C. Kros, ***The Seeds of Separate Development: Origins of Bantu Education***
Unisa Press, Pretoria, 2010
193 pp
ISBN 978-1-86888-522-0
R210.00

The legacy of Bantu Education has been an enduring one. It was the brainchild of the Eiselen Report and its failure was epitomised by the student uprisings of 1976. The Eiselen Report, like the man for whom it was named, W.W.M. Eiselen, is an ambiguous document. On the one hand it sought to contain the intellectual possibilities of education and hence the political consciousness of African students, while on the other hand it attempted to face the challenges affecting education, many of which remain today.

By tracing the intellectual life and influences of W.W.M Eiselen, Cynthia Kros is able to look at the events shaping Bantu Education, viewing it not simply as a product of apartheid policy but as shaping apartheid ideology itself. In the introduction to *The Seeds of Separate Development: Origins of Bantu Education*, Kros draws parallels between Eiselen and Adolf Eichmann, men who, driven by their ideological beliefs, saw themselves as

"idealists". Using Hannah Arendt's work on Eichmann, Kros suggests that Eiselen played a significant role in the normalising of apartheid – the "banalisation of evil" (p xvi). Nevertheless, Eiselen cannot be divorced from his context.

Kros continues this theme in the first chapter, "Rising Nation and Nationalism", where she assesses the existing historiography relating to Afrikaner nationalism and the creation of the apartheid state, drawing upon the work of O'Meara, Giliomee and Dubow. Dan O'Meara allocates the rise of Afrikaner nationalism to the emergent Afrikaner middle class, while Hermann Giliomee resists this view of Afrikaner nationalism as a product of capitalism, emphasising not only the historical identity of Afrikaners as developed from the seventeenth century, but also the way in which the global context of the 1930s and 1940s helped shape apartheid. This is integral to the work of Saul Dubow, where he demonstrates that in the aftermath of the Holocaust, ideas of racial inferiority were justifiably unpopular and notions of culture instead became a marker of difference. It is the latter intellectual trend that was to influence Eiselen. Kros's biography of Eiselen is thus an attempt to combine the world of ideas with that of lived experience and through the lens of this deeply ambiguous figure, a means of understanding Bantu Education and the origins of apartheid ideology.

Eiselen's early influences form the subject matter of the second chapter, "Son of the Berlin Mission". Growing up in Botshabelo, his parents members of the Berlin Mission Society (BMS), Eiselen was hardly unaware of the belief system of the BMS, especially when it came to an understanding of culture. The German missionaries stood on the fringes of two worlds, belonging to neither English nor Afrikaner settler society, nor indigenous African societies. They did not follow the ideology of the British missions with their emphasis on the "civilising mission" and the ultimate incorporation of indigenous people; nor did they countenance the "Boers' vulgar racism" (p 17). Instead, the BMS focused on the *volkseie* which can be interpreted as the unique cultural aspects of a group. Preaching in indigenous languages gave them an understanding of the value of indigenous culture. In terms of education, instruction in the mother tongue would help in the preservation of indigenous culture against Western encroachment.

After his postgraduate education in Germany, Eiselen took up a senior lecturership at the University of Stellenbosch. This was during the Pact Government where the "native question" loomed large due to the competition between black and white labour culminating in Hertzog's restrictive legislation. Hertzog's discriminatory policies were strongly opposed by Christian liberals such as Edgar Brookes. Eiselen's response to Brookes was a defence of the separation of races, demonstrating the influence of scientific racism and showing his support of the Afrikaner nationalists. He was later to moderate these views but his emphasis on mother tongue instruction and a "strong rejection of assimilation" (p 25) were to remain.

Although the University of Stellenbosch had a history of association with prominent Afrikaner nationalists, Eiselen did not find himself at ease there. The Stellenbosch academic at the time focused on his academic and intellectual influences forming what Kros, drawing upon the work of Aletta Norval, cites as the "horizon of intelligibility" (p 30). In effect Eiselen operated within a particular intellectual and cultural milieu which shaped his thinking. As a student, one of his graduate teachers was Dietrich Westermann, a former Berlin missionary who believed in the use of language to understand the belief system of cultural groups – a view that was espoused by the proponents of indirect rule during the colonial period. Anthropology at Afrikaans

universities was influenced by the German school of thought but Eiselen drew also upon the British approach, in particular the work of Malinowski with its emphasis on the complexity of indigenous societies and their structures of power and knowledge, which Eiselen incorporated into his own thinking. He often found himself more readily able to identify with the English-medium universities such as Wits, eventually resigning from Stellenbosch to become the chief inspector of "native" education in the Transvaal in 1936. As such, Eiselen does not fit easily into the mould of Afrikaner nationalists like Verwoerd, for instance.

Eiselen's emphasis on indigenous languages and the use of mother tongue instruction was not simply a product of nationalist views of segregation but had its origins in his BMS background and his academic training. Although mother tongue instruction and cultural difference came to be seen by 1976 as a hated feature of Bantu Education, Eiselen's views were by no means reviled at the outset. The growing division in indigenous groups between the mission-educated, English-speaking intellectual elite and others meant that some African educators supported Eiselen's policy on mother tongue instruction, especially if they had not received mission education. Moreover, the 1930s and 1940s were a period of increasing radicalisation in black politics which emphasised the value of indigenous culture and language within the ambit of African nationalism. Cultural distinctiveness was not the sole prerogative of ardent Afrikaner nationalists. When Eiselen resigned his post in "native" education, many Africans believed it to be in protest to segregationist policies – an astonishing view of a man who was a member of both the Broederbond and New Order.

In Chapters 5 and 6, Kros pays greater heed to the context of the 1940s, drawing attention to the limited purview of liberalism in this period which viewed assimilation as only a distant possibility, focusing instead on the "civilising mission" and acknowledging cultural distinctiveness. According to the recommendations made by the liberal Social and Economic Planning Council, the government should take responsibility for the education of natives and make the "reserves" viable through the improvement of agriculture and establishment of industry on the periphery. The United Party government, in line with international trends, particularly Roosevelt's New Deal, envisioned a greater role for the state in providing health care, primary school education and pensions to Africans. On the other hand, the National Party concern was with the "poor white" problem. This occurred against a backdrop of rising African militancy – the African mineworkers' strike, bus boycotts in Alexandra, Communist Party activism against the carrying of passes, protests against betterment policies and the riot at Lovedale, which forms the focus of Chapter 6. Kros views this as being not dissimilar to 1976 with students protesting having to engage in manual labour, hierarchical and preferential treatment and an education policy "recommended as appropriate for African students being prepared to meet the world of segregation" (p 80).

The focus of "Prelude to the Eiselen Commission" is on the Fagan and Sauer Reports. The former, utilised by the United Party but rejected by Eiselen, acknowledged the presence of Africans in the urban areas of South Africa, suggesting that complete segregation was unattainable. Criticised as being riddled with "ambiguities", these ambiguities nevertheless, according to Kros, reflected the friction evident in the country. In contrast, the Sauer Report was a concrete symbol of National Party emphasising the value of total segregation as protecting white and black interests. Eiselen himself embraced the report, pointing out "the alienating nature of Native Education" (p 90) which left little place for African intellectuals in either white or black society. He

criticised the Fagan Report for its acceptance of African urbanisation which relegated Africans to perpetual inequality as well as leading to an over-reliance on cheap black labour, exacerbating the "poor white" problem.

In her final chapter, Kros discusses the Eislen Commission and Report, pointing out that they need to be contextualised as a project of the modern state with education playing a key role. The unrest of the 1940s had suggested the collapse of "traditional authority" and the solution was an emphasis on culture and mother tongue instruction to contain African political awareness and alleviate the disruption brought about by modernity. This would be the new vision of native education. The Eiselen Report which became a hallmark of apartheid ideology was however not simply a product of Afrikaner nationalist thinking. As Kros painstakingly demonstrates in her argument, it was a product of intellectual ideas about culture, the role of the modern state and even liberal values. Kros thus shows that the Eiselen Report, and its subsequent effects on Bantu Education, was not only a key feature of apartheid rather than a mere by-product, but that apartheid itself takes on a more nuanced aspect, shaped by its context and bounded by the intellectual horizons of the 1940s. For Eiselen, a policy so heinous could indeed have a moral foundation.

Suryakanthie Chetty
University of Johannesburg