in December 1932. The Nazis played a double game of parliamentarianism and anti-parliamentarianism during
most of the Weimar period. The democratically elected French Senate and National Assembly voted themselves out of power, which they placed in Marshal Pétain's hands in July 1940, by an overwhelming majority. Prominent democratic conservative French politicians of the later Third Republic -- Laval, Flandin, Chautemps, Bonnett, Anatole de Monzie -- helped inaugurate the moderate fascist Vichy regime. While overt anti-democratic thought in France circulated amongst the fascist gangs, such as La Rocque's Croix de Feu or Doriot's PNF, the "democratic" right, more afraid of Communism at home and abroad and Leon Blum's Popular Front than fascism, readily jumped at the chance to establish an authoritarian rightist regime when circumstances allowed for it. (Some did so more enthusiastically than others, such as Laval.) The fascist ideology of Maurras and the action Francaise had penetrated deeply (directly or indirectly) the minds of many of the leading officials, civilian and military, of French Republican democracy. Even the French democratic left was not wholly immune from the drift towards authoritarianism.

In South Africa authoritarianism was veiled amongst Christian Nationalism's parliamentary champion in the democratic forum, but just barely. The Nationalist Party, to say the least, clearly did not repudiate the anti-democratic current circulating within the upper echelons of the Broederbond, or within the extra-parliamentary organizations such as the Ossewa Brandwag. The Broederbond and the
Nationalist Party talked of an Afrikaner republic in organic, corporatist terms, not specifically calling for a one-party state. As the AB secretary stated in an article printed in the Bloemfontein English-language newspaper the *Friend*, on Dec. 14, 1944, "The aim of the Broederbond, taken literally from the constitution ... a healthy progressive unanimity among all Afrikaners who strive for the welfare of the Afrikaner nation." Unanimity excluded Smuts, Hertzog and all Afrikaners who did not submit to the dictates of the inner circle of the AB. The true Afrikaner was to have sole power in South Africa in a Christian National Republic. The methods and organization of the German Nazis were studied to attain this, and prominent Broeders like Diedrichs, Meyer and Van Rensburg had visited Germany before the war to make a close study of Nazi techniques of propaganda, manipulation of public opinion, and infiltration of public bodies. Whatever the precise form of Nationalist Party rule envisaged by AB and NP leaders (the two were more or less the same), an authoritarian state would have been established by the NP very willingly where it would have been impossible to remove the NP through electoral or other constitutional means, in the event of a German victory in World War II, with a consequent new fascist world order.

The NP did not conceal its right-wing position during the war. Now, right-wing is a term which covers a lot of ground.
During this century it has come to mean Burkean conservative, Libertarian capitalist, feudal, religious conservative, defender of any status quo position (even hard-line Stalinists in Russia or China in the 1980's are often described as "conservatives"). Almost the only common quality that all of these positions have is their anti-Communism. This is not enough to consider something or someone right-wing. Western Social-Democrats such as Hugh Gaitskill in the 1950's and 1960's were strongly anti-Communist, as were American Democrats such as Lyndon Baines Johnson. Here, right-wing will mean being anti-Communist and anti-humanist. A rightist political position will be defined as one that is opposed to Communism, and opposed to a general leveling of class differences or racial barriers in some significant way. A right-wing movement or government could be anti-laissez-faire, as were fascist regimes such as Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Falangist Spain, and could even favour some measure of government action and to secure employment or welfare benefits. If such policies exist and are advocated by the group in question, however, in terms of anti-Communism as an internal or foreign policy, and if they are limited to one racial or ethnic group while others are suppressed, within the country, or by imperialistic wars of aggression, and if considerable socio-economic differences based on ownership of private property still exist within the state or group in
question, then one can, without reservation, define such a movement or government as right-wing.

By the aforementioned definition the NP adopted a right-wing stance during World War II. It was militantly anti-Communist both at home and abroad. The sympathy that NP leaders like Hertzog and Malan had expressed for Soviet Russia in the early 1920's had long since been superseded by events. When the South African Communist Party declared in favour of a Native Republic in 1928, it put itself and the ideology it represented out of the mainstream of White South African politics. In effect, it made itself anathema to the White working class of South Africa. The NP did not make much of the anti-Communist issue until the late 1930's, as the ideological polarization between fascism or Naziism and Communism became more of an issue in international affairs.

During the war, the NP displayed considerable antipathy towards Soviet Russia and militant opposition to what it considered to be Communist-inspired labour agitation amongst the natives, and even amongst White workers. After the Nationalist victory in 1948, the new NP Minister of Labour boasted of the anti-Communist impetus of the Broederbond-established Blanke Werkersbeskermingsbond (White Workers Protection League). The BWBB was set up to wean White workers away from class-oriented unions which might stress class identification, even with non-White workers, over national identity.158
The NP associated Soviet Russia with class ideology at home, and opposed both militantly during World War II. Of course the South African labour movement was not dominated by Communists. There were Communists or Marxists in the labour movement, such as ex-South African Communist Party member Solly Sachs, who was president of Garment Workers' Union (part of the old South African Trade and Labour Council, the coordination body of most South African unions), or Ray Alexander, Secretary of the Food and Canning Workers' Union, but the SATLC was not dominated by Communists at any time. Most of its members were affiliated with the Labour Party, which was affiliated with the Second International, the world-wide Social-Democratic movement.159

The Communist Party of South Africa opposed the infiltration of fascism in South Africa to the best of its ability during the 1930's. White workers mustered their forces to defeat the Broederbond attempts to capture or split trade unions.160 Labour leaders such as Johanna Cornelius, President of the Transvaal Government Workers Union, J. Wolmarans, Chairman of the Textile Union, H.S. Camprechts, Secretary of the Leather Workers' Union (Gideon) and others spoke to rural audiences about the dangers of fascism and war.161 The League Against Fascism and War was formed in March 1934 by trade unionists, communists, Labour party members, Friends of the Soviet Union and radical societies.162
There is no doubt, however, that the NP was genuinely afraid of any hint of Marxist or Communist influence in South Africa, for an ideology of class, whether Communist or Social Democratic, ultimately cut at the heart of the Nationalist world-view. Their cooperation with the Labour Party during the 1920's and early 1930's was based on a tactical alliance of defending certain interests of the White, and for the NP particularly, the Afrikaner worker. As long as the Labour Party was itself racist and did not press for socialization of the economy, the NP could afford an alliance with it. The NP wanted to create amongst the White workers a "labour aristocracy" that would be a contented component of the national (Afrikaner) life. The very idea of Bolshevism was a direct assault on the Nationalist world-view, for Marxism aimed at all humanity recovering its essential "species-being" in full Communism or socialism, where for the Nationalist, his Christian and national identity was his essence.

The German Nazis also stressed the unity of "die Volk," the identification of the worker with his fatherland and his race, over and above any international or interracial connections. It did not matter to the leadership of the NSDAP that the German Communists could have easily been suppressed by the Reichswehr in 1932, or that Stalin did not want war with Germany in 1941; the leading Nazis saw a potential threat, and their foremost ideological adversary, in the international Communist movement. To the Nationalists in
South Africa, Communism or radical socialism was never an immediate adversary, except in the struggle for control of the Trade Union movement, but it was part of the looming catastrophe which liberalism and race mixture heralded.

The Nationalists opposed *laissez-faire* capitalism. 163 Some, in the Nationalist Party, actually did sincerely stress the "Socialist" element of what they understood to be National Socialism. To most Nationalists, however, what was necessary was a state-managed capitalism that allowed the Afrikaners a piece of the economic pie, and enough state controls to have a sort of "welfare capitalism" for White, and particularly Afrikaner workers. 164 This was a position that most Broederbond members and NP leaders (the two were essentially the same) subscribed to, the exception being OB militants such as Meyer, who did emphasize the Socialist characteristics of National Socialism. German National Socialism never abolished capitalism. It managed it, even tightly controlled it so as to harness German industry to the needs of a wary economy. Some early parts of the Nazi programme were similar to NP policy in the denunciation of "finance capitalism and calling for its control or elimination by and on behalf of the volk community." 165 It might be added here that "state-managed" capitalism has been part of the Afrikaner heritage since the 1890's. The state was involved in the development of the gold-mining industry in the SAR since the 1890's. The Transvaal government provided the conditions for the
organization and recruitment of the black labour supply, most of which was brought to the Rand from hundreds of miles away, and it played a major role in building the railways, which were largely publicly financed. Since the gold-mining industry was the major component of the industrial capitalist component of the South African economy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it is correct to say that the state and mining capital were both active and dominant players in the industrial capitalist sector of the economy from its inception.

The Nationalist Party, in opposition, articulated the demands of one element of the population, the Afrikaner white working class (a small part of its ethnic base) that was most at the mercy of mining capital. In power they advanced the interest of the state-capital axis in South Africa to use black labour and control white labour while giving the white workers a few more benefits. The Nationalists were basically a nationalist party that advocated the interests of Afrikanerdom. They wanted Afrikaners to gain control over the South African state, and South African capitalism, and manage both for the benefit of the Afrikaners. It was not on the issue of state management of capitalism per se that the Nationalists were much different from the SAP-United Party, although they did extend the role of the State while in power. It was who would manage capitalism that separated the Nationalists from the SAP-United Party.
So, the NSDAP and the NP had similar grievances against "international capitalism" (in South Africa, against British Jewish control of the economy, and in Germany, against the onerous economic shackles thrown upon Germany by the Versailles Treaty) that made them condemn certain aspects of capitalism. At the same time, neither party ever called for a full-scale replacement of the system by attacking the capital relation itself.

The similar populist character of both parties masks a certain difference in the nature of each. The NP was a narrow, exclusivist nationalist party that wanted to dominate a racially-stratified nation, arrogating exclusive power to itself. Private ownership of the means of production, mixed liberally with state controls and some degree of state ownership, was to be the norm as long as the Afrikaner had a virtual monopoly of the political sphere. It was right-wing in the sense that it wanted political and economic power in South Africa for the Afrikaner, and the politico-economic rights of the other racial groups within the country were to be strictly subordinate to those of the Afrikaner. The Reddingsdaadbond, a Broederbond-controlled organization, is an example of Nationalist support for Afrikaner private capital, and their basic acceptance of the capitalist system as long as it was dominated by Afrikanerdom. The good DRC preachers, teachers, advocates and medical men who headed the NP propounded a narrow ethnic nationalist ideology which would
uplift the Afrikaner to what they considered his natural birthright -- dominance in his own land over uitlanders and kaffirs. They would maintain the capitalist system with some important statist modifications. This stratified society with the Afrikaner on top was the ultimate goal of most NP members and leaders, and indeed most Nationalist-minded Afrikaners in South Africa. Meyer, Rensburg, Pirow and some Ossewa Brandwag extremists were the exception.

The social base of the NP differed from that of the German Nazis and the Italian Fascists; it was more widely distributed within the Afrikaner community. The Nazis drew their main support, when they mushroomed into a mass party after the 1930 Reichstag elections, from big business, the Protestant urban middle classes, and farmers. The Catholic Center Party had a lock on much of the middle-class Catholic vote (and some of the Catholic working-class vote) in South Germany (Bavaria) and the Rhineland. The Social Democrats and the Communists shared the working-class vote, and the German National People's Party (DNVP) retained the support of many of the traditional Prussian landowners. The Nazis made a strong appeal to Protestant middle-class voters, who had previously voted for the ultra-conservative Nationalists, the conservative German People's Party (Deutsche Volksche Partei, DVP, Stesseman's old party), and the liberal German Democratic Party (DDP).
The NP had a broad base of Afrikaner support more characteristic of a purely nationalist party than of a fascist party. (In South Africa, however, the NP had majority support amongst the Afrikaner community in 1943, five years before they came to power and while they were in opposition to war that their government was waging on the winning side.) This is not to say being nationalist excludes being fascist or the other way around; but fascist parties or movements, such as the Spanish Falangist Party when it became the umbrella organization for all the anti-republican forces after the rising of July 18, 1936, or the NSDAP, or the Italian Fascists, all based their climb to power and drew their active support primarily, not exclusively, from the propertied classes (first the lower middle class, then peasants and the upper classes), rather than the urban working class. Nationalist parties can have a "left" or "right" orientation, as well as being either democratic or authoritarian. The Parti Quebecois, from 1967 until about 1985, had a clearly "left" or social-democratic orientation; its nationalist predecessor, the mildly autonomist Union Nationale adopted a conservative pro-business under Duplessis. The Union Nationale, a fusion of left-wing Liberals dissatisfied with the conservative economic policies of the Liberal Taschereau administration, and the Quebec Conservative party, led by the social reformer and later fascist sympathizer Camilien Houde in the early 1930's, exhibited the same odd mixture of
reformist and conservative policies that characterized purified Nationalists of the late 30's and early 40's.\textsuperscript{170} It was a nationalist party that rose to power in the 1936 provincial general election, advocating social reforms.\textsuperscript{171} The UN received its support originally from rural French Quebeckers and amongst the French working class of east-end Montreal, but later, after it rose to power under Duplessis, fell into the traditional pattern of alliance with business and the Catholic Church that characterized previous Liberal administrations in Quebec. The Union Nationale was similar to the Nationalist Party in its ethnic-centered, multi-class (including the working class) base of support.

The NP developed the mass support characteristic of a party seen to be fighting for national rights against dispossession by a foreign power or alien force. John Redmond's Irish Party won 81 of Ireland's 103 seats at Westminster because it was seen by Irish Catholics to be the authentic spokesman of Ireland's national rights at the time.\textsuperscript{172} Its support cut across class lines amongst Irish Catholics. The Indian Congress Party has largely dominated Indian politics since 1947 because it attained a reputation as the authentic spokesman of the Indian nation as a result of its leading role in struggles in the 1930's and 1940's, led by Gandhi and Nehru, for Indian independence. Its broad support has cut across caste, class and religious lines for over 40 years.
The HNP catapulted themselves into a similar role amongst Afrikaners in South Africa during the war years. It was then that they emerged as the majority party amongst Afrikaners for the first time since fusion in 1934. O'Meara argues that the 1943 election pointed to the new emerging class base of the Nationalist party. It increased its rural support, rising to 11 seats from 1 in 1938 in the Transvaal and going up to 14 from 1 in the Orange Free State. The HNP also captured 1 working class seat on the Witswatersrand and registered significant gains in 5 others. This represented a small payoff for the work of the NRT, and another potential source of major advance for the HNP in the next elections. O'Meara is arguing that the class base of the HNP seems to be a coalition of petit-bourgeois farmers (the wealthier farmers still supported Smuts in 1943, for the United and Dominion parties still controlled 42 of the 82 rural seats in the country) and white Afrikaner workers who aspire to the role of a white labour aristocracy (with limited success under the previous Hertzog government, as Yudelman argues) and saw the Nationalists as a vehicle to that end. This provided the base for the cross-class alliance of Afrikanerdom that emerged during the war, and eventually led the Nationalist Party to power. This link to the working class was rare amongst European fascist parties of the inter-war era.

The UP won the 1943 election, and most urban ridings, on the strength of the unanimous backing of the English
community, which was about 40 percent of the electorate. The NP was already well on its way to becoming the exclusive voice of Afrikanerdom that it was to be in its electoral heyday of the 1960's under Voerwoerd. The Nazis and the Italian Fascists, because they weren't tribal movements, never reached the degree of electoral support that the Nationalists demonstrated in the 1943 elections amongst Afrikanerdom in any democratic election that they contested. The HNP by 1943 had, in the view of Afrikanerdom, become the symbol of Afrikaner national resistance to the other national groups in the country. By aiming to hive off the Afrikaner working class from class identification, and establish them and other white workers as a "labour aristocracy" (or at least to convince them to see themselves as a labour aristocracy), the HNP succeeded in establishing itself as a mass-based nationalist party. Since the Afrikaners were not a homogeneous economic class as a whole in South Africa at this time, the HNP cannot be classified as a class-based party, as were, to a considerable extent, the Nazis before their rise to power. (The Nazis can be considered an 'anti-working class' party.)

The HNP was certainly a hyper-nationalist party during WORLD WAR II, and in this respect it was very similar to the fascist movements in Europe at the time. The very essence, the sole purpose of the HNP, was to boost Afrikanerdom, even at the expense and the liberties of all other population
groups in South Africa. The aim of advancing the Afrikaner was the guiding philosophy of Hertzog's Nationalist Party, the GNP of 1934 to 1939, and the HNP. This ethnically exclusive nationalism must be distinguished from the South Africanism of the United Party.

Now, the HNP was hyper-nationalist during World War II, in the sense that it emphasized, in documents like the Draft Constitution which it endorsed, the supremacy of the Afrikaner in South Africa. To attain this aim, the HNP was willing to abrogate the existing legal rights that the other population groups in South Africa then enjoyed. Hyper-nationalism or chauvinism can be distinguished from simple nationalism in that hyper-nationalism glorifies the nation, or one's ethnic group, to such an extent that it excludes, or at least transcends, all other values or loyalties. Even religious belief becomes, in a major way, an element of folk culture. The preservation of one's own group with its attendant beliefs, customs, folklore, and land, becomes so important an ideal that one is prepared, if necessary, to trample over and completely exclude all other national groups that could possibly impinge or get in the way of one's nation or race.

This was certainly a characteristic of German National Socialism and European fascism in general during the 1930's and 1940's. In Germany, the nation was constantly glorified in propaganda, and building up Germany became the exclusive drive behind foreign and domestic policy. In Nazi ideology
the nation was the embodiment, the incarnation of the Teutonic, Germanic race. Hitler, and the other Nazi leaders, viewed the survival and domination of the German race in Europe as the primary goal of foreign and domestic policy. To secure the German people's survival, Poland had to disappear as a state, the Jews had to be exterminated, the Soviet Russian state had to be destroyed and the Slavs in general decimated, and the survivors reduced to subservient status. The central aim of German foreign policy was to be, as Hitler said in his last will and political testament, in fact, in the last words he ever wrote, "to win territory in the East for the German people." Hitler viewed German territorial expansion as the means of securing German biological expansion, the state or nation serving as a vehicle for the expansion of the race.

The NP, too, was hyper-nationalist during World War II. The celebration of the centenary of Blood River in 1938 inaugurated a new phase of heightened Afrikaner ethnic consciousness amongst many Afrikaners. Organized by the Federasie van Afrikaner Kultuurorganisasies (F.A.K.), a Broederbond-sponsored grouping, the 1938 reenactment of the 1838 Great Trek caught most Afrikaners up in a great wave of nationalist enthusiasm. The covenant of Blood River was reaffirmed in the 1938 centenary celebrations. "The sacred history was constituted and actualized as a general context of meaning for all Afrikanerdom in spontaneous liturgical
reenactment during the 1938 celebrations. Moodie goes on to say that the Afrikaners he interviewed, who participated in the 1938 Trek, recalled their emotional involvement in the celebrations as intense. Emotions were heightened to such an extent that the Nationalist daily Die Burger estimated that one-tenth of Afrikanerdom participated at the culminating ceremonies in Pretoria at the Voortrekker monument on Dec. 12, 1938. The near-eschatological hopes that the celebrations aroused also left a sense of disappointment after the end of the centenary trek. These were aroused, and at the same time reflected, by such statements such as that in the editorial in the Dec. 15th issue of the Afrikaner weekly Die Oosterlig, which stated that "Tomorrow, a new day will dawn for the Afrikaner people; the dayspring of the fulfillment of its ideal; of victory in its freedom-struggle."

This outbreak of Afrikaner historical consciousness led to the formation of the OB, as a cultural organization, the following year. The outbreak of war in September 1939, declared against the wishes of the majority of Afrikaners, deepened Afrikaner alienation from their English-speaking, white fellow citizens, thereby further strengthening the mood of heightened racial awareness seen in the 1938 centenary celebrations. The Broederbond academics in the 1930's, such as Du Plessis and Diedrichs, who developed Nationalist political philosophy, systematized centuries of Afrikaner practice into a coherent political philosophy. Insularity,
loss of contact with Europe and flight from the onslaught of modern cosmopolitanism (i.e., the Great Trek of the 1830's) became elevated to the official philosophy of the GNP/HNP in the 1930's.

Afrikaner Nationalism was a natural outgrowth of the historical experience of the Afrikaners in South Africa. The extreme nationalist reaction in Germany in the post-World War I era was formed by the Treaty of Versailles, and after the sacrifices of the war, in the case of Italy, by the modest territorial gains that accrued to her. The economic catastrophe of the inter-war period heightened feelings of embittered, wounded national pride. The Nazis, and the Italian Fascists, however, arose in countries and under conditions where racial homogeneity allowed class cleavages to become potent sources of national discord. The Nationalist Party, on the other hand, was formed in a political and social climate that gave greater play to ethnic divisions as the main cleavage points in the political process. The "South Africanists" of the SAP and the Untied Party maintained power between 1910-1927 and 1939-1948 by breaking the tribal adhesion of enough Afrikaners for the NP to ensure their own election with the near-unanimous support of the English. Yet, as the rapid rise of the NP to power after its founding in 1913 and the dominance of the HNP since 1948 both indicate, there seemed to be a natural tendency of Afrikaners to support
their ethnic party, which only extreme crisis such as war or Depression interrupted.

The anti-humanist character of fascism and Naziism, which was shared by the Nationalist Party, is itself somewhat more esoteric than other elements of classic fascism, and is the common thread running through them. A party is anti-humanist if it attempts to buttress social and economic privilege, particularly a great degree of privilege, and receives its support from groups that seek to protect their position from a thrust from below. Both the liberal and the socialist traditions have emphasized at least equality of opportunity. A party movement or regime that attempts to fix class or social structure in such a away that at least social mobility is impossible seems to be denying equal treatment to all sections of the population, so to speak; denying them entry into the promised land. Hyper-nationalism and chauvinism are, by definition, anti-humanist, because they usually imply or entail denying elementary liberal democratic liberties and equitable social treatment to all ethnic or national groups other than their own. Of course, by "humanist", one means "left", or at least "centre liberal-democratic", but the contemporary (post-1945) democratic conservative parties of the Western democracies, by allowing at least a fair degree of social mobility and by adhering to democratic norms, do not appear overly anti-humanist.
The Nationalist Party during the war years seems to fit the description of "anti-humanist". It was authoritarian, right-wing, hypernationalist, and it received the support of a national group composed in part of an intermediate property-owning social class in the midst of the South African social structure. The whole thrust of the HNP was Afrikaner welfare, combatting Afrikaner poverty, insuring Afrikaner dominance in South Africa, in other words advancing the Afrikaner alone, even if it was necessary to establish a repressive authoritarian state. The HNP adhered to the Nationalist interpretation of Calvinism, itself a rather strict, unforgiving version of Christianity, that saw the Afrikaans people as an elect group in South Africa, and South Africa as a divinely promised land. This second "Old Testament" Israel had the right to displace the heathen indigenous inhabitants, who were lost in evil darkness, and needed the light of Christianity provided by a firm guiding hand. Not one Nationalist politician of the Second World War period would have denied this description as anything other than the divinely ordained true destiny of the people.

So, the HNP was an anti-humanist party. Its Christianity was a tribal, reactionary sort of fundamentalism that, at best, viewed the non-AFrikaans inhabitants of South Africa as second-class citizens in their own country (and in the case of the natives, as either benighted tribal savages or a source of cheap labour). As the ideology of the Herenigde Nationalist
Party became more tinged with fascism during the early war years, it more clearly than ever demonstrated, in Nolte's words, that resistance to practical transcendence which is more or less common to all conservative movements. It was only when theoretical transcendence, from which that resistance originally emanated, was likewise denied that fascism made its appearance. Nolte further elaborates that fascism has at its command forces which are born of the emancipation process and then turn against their own origin. If it may be called the despair of the feudal section of bourgeois society for its traditions, and the bourgeois elements betrayed of its revolution, now it is clear what this tradition and this revolution actually are. Fascism represents the second and gravest crisis of liberal society, since it achieves power on its own soil, and in its radical form is the most complete and effective denial of that society.

The HNP, during World War II, was certainly closely linked to the "fascist wave" of the inter-war years, which was a rebellion against equality (the egalitarian and democratic premise of liberal society and socialist thought), a sort of "Nietzschean" assertion of the rights of the "superior", and consequent denial of common humanity.

The Nationalists never really had a 'cult of the leader' comparable to that of Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy. It is true that Malan was proposed as Volksleier in 1941, a position, as mentioned earlier, that Die Transvaler held to be equivalent to Hitler's position in Germany, but this was most
likely in the 'spirit of the times', when during the first years of World War Two a German victory seemed likely, and it would be necessary, in the view of many Nationalist party members, for South Africa to accommodate itself to a new fascist world order. Of course many Nationalists, if not yet most, including the top leadership of the party, were quite willing to do this, but the cult of the leader was not an integral part of Afrikaner nationalism as represented by the HNP as it was of the German Nazis or the Italian fascists, (or of Spanish Falangism, either). It is interest to contrast the HNP's 'view of the leader' with that of their more openly fascist, indeed Nazi, rivals in the Ossewa Brandwag. L.J. du Plessis stated in Die Ossewa Brandwag on May 5, 1943, that the turmoil and stress of the revolution would throw up the Man of Destiny, the authority that he would wield would be almost absolute. This view of leadership was an integral part of the Ossewa Brandwag's wholehearted acceptance of National Socialist ideology.

The Nationalists here, as on so many issues, were more flexible and pragmatic than their more ideologically pure rivals on the extremes of Afrikaner nationalism. No one individual ever did overwhelm, by force of character, this essentially corporate expression of 'ethnic power mobilized', to use Gilliomee's and Adam's terminology. They may have deemed it expedient, even necessary, in the light of the world situation in 1941, to move the party in a fascist direction by
giving Malan the title of Volksleier. They also may have thought that by giving Malan that title, they would successfully preempt the threat from Pirow and Von Rensburg (Commandant of the Ossewa Brandwag) to Malan's and hence the Nationalist Party's leadership of nationalist Afrikanerdom. The party congress of June 1941 which gave Malan the title gave Malan extraordinary powers which had nothing to do with the Volksleirskap and which he was to use to strengthen the organization of the party against the sort of threat that a Pirow-Van Rensburg alliance might be supposed to imply. In any case, although South Africa, and in particular Afrikanerdom, have had a tradition of strong leaders in the twentieth century, there is every reason to believe that the Nationalists, during World War Two, elevated Malan to his formal title as Volksleier for purely opportunistic reasons, in contrast to the cult of the leader that was such an integral component of many forms of European fascism.

Militarism was more of a feature of the Ossewa Brandwag than the Nationalist party during the war years in South Africa. The OB, the designated representative of Afrikanerdom in the cultural field, was organized on a commando basis, and its first units were recruited from the ranks of the South African armed forces. Their activities included military drill and manoeuvres. The OB stormjaers (stormtroopers) took part in extreme anti-government anti-war activities to
the point of sabotage of government and military installations.\textsuperscript{193}

Again here the Nationalist party's viewpoint was pragmatic. Roberts and Trollip state that Malan was not persuaded that braaivleisaande and semi-military parades (to mention no worse) could take the place of parliamentary management and parliamentary institutions.\textsuperscript{194} Whatever the state of Malan's mind, it is a fact that the Nationalist party operated at the parliamentary level. The Nationalist leaders were prepared to go along with the OB and its militant and militaristic orientation up to the point that the OB began to challenge the Nationalist party's status as the political representative of anti-war republican minded Afrikanerdom, or as long as it seemed that fascism would carry the day in the world struggle being played out in the battlefields of Europe and Asia. The HNP was quite eager to distance itself from the ideology of National Socialism and militarism when the OB and the New Order challenged its political role, and when Germany started to lose the war.\textsuperscript{195} Perhaps it would be correct to say that the more overt stream of World War Two vintage Afrikaner fascism, represented by the Ossewa Brandwag, was overtly militaristic and stressed military activities and physical fitness, (connected with military preparedness) as did the German Nazis and Italian fascists.
The Nationalist party was a mass movement, and in this respect it was similar to the NSDAP and the fascist party in Italy. As an ethnic party in a polity characterized by extreme ethnic polarization, the Nationalists had the mass base to be a powerful political organization. The HNP was the party political arm of an interlocking number of volskorganisies dedicated to a single ideology, Afrikaner Nationalism.\textsuperscript{196}

One feature of the South African situation that was unique was the influence of the Broederbond over the HNP. Stultz claims that it controlled the HNP and the related volskorganisies.\textsuperscript{197} It may be more correct to say that the leadership of the HNP, the Dutch Reformed Churches, the other volskorganisies and the Broederbond broadly overlapped. There was a unanimity of purpose amongst the various components of Afrikaner nationalism after the HNP established its dominance in the political field by 1943. Nonetheless, the presence of an autonomous secret society wielding great influence, if not outright control, over the direction and policies of the Nationalist party was unique to the South African case and had no parallel in the cases of the NSDAP or the Italian fascists.

In a wider sense though, the HNP's structure as a mass party dedicated to an authoritarian ideology was similar to that of the Nazis and the fascists. Many of the trappings of a fascist mass party were present. The fever pitch of that Afrikaner nationalist sentiment reached during the Voortrekker
centennial celebrations of 1938, an event organized by the Nationalist party and its related volksorganisies is reminiscent of the enthusiasm of the Nuremberg rallies. The mobilization of a constituency, in this case Nationalist Afrikanerdom, by a well-organized party apparatus, matches the coalition on non-working class interests mobilized by the German Nazis and Italian Fascists.

The NP had more of the characteristics of an inclusive rather than a classic fascist party. Its religious orientation, the fact that it drew its base of support from a primarily rural Afrikaner population, and its multi-class appeal to Afrikaners, seem to put it more in the category of the Spanish Falangism of Franco's Spain, and some of the fascist movements of inter-war Eastern Europe, such as the Slovak Hlinka Guard and the Croatian Ustasi. These last two movements also asserted the national rights of the Slovaks and Croats within the multiethnic Czech and Serb-dominated Czechoslovak and Yugoslav states. In this they were similar to the Nationalists in South Africa, who fought for Afrikaner rights within the Union.

Nazi totalitarianism was the ultimate example of fascist anti-humanism, and Nazi racism the ultimate consequence of Nazi totalitarianism. The radical extremes of Naziism went beyond the imaginings of HNP politicians such as Malan,
Srijdom, Voerwoerd and the others. None of these leaders gave any indication during the war years or before that they contemplated measures in South Africa against the Blacks, Indians, Coloureds or Jews resembling the systematic extermination of the Jewish people in Europe, or the wholesale decimation of the Slavic races, of whom the nearly 4 million dead Soviet POW's were just a harbinger. These crimes, particularly the Nazi extermination of the Jews, had little or no connection with traditional Prussian or German state policy, and were hardly connected with German military policy, but were a direct consequence of Nazi ideology. The "radical" characteristic of Nazi totalitarianism was a distinctive feature of National Socialism. The hyper-racism of National Socialism was the most distinctive characteristic of Nazi "radical totalitarianism." Nazi racism was the apogee of anti-humanist totalitarianism in the twentieth century. The Nazis inaugurated a series of policies, at home and abroad, which broke the bounds of all forms of traditional European conservatism, and in fact were at complete variance with all aspects of traditional liberal, conservative or Judeo-Christian thought. Even traditional Christian anti-semitism was not racially based. It stemmed from religious intolerance, and the conversion of the Jews was a constant goal of the medieval Church, which certainly never envisaged the wholesale extermination of virtually every last Jew solely on the basis of his or her racial descent.
The HNP, and indeed most European fascist movements of the twenties and thirties, did not have aims which were as divorced from traditional European moral and political norms, and that were as ambitious in their scope. Now, the Nazis were not the only architects of mass slaughter among the European fascists, as the Croat and Rumanian example illustrate. Franco's regime in Spain was also brutally repressive; it slaughtered hundreds of thousands of Republican sympathizers in Spain between 1936 and 1945.

The worst offenders amongst the fascist states of Europe did not act from the purely racist motivations of the Nazis, and therein lies the crucial difference between Naziism and all other forms of fascism. Racism is probably the ultimate form of anti-humanism, in that it denies common humanity to a particular group, simply on the basis of their genetic descent or their skin colour. By their own route, the Nationalist Party of South Africa arrived at a position as inhumane and as illiberal as that of the Nazis. In this, they were more similar to the Nazis that virtually any of the other inter-war fascists. The Spanish slaughters originated in class and ideological hatreds fanned by civil war. The Croat and Rumanian massacres had their roots in ethnic-national religious antagonisms. The nazi regime pursued its policies in the East, and indeed in Germany itself, on behalf of a secular pseudo-scientific racism. The Nazi slaughters were done coldly, at the behest of the top party leadership, and
were not as popular with the Germans as were the massacres of Serbs and Jews perpetrated by the Ustasi and the Iron Guard.

In Naziism, secularized racism sunders itself from its historical antecedents. In Hannah Arendt's definition of racism, Nazi racism was a development of hyper-nationalism, but in such a one-sided, radical, totalitarian way that it substituted long-term interests of the race, which included the extermination or subjugation of other races or nations, for the traditional aims of German foreign policy, securing Germany's frontiers with France, or gaining colonies in Africa. The anti-semitism of Christianity, the fundamental source of European racist hostility to the Jews, is transmuted into a just defence against racial infection by the Aryan peoples, needing no further justification. The Jews were guilty not because they were not Christians, but just because they were Jews. Jews in the eyes of traditional Christianity were in principle redeemable; in Naziism they were no more redeemable than cancer cells. Nazi racism attempted to create, in H. Arendt's term, a "Race" of Aristocrats Against a "Nation of Citizens" all over Europe. Through refashioning the German people, by culling out the weak, retarded, elderly and chronically ill, as was done to Germans between 1939 and 1941 until Church pressure and public outcry led by Cardinal Galen stopped it, German racist National Socialism went far beyond the bounds of traditional nationalism, as well as of Christian values. Nazi racism was nationalism gone wild,
cancerous, eating up its surrounding environment, even the forces that nurtured it, nullifying all other values. Nazi totalitarianism was not unique in its brutality, but in using that brutality in such a systematic, cold and thorough way.

Now the Nationalist Party certainly continued to display a consistent racism throughout World War II, towards the non-whites of South Africa. H. Arendt saw in the Afrikaner relationship to the blacks of South Africa the ambiguity of viewing them as less than human, and yet as men created in God's image just as themselves. "The great horror which had seized European men at their first confrontation with native live was stimulated by precisely the touch of inhumanity at human beings who apparently were as much a part of nature as wild animals. The Boers lived on their slaves exactly the way natives had lived on an unprepared and unchanging nature." This racism, which viewed the Bantu and Capoids as something less than human, was tempered and excused by their Christianity, the one thing that at the early stages of Afrikaner history seemed to set the Trekboer apart from the natives.

The HNP, of course, never envisaged leading the blacks to a dominating role in South Africa. In the 1948 parliamentary debate, J.G. Strijdom, one of the most open and honest of the Nationalist politicians, attacked liberal United Party minister Hofmeyr for his liberal humanitarian intention to eventually remove the colour bar: "Strijdom sneered at
Hofmeyr ... Could not Hofmeyr understand that the white man ruled by power, not by merit? Strijdom's honesty was rare; most Afrikaner nationalist politicians advocated the colour bar and racial discrimination over the non-whites of South Africa because it was ordained by God, and ultimately in the best interest of the native as well as the white. This "need to justify" could be accounted for by their religiosity, and their need to salve their "Christian conscience."

André Du Toit believes that this Christian, in fact specifically Calvinist rationalization of early Afrikaner racial domination in South Africa was more of a facet and creation of a 19th century Neo-Calvinist thinking and of 20th century Afrikaner Nationalist ideology and not the primary rationale or spur to Trekboer attitude toward the non-whites of South Africa. Du Toit believes the literature of the period is more indicative of a frontier mentality towards non-whites sundered from the civilizing, humanizing influence of Church and State. Arendt recapitulates the myth, which is more useful in understanding Afrikaner views of their past, than in understanding the behaviour or rationalization of that behaviour by their forbears.

The record of Afrikaner nationalism in power, after May 1948, certainly shows nothing to compare with the Nazi extermination of the Jews and Slavs during World War II. Nor was their control over the whites of South Africa in any way comparable to Nazi totalitarian control. White South Africa
has been a racially exclusive democracy from 1948 to the present day. However, their totalitarian control over the blacks of South Africa, in particular their organization and strengthening of segregation in South Africa since they have been in power, is indicative of a strong authoritarian, even totalitarian streak within the party. It should not necessarily be assumed that a hypothetical Christian Nationalist fascist republic in South Africa, although Calvinist dogma would have been part of the core of its ideology, would not have been tempted to imitate the Nazi practices of genocidal "race purification". Perhaps Nationalist or Afrikaner restraint in terms of not exterminating their natives might have stemmed from their reliance on the Bantu as a cheap labour force underpinning their economy, as much as from Christian tempering of raw racial domination.

The anti-semitism of the HNP, in contrast to that of the NSDAP, was not an integral part of that party's ideology. Most Jews in South Africa were descendants of poor Eastern European Jews who had immigrated to the Transvaal after the gold discoveries of 1886. The success some of them had may have laid an undercurrent of anti-semitism amongst Afrikaners that resurfaced with the rise of Naziism in the 1930's. The old Nationalist Party of Hertzog had no tradition of anti-semitic tendencies. Malan, in 1930, brought in an
immigration bill to limit entry into South Africa for Eastern European immigrants, mainly Jews, and Malan many years later admitted that was the aim of the bill.\textsuperscript{207} The fact is that the Nationalists were suspicious of all who were not Germano-Dutch-French Protestants, but were not especially anti-semitic, and were prepared to tolerate a minimal number of Jews in South Africa. As long as the latter kept their place, there was even a small degree of sympathy for them as a persecuted race. Yahweh's covenant with Moses on behalf of Israel in Exodus was in fact the model of the Afrikaner covenant with God. The Israelites, like the Afrikaners, were supposedly led by God to settle and conquer a nation of barbarous, evil heathens.

This original view changed radically in the 1930's with the rise of Hitler and Nazi Germany. The Nationalists began to talk about "British-Jewish" capitalism exploiting the Afrikaner, and many nationalists were involved in agitation against Jewish immigration into South Africa. The extreme wing of the HNP, led by Voerwoerd, editor of \textit{Die Transvaler} in the immediate prewar period and during the war, and by J.G. Strijdom among others, was violently anti-semitic.

In 1936 Voerwoerd was one of several prominent Nationalist academics opposing further Jewish immigration into South Africa. That year, the United Party government bowed to Nationalist Party pressure to limit Jewish immigration into South Africa by drafting an aliens bill. This bill was even
strict than the 1930 Immigration Law. Refugee organizations attempted to bring in more refugees from Germany aboard a ship they chartered, the S.S. *Stuttgart*. Voerwoerd was one of the main speakers at a meeting held on November 4th to protest their arrival, and he called upon the government to halt further Jewish immigration into South Africa because, among other things, the Jews were an unassimilable element.²⁰⁸

There were other instances of Nationalist anti-semitism around this time. Jews were forbidden membership in the Nationalist Party from 1940 until the 1960's. The leader of the openly Nazi Greyshirt movement, Weichardt, eventually became a Nationalist Senator. Clearly, the GNP/HNP was open to Nazi influence at this point, but as the fortunes of war changed, and certainly after Hitler's defeat, anti-semitism was put on the back-burner and eventually shelved. The HNP was never inherently philosemitic or anti-semitic; they have moved from not considering the issue, prior to 1937, to closely identifying with Nazi anti-semitism, to establishing fairly closely relations with Israel in the 1970's and 1980's, particularly after the rise to power of the Begin/Likud government in 1977.

GNP/HNP anti-semitism is another example of Nationalist politicians not really fully understanding, or caring to understand Nazi ideology. They saw Germany as a power opposed to their old enemy Britain, and opposed to Soviet Russia, advocate of internationalism and uncompromising anti-racism.
Perhaps this was all that was necessary for them to be pro-German, and pro-Nazi. The fine points of Nazi extremism, the ideology of a Heydrich, Eichmann or a Kaltenbrunner, which saw total genocide as a solution to the "Jewish problem", was not in the minds of the HNP leaders when they occasionally identified themselves with National Socialism.
CHAPTER V

The HNP was not a Nazi party, because it was not a full-fledged, exclusive fascist party. It was not an exclusive fascist party -- even though it was authoritarian, right-wing, hypernationalist, and anti-humanist -- because it was not a class-based movement, as Naziism and Italian Fascism were; the Nationalist Party was an ethnic party, advancing the interests of all classes of Afrikaners. The Nationalists did, however, betray signs of Nazi influence in some areas.

Clear signs of Nazi fascist influence can be found in the HNP's authoritarianism, its right-wing anticommunism, its Nazi-induced anti-semitism, in its cult of the leader the militarism of the Ossewa Brandwag is an example of Nazi influence on Afrikaner fascism writ large. The emphasis on hierarchy and leadership that one finds in the statements of Nationalist leaders or in pro-Nationalist publications and documents in the late 1930's and early 1940's is not coincidental. It as a conscious attempt to pattern Nationalist ideology upon Nazi and fascist authoritarianism. The overt anti-communism of the Nationalist Party was certainly stimulated by the growth of the world fascism in the 1930's, but was inherent in the racist ideology of the Nationalists. Nationalist anti-semitism during the same period was also derived from Nazi ideology.

The glorification of the leader, though never taken to anywhere near the same extent as in Germany, was a phenomenon
that occurred in the Nationalist party during World War Two, and was probably influenced by the examples of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. It is also the case, however, that the attribution of the title of Volksleier to Malan was partly influenced by the need of Malan and the Nationalist Party to maintain their political supremacy amongst Nationalist Afrikaners over the OB and the New Order. Van Rensburg and Pirow were also contenders for the title of Volksleier. At any rate, the cult of the leader never assumed anywhere near the importance to the Nationalist Party as it did to the Nazis, or the Italian Fascists.

A militaristic orientation was a feature of one facet of Afrikaner fascism, the Ossewa Brandwag. With its emphasis on military training and physical fitness, and the openly Nazi ideology of its leader J.J. van Rensburg, this designated 'cultural arm' of Afrikaner nationalism was the logical vehicle for fascist type militarism in South Africa. The Nationalist Party itself, with its more pragmatic, parliamentary orientation shied away from a militarist ideological bent.

In other ways, the Nationalists and their Broederbond controllers were similar, but not necessarily influenced by, foreign fascist sources. Similarities can be found in the HNP's authoritarianism, its emphasis on state-controlled capitalism, its hypernationalism, its anti-humanist racism and its organization as a mass party. The Broederbond control of
the Nationalist party was stimulated, but not exclusively modelled upon, Nazi authoritarianism. Broederbond influence over the Nationalists was quite extensive during the 1920's, although the party was more democratic in form and substance while Hertzog was leader. The idea of a secretive elite controlling a mass movement was certainly affected by the rise of authoritarian fascism in the 1930's.

Another similarity between the Nationalists and the Nazis was their shared commitment to controlled capitalism. Here one can more readily speak of a similarity rather than of influence, for the Nationalists, ever since the first Hertzog government, were committed to a form of racist-controlled capitalism. The rise of fascism in the 1930's, however, probably stimulated statist thought amongst Afrikaner Nationalist political leaders and intellectuals.

It is hard to say whether the flowering of Nationalist ideology, propounded by Diedrichs and others, was influenced by Nazi ideology. The glorification of ethnicity is certainly a common trait of National Socialism and Afrikaner Christian Nationalism, and accounts in part for the sympathy with which many Afrikaner Nationalists viewed Nazi Germany.

Anti-humanist racism was something the German Nazis and the Nationalists had in common. The HNP leadership identified with a philosophy that espoused the superiority of the white Nordic race. Nazi racism meshed quite well with the Afrikaner
historical experience of wrenching the country from dark heathen savages, and maintaining their superiority over them.

A similarity between the Nazis and the Nationalists was the fact that they were both mass parties. The Nationalist Party was already a large mass based ethnic party before the rise of Nazi Germany, and although it may have owed some of its propagandistic devices, such as the Voortrekker centenary celebrations, to the Nazis, it is more likely that the growth of the Party machinery and its limited use of mass spectacles (the Voortrekker celebrations again), were the result of a parallel process of development, and not imitation.

There are two sharp differences in outlook between the Nazi worldview, and the outlook and background of the Nationalist leadership and its supporters. The depths of Nazi nihilism were never evident to the leadership of the Nationalist Party. The total break with all Christian and liberal democratic standards that included mass extermination of entire peoples was not a part of Nationalist ideology. It is not a totally insignificant fact that the Nationalist leaders, representative of their followers, were virtually all believing Christians, whereas the Nazis were either not devout or outright atheists and agnostics. The Nationalist leaders were very much the representatives of an ethnic community, its folkways, its ways of life, and its beliefs. In this they were similar to the Croatian Ustasi, the Slovak Hlinka Guard, and other Eastern European "inclusive" fascist movements.
The Nazis were very much uprooted moderns in all respects. They were in the main not university-educated (Goebbels being a notable exception), not wealthy, and had no strong ideological orientation before they came into the Nazi party. They make a sharp contrast with the Nationalist leadership of the thirties and forties. Dr. Malan was a predikant, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church. Strijdom was an attorney, Voerwoerd was a university professor: "after obtaining his B.A. with distinction, majoring in sociology, psychology and logic, Hendrik got a university appointment as a demonstrator in the Department of Psychology." The other Afrikaner leaders were at least farmers, landowners with a profound stake in South Africa, and a prosperous South African economy.

The extreme religio-national parochialism that was the ethos, the raison d'être of the HNP, similar to that of the Ustasi in Croatia, does not lead the observer to conclude that anything like the pogroms perpetrated by the latter group would have necessarily occurred under such a regime. There is a complete absence of violent or murderous rhetoric by the Nationalist Party and its leaders during the war period. The Nationalists would have been constrained, in any case, from exterminating the Bantu as their ancestors exterminated the San, because the South African economy had grown dependent on Black labour. However, it is interesting to note that one of the ultimate aims of Voerwoerd's apartheid (as formulated and
applied by him during his reign as Prime Minister from 1958 to 1966) was to free South Africa's economy from dependence upon Black labour. At any rate, the Nationalist Party made no attempt to indicate it had any totalitarian genocidal aims towards the non-Whites in the country during the war years. The racism of the Nationalist Party, combined with other factors, pushed them in the direction of the radical fascism of the Germany Nazis during World War II. There is, however, no proof of radical fascist aims comparable to the practice of the Nazis during this period.

The other thing that differentiates the Nationalists from classic fascist movements is that while the Nationalist Party fed off the social discontent of most classes of Afrikaners its mainstay seems to have been the nationalism of a wide body of Afrikaner farmers, teachers, civil servants and other petit bourgeois. These groups suffered from the inequities of the economic system in South Africa, but their discontent, as was the case with Afrikaner poor whites, was a combination of social and national frustrations. That the Nationalist Party increased its popular support in the 1943 election while the booming South African economy benefited all sections of the population indicates the power that its fundamentally nationalist appeal had to most Afrikaners. Opposition to British domination of South Africa was often a fusion of social and national concerns for particular groups, as was the case of Afrikaner farmers in the Cape, who wanted state support
to create new extra-Imperial export markets, but Afrikaner resentment at British imperialism was the driving impetus of the party. Most Afrikaners fed off a long tradition of resentment against British colonialism and imperialism, and did not like to feel like foreigners in their own country, particularly when it could be reclaimed through the ballot box.\(^{214}\) It was this tradition that Hertzog tapped when he attempted to assert South Africa's sovereignty, by not going to war in 1939.\(^ {215}\) The failure of Hertzog's gambit inflamed the nationalist passions of most Afrikaners, who felt they were acting as a colony again, in fighting Britain's war.

It is here that the third point of this definition of fascism helps clarify the question of the HNP's fascism or Naziism. The "exclusive" definition of fascism given here denies the title of "pure" or "classic fascist movement" to the HNP. In an ethnically and racially homogeneous country, such as Germany or Italy, one sees the forces which give rise to fascism come out in a clear form. Fascism's initial mass base is the lower middle class, and it expands to include the peasants, the upper middle class, and the upper echelons. Fascism, as argued here, is a reaction by a multi-class coalition of the lower middle, middle and upper classes to the demands of the urban proletariat. (The Nazis received some working-class support, but the overwhelming bulk of the working class supported the Communists or Social Democrats.) Fascism rejects the claims of the workers to economic equality
in the form of Socialism in order to defend, maintain or reclaim the bourgeois coalition's stake in the system as property holders. In Italy in the 1920's and Germany in the 1930's, we saw this process occur. A reaction to some of the demands of the working classes takes place, basically unsullied by religious conviction or ethnic divisions. Neither Hitler nor Mussolini can be accused of religious bigotry. Hitler never made his peace with the churches, and the first Fascist program in Italy included the nationalization of Church property. Neither the Italian nor the German movement had a 'Christian' goal.²¹⁶

If the Nationalist Party can be said to have been fascist during World War Two, it would have to be in the 'inclusive' sense that many of the eastern European fascist movements of the time can be so described. Perhaps the Nationalists can be considered to be a fascist movement particularly adapted, to conditions in South Africa. Its pragmatic constitutionalism derived from British parliamentary forms and practice being a more successful adaptation to South African conditions, given the unfavourable (from the standpoint of most nationalist-minded Afrikaners during World War Two) turn of the war, than the more dogmatic obviously Nazi influenced fascism propounded by groups such as the New Order and the Ossewa Brandwag.

So, it is the third point of "classic" fascism -- middle-class reaction to the left, resulting in an authoritarian, leader-centred, one-party regime -- that is the most marked
feature of "classic" fascism, what really distinguishes it from more traditionalist, rightist, inclusive fascist movements or governments. The HNP, during the war years, showed authoritarian leanings; it was right-wing in that it upheld the private property rights of Afrikaner farmers and businessmen, and was militantly anti-communist, and was hypernationalist and anti-humanist in that it was racist. It fails the test of qualifying as a classic fascist movement, in that it was a nationalist, all-class party, reacting against foreign domination, on behalf of a particular ethnic group within a multinational state. In this respect, it differs from characteristics of the German National Socialists and the Italian Fascists. The defense of the property-holding status of the Afrikaner, which was an aim of the Nationalist party throughout its history, was mingled with the objective of securing the maximum possible amount of Afrikaner sovereignty in South Africa, to the benefit of all social classes of Afrikaners. The tendency to secure a complete break with the Commonwealth, which became obvious during the war years, further defines the purely nationalist objectives of the Nationalist party.
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