

A TRIANGLE OF FORCES: LANGUAGE, RELIGION AND POLITICS

BY

J. SMUTS



GRAHAMSTOWN
RHODES UNIVERSITY

1973

**A TRIANGLE OF FORCES:
LANGUAGE, RELIGION AND
POLITICS**

**INAUGURAL LECTURE DELIVERED AT
RHODES UNIVERSITY
on 3rd April, 1973.**

BY

J. SMUTS

M.A., Ph.D. (Cape Town)

PROFESSOR OF AFRIKAANS/NEDERLANDS

**GRAHAMSTOWN
RHODES UNIVERSITY**

1973

*Dedicated to the memory of a great scholar
and teacher, Rob Antonissen,
Professor of Afrikaans/Nederlands
at Rhodes University, 1958-70,*

A TRIANGLE OF FORCES: LANGUAGE, RELIGION AND POLITICS.

“It is peculiarly important that linguists, who are often accused, and accused justly, of failure to look beyond the pretty patterns of their subject, should become aware of what their science may mean for the interpretation of human conduct in general. Whether they like it or not, they must become increasingly concerned with the many anthropological, sociological and psychological problems which invade the field of linguistics.” This statement was made in 1929 by Edward Sapir, the noted American anthropologist, whose work provided some of the first mainsprings of modern linguistics, in an article entitled “The status of linguistics as a science”. It cannot be said that linguistics continues to repel psychological problems, but even so most linguists to-day are not sufficiently aware of, or concerned about, issues which encroach upon anthropology and sociology.

I offer these comments as justification for choosing a topic for my address which by right belongs to the domain of sociolinguistics, and which I hope will be of more general interest than a purely linguistic subject.

Throughout recorded history there has been a powerful interaction between language on the one hand and religion and politics on the other, and this has affected in no small way the course of history of most of the civilised tongues, not least of which the Afrikaans language, which owes its rise to the status of a recognized official language and a cultural language in large measure to the working of religious and political factors.

In this address I propose to examine briefly the significance of the link and interaction between language, religion and politics, in particular in their South African context.

In his book *Voices of Man* Mario Pei makes the assertion: "The only valid reason for linking together language, race, nationality and religion is that they possess a least common denominator of intolerance and fanaticism, founded upon a basic misunderstanding of each and every one of them. Throughout recorded history we see men fighting, killing and dying in the name of one or another of these slogan words".¹ I do not share this view. Language, religion and politics are all social phenomena, and in civilized or, in modern parlance, developed countries, also cultural phenomena. They provide for some of man's most basic needs, viz. the need for a means of self-expression and communication, the need for someone or something to worship and for belief in some being or power which controls man's destiny, and the need for regulation of the affairs of a human community with which every human being identifies himself.

LANGUAGE

R. H. Robins states: ". . . the acquisition and the use of language are amongst the most distinctively human of all human capabilities. Language is the raw material of all literature, whether written or oral, in all cultures; the existence of language is an indispensable condition of human culture and social life as we know it or have ever known it."² It may be safely asserted that all languages are all-pervasive within their respective communities, that they are all normally a reflex, instinctive action once they are properly acquired, that they are geographically localized, socially stratified, subject to change, but also to standardizing influence.³

It is primarily language which has enabled man to gain the mastery over other animals and over nature. It is man's greatest invention, consisting in the systematic application of previous behaviour patterns. No other species of living beings has been

able to conventionalize the cries and utterances, by means of which animals interact, into a system of symbols, the use of which involves cerebration.

Man seems to have a predisposition to interpret symbolically everything in the environment with which he interacts. The abstract nature of the linguistic symbols means that man has at his disposal a powerful aid to thinking processes with unlimited possibilities for cultural development.

Man is unique in two ways: he is a talking-animal and a tool-bearing animal. "In the pursuit of their tool-bearing activities, men and women have learned to co-operate on a planetary scale, but such co-operation is perpetually thwarted by local limitations of their speech-habits.⁴

For while language is common to all the peoples of the world, there is no common language, but according to an arbitrary estimate some 3 000 different tongues, exclusive of minor dialects. The majority of these are only in oral use and some are spoken by tribes numbering only a few thousand or a few hundred. In fact, there are only 13 languages with 50 million or more speakers, in numerical order: Chinese, English, Hindustani, Russian, Spanish, German, Japanese, French, Malay, Bengali, Portuguese, Italian and Arabic. India's millions speak 33 major languages and a host of minor languages. Afrikaans, in view of the fact that it is a written language with a literature and some 3 million speakers, accordingly has a claim to be rated above the majority of the languages of the world. And if we think of S. Africa as a multilingual country, let us remember that in the U.S.A. there are some 30 million with a mother tongue other than English. G. B. Shaw claimed that "England and America are two countries separated by the same language". Because of the modern means of communication such as the radio, the movies and television, British and American English have been drawing closer. But the technological achievements that have made the world a smaller place have not had the effect of reducing the number of languages in the world. The most surprising phenomenon is the survival of dialects in civilized countries with a standard language, despite

factors such as universal education, modern communications, etc. As Mario Pei states: "The natural tendency of a language is centrifugal, not centripetal".⁵

In the hundred years between 1800 and 1900 the number of full-fledged national languages in Europe increased from 16 to 30, and in the first 37 years of the present century Europe's standard languages further multiplied to 53, adding almost as many to their number as in the entire thousand years that went before.⁶

The tremendous technological developments of the present age have not lessened the importance of language. Visual means of communication such as the cinema and television, and photographs transmitted by radiotelegraphy or communication satellites have a powerful effect in bringing home to us events and conditions in other countries, but a picture can never have the impact of emotionally charged slogans such as "apartheid", "uhuru", "racial equality", "white imperialism" and "black power", "boerehaat" and "swart gevaar".

Language is abundantly misused for propaganda purposes, but this is not something new. The earliest example of its use in a "war of nerves" is a Sumerian poem written 5 000 years ago. It is, however, unfair to charge language with serving evil by acting as an auxiliary to intolerance, discrimination and hatred, the undermining of moral standards, law and order, to which much of the energy of the press and radio seems to be devoted at present, for language, like science, is impersonal, and it is man who deserves the blame for its misuse.

LANGUAGE AND RELIGION

There is no intrinsic link between language and religion, but the higher religions could not have developed without the aid of language. In the case of languages which have served as carriers of religion, the effect upon the language has been considerable, as witness the cases of Greek and Latin which served Christianity, Hebrew, which served Judaism, and Arabic, which served Islam in that rôle.

It is a fact that the majority of languages have as their earliest written documents a religious text. Mario Pei states: "It might almost be suspected that writing was developed not as an auxiliary to speech, but as an aid to religion and a depository of religious tradition".⁷ The Akkadian cuneiform and the Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions are mainly concerned with sacred matters, while Avestan, a language akin to Sanscrit, is known only by the sacred writings of ancient Iran and of Zoroastrianism. Even the earliest writings in German were intended for religious instruction.

Nearly all the great religions of the world have either given rise to a language or have caused the obscure dialects which first served them to spread to other lands and to develop into languages of importance. The Jewish faith spread Aramaic and Hebrew, and also Jiddish, over a great section of the globe. Mohammedanism spread the once isolated language of Southern Arabia to vast regions of Europe, Asia, Africa and Oceania, where it influenced native tongues like Persian, Hindustani, Turkish, Malay, Hausa, etc.

Christianity, which found two established languages, Latin and Greek, ready to act as its bearers, ensured the survival and spread of these languages in spite of the invasions by foreign speaking barbarians, who overran the Roman Empire, for they were converted to Christianity and adopted not only the religion, but also the language, Latin, that was bound up with it. At a later stage Christianity, however, broke down the classical system of aristocracy in language whereby only Greek and Latin were considered worthy of study, by making an appeal to peoples in their own tongues. Even before the fall of the Roman Empire missionaries started to reduce spoken languages to written form for purposes of converting the speakers to Christianity, in the process giving these tongues dignity and a literature. This work has continued without interruption ever since practically all over the world. Numerous written languages have as their first written document a translation of the Bible. The earliest is probably the 4th century translation of the Bible into Gothic, the first Germanic language

to have a literature. Religious texts played a very important part in the standardization and modernization of established tongues; for example the King James Version of the Bible did much to fix the standards of modern literary English, while Luther's translation of the Bible laid the foundation for modern German.

As early as the 5th century St. Augustine, in reply to criticism that he made use of vulgarisms in preaching the gospel, stated: "It is better that the grammarians should chide than that the people should not understand".

Perhaps the most important historical incident in which language and religion played an interrelated part was Charlemagne's encyclical of 786, ordering the bishops and priests of his realm to use a more grammatically correct Latin in the sermons and scriptural readings of the churches. This led to the destruction of the already tottering Vulgar Latin, which had relied on the support of the familiar Church language. The classical language was incomprehensible to the people and the spoken tongue was swiftly transformed into Old French. In 813 Charlemagne was forced to recognize the new state of linguistic affairs in his northern French provinces and, reversing his earlier decision, ordered the Church sermons to be delivered in the *lingua romana rustica*, the newly-born French language, instead of the *lingua latina*.

The Reformation hastened the rise of the vernacular languages. Protestantism laid emphasis on the reading of the Bible and on the sermon, as the centre of the divine service, and therefore attached much importance to the translation of the Bible into the vernacular languages, which often meant the starting point of a literature in such languages at the very time that the invention of printing made the production of books easier and cheaper.

For a millenium after the break-up of the western provinces of the Roman Empire in the 5th century a living unitary Western Christian Church had taken the place of a unitary Roman Empire. The Reformation found instruments and allies in the parochial sovereign states against the oecumenical Western Church, and in the parochial vernacular languages as against

the oecumenical Latin language. In all Western countries the cultivation of the vernacular languages was now extended from the fields of literature into the fields of administration, law and science, but due to the influence of the Catholic church Latin retained an important position in the field of education until the 19th century.

Another interesting aspect is the particular vocabulary of the religious writings of certain of the higher religions, a term used by Toynbee for the newer religions which rise above nature-worship and man-worship.⁸ The equation of religion with belief is rather recent, for primitive religion was concerned wholly with practice. The notion of beliefs came to the higher religions from the philosophers, as is obvious in the case of the Indian group of religions. Christianity and Islam did not originate in philosophical surroundings, but in regions within the Greek cultural sphere. The exposition of Christianity in the Greek language made its implication in Greek philosophy inevitable, because by the first century A.D. the Greek language had long been imbued with a Greek philosophical vocabulary. Islam likewise came into being in a region which for a thousand years had been under the influence of Greek culture and expressed its beliefs in Greek philosophical terminology.⁹

LANGUAGE AND POLITICS

Political ideologies like Nationalism and Communism may also be regarded as religions. Toynbee states that the worship of one's own collective power, as embodied in a parochial community and organized state, has in fact been the master religion in the civilizations of the Christian era.¹⁰

Nationalism in the modern sense, viz. that of a state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is regarded as due to the nation-state, is relatively new. An attachment to one's native soil, community and traditions and to established territorial authority has existed throughout history. In the ancient Greek world the city-states were the true gods of the people. The ancient Hebrews distinguished themselves from the Gentiles, the ancient Greeks from the Barbarians. Before the

French Revolution the loyalty of the individual in Europe was given to different forms of authority or political organization, such as the king, the feudal lord, the church, the free-city or the guild. But in modern times the demand is for each nationality to form its own state, and loyalty is owed to the national government which promulgates uniform laws, and often a uniform system of education and a uniform language. The wars of the Revolution and of Napoleon spread modern nationalism from France to the rest of Europe.

Most nationalities display certain characteristics which distinguish them from other nationalities such as common descent, language, territory, customs and traditions or religion though none of these is essential to the existence of nationality, e.g. the U.S.A. with no common descent or Switzerland with different languages. Thomas Molnar states that the outbreak of nationalism in Italy, Germany, Eastern Europe and the Balkans had its roots in the discovery of the nation's cultural and artistic, religious and linguistic past, all of them very real factors in emphasizing the identity of the nation.¹¹

From the beginning of the Roman Empire to the end of the Middle Ages the general and the universal had been stressed, and imperial unity had been regarded as the ideal state of affairs. The new nationalism, however, glorified the peculiar and the parochial, national differences and individualities. J. G. Herder (the German disciple of J. J. Rousseau), who developed the theory of the "Volksgeist", regarded each nationality as a manifestation of the Divine, and therefore sacred. He equally respected all languages and felt that every man could only be himself if he could think and create in his own language. He was the first to make the claim that the rights of nationality were above all the rights of language.¹²

The period following on the nationalist revolutions of 1848 was not one of harmony or fraternity. The new nationalism came to stress collective power and unity above personal liberty, and changed in the middle of the 19th century from liberal humanism to aggressive exclusivism, from emphasis on the dignity of the individual to that of the power of the nation. This

change occurred not only among the Germans, but among all the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. The new spirit of violence, of glorification of heroic deeds in the nation's history, of the revival of the past and its use to inspire the members of the nation, are phenomena which resulted in the excesses of the 20th century, during which Italian Fascism, German National-Socialism and Russian totalitarianism developed into world imperialism.

The present century is the age of national self-determination, but the liberation of many nationalities has not strengthened the trend to peace and liberty, for many nationalities on release from oppression have themselves become oppressors. Despite the fact that nationalism lost much of its hold on the West as a result of two world wars, it is to-day stronger than ever and this time is a planet-wide phenomenon. Molnar states "In the Third World nationalism is now waking up: enormous masses of India, the Arab lands, China, Indonesia, Africa and Indo-America have only nationalism as a sign of differentiation".^{13.}

The revival of nationalism is partly a reaction to the collectivist ideology advocated successively by Hitler, Stalin and one-worldist "totalitarian democrats". In such a supra-national state there would be absolute regimentation, and all nations would have to sacrifice their identity. The fact is that man gives his loyalty only to limited communities. The Rumanian historian Mircea Eliade argues that we are aware of the nature of being or of the absolute only when we manage to articulate our own segment of the universe as an intelligible whole.^{14.} Molnar sees nationalism as a means available to mankind to protect himself against forced unification. He sees in the story of the Tower of Babel the lesson that man should not build a world-state because this would become a giant idol competing with God, and in the fact that mankind speaks some 3 000 tongues the working of providence. ^{15.} Hans Kohn makes the profound assertion: "The 20th century is the first period in history in which the whole of mankind has accepted one and the same political attitude, that of nationalism . . . World-wide nationalism has, however, not simplified or facilitated the task

of creating a cohesive or co-operative society. National and imperial ambitions among Asian and African peoples threaten to clash as they have among European peoples.”¹⁶ Despite the fact that it is a world-wide element, nationalism is a very divisive force if it is not tempered by a spirit of tolerance or the humanitarian universalism of a non-political religion. The failure of international organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization is mainly due to the disunity arising from active and often militant nationalism.

National consciousness is a highly complex social phenomenon in which race, religion and language may all play a part. Most nation-states have an official or centralized language, while religious and racial factors are usually ignored, as in the case of democracies of the American type. Among the ancients race and religion counted little, language was paramount, but only in so far as it was linked with universality and culture, as witness the spread of Latin and Greek. The Hebrews were perhaps the only people of antiquity who welded the concepts of race, religion and language into a homogenized unit.

Among nations with a diversity of languages nationalism has led to struggles for linguistic equality, carried on successfully by Flemish-speaking Belgians against the formerly dominant French language, by the Irish in Eire, and the French in Canada. Nationalist movements in Wales and Scotland also strive for equality for Cymric and Goidelic.

In many of the newly independent states diversity of language has created serious problems. India and Pakistan based their nationhood primarily on the religious factor, and then found themselves plagued by diversity of language. The same problem presents itself in many African states such as Ghana and Nigeria. As in every other national renaissance there has been a developing interest in the use of vernaculars for the purpose of literary and scientific expression. Most nationalists would probably agree with Jean Paul Sartre that the movement for the liberation of Africa is in one of its aspects a struggle to break out of the “prison-house” of alien languages and cultures imposed on Africans by Europe.¹⁷

Mario Pei states that pride in language is probably the most distinctive mark of national intolerance. One of the manifestations of linguistic nationalism is the linguistic purity movements. Shortly after the Renaissance some European languages endeavoured to replace foreign loan-words, e.g. Dutch writers attempted to eliminate French loan-words. Iran wants to purify the Persian language of Turkish and Arab words, and Mustapha Kemal undertook to purify the Turkish language of its Arab and Persian loan-words. The Italian Fascists tried to eliminate from the Italian language certain international words because of their supposedly foreign origin, and to replace them with "Italian" words, with rather ludicrous results, for "hotel, menu, chauffeur", words of Latin origin, were replaced by "albergo, lista, autista,," of Germanic or Greek origin.

When languages come into contact, it is inevitable that they will influence one another, so that there is no pure language unless it is a very primitive tongue. Among Western European groups whose known histories indicate maximum racial and linguistic intermingling are the British, French, Italians and Spaniards. To judge from their contribution to European culture, neither racial nor linguistic intermingling has been unfavourable. Nevertheless purists have at various times tried to purge the mixed language par excellence, English, of words of foreign origin. These linguistic nationalists created the slogan: "Avoid Latin derivatives; use brief, terse Anglo-Saxon monosyllables". The only Anglo-Saxon word in the slogan is the second-last. The movement to purify Afrikaans of English influence found expression in the hunt for anglicisms which was at one time described as a serious rival for Rugby as the national sport.

Another nationalist phenomenon is the drive conducted on behalf of the national or official language against minority languages or dialects. Mussolini abolished all regional societies in the belief that he could thus get the Italians to relinquish their dialects and use the national language instead. The Republican Spanish Government permitted the teaching of Catalan and Basque in the schools of those regions, but when Franco came to power in Spain he forbade this. France forbids the teaching of Breton in the schools of Brittany. This attitude

Mario Pei states that pride in language is probably the most distinctive mark of national intolerance. One of the manifestations of linguistic nationalism is the linguistic purity movements. Shortly after the Renaissance some European languages endeavoured to replace foreign loan-words, e.g. Dutch writers attempted to eliminate French loan-words. Iran wants to purify the Persian language of Turkish and Arab words, and Mustapha Kemal undertook to purify the Turkish language of its Arab and Persian loan-words. The Italian Fascists tried to eliminate from the Italian language certain international words because of their supposedly foreign origin, and to replace them with "Italian" words, with rather ludicrous results, for "hotel, menu, chauffeur", words of Latin origin, were replaced by "albergo, lista, autista,," of Germanic or Greek origin.

When languages come into contact, it is inevitable that they will influence one another, so that there is no pure language unless it is a very primitive tongue. Among Western European groups whose known histories indicate maximum racial and linguistic intermingling are the British, French, Italians and Spaniards. To judge from their contribution to European culture, neither racial nor linguistic intermingling has been unfavourable. Nevertheless purists have at various times tried to purge the mixed language par excellence, English, of words of foreign origin. These linguistic nationalists created the slogan: "Avoid Latin derivatives; use brief, terse Anglo-Saxon monosyllables". The only Anglo-Saxon word in the slogan is the second-last. The movement to purify Afrikaans of English influence found expression in the hunt for anglicisms which was at one time described as a serious rival for Rugby as the national sport.

Another nationalist phenomenon is the drive conducted on behalf of the national or official language against minority languages or dialects. Mussolini abolished all regional societies in the belief that he could thus get the Italians to relinquish their dialects and use the national language instead. The Republican Spanish Government permitted the teaching of Catalan and Basque in the schools of those regions, but when Franco came to power in Spain he forbade this. France forbids the teaching of Breton in the schools of Brittany. This attitude

goes back to the time of the French Revolution. In 1790 the first decrees of the French Revolutionary Government were translated into minority languages such as Provençal, Breton, Basque and Catalan, but later this policy was reversed and it was decreed that French would become the universal language.

Mario Pei makes the interesting statement: "Since language is the paramount symbol of nationality, it is not surprising that an official prohibition to use a language has often been the prime cause of its survival".¹⁸ There are numerous examples to prove this. Celtic languages such as Irish Gaelic, Breton and Welsh, and others such as Basque and Breton, Lithuanian and possibly Polish might have succumbed to the pressure of the dominant language of their respective areas if persecution had not bolstered them up. This probably also holds good for Afrikaans.

In this nationalistic age language consciousness is probably greater than at any other time in history, as witness the linguistic strife in countries such as Belgium and Canada, and the language riots among people of the same race and religion but different language backgrounds that have taken place in India, East Pakistan and Ceylon. Since the middle of the 19th century and particularly in the present century we find a tendency to increase deliberately the differences between kindred, and particularly neighbouring languages. Under favourable circumstances considerable language groups have begun to mark themselves off more sharply from their neighbours by accepting languages which they themselves never spoke, but which they derived from a language used at some time by actual or reputed ancestors. Examples of this are Scottish and Irish nationalists struggling with unfamiliar varieties of modern Gaelic, and young Zionist Jews diligently learning modern Hebrew. In Norway too we have seen the language of a whole community being changed to suit the desire for nationalistic separation.¹⁹ Another factor has made itself felt in our time. Dell Hymes states that "a language may be retained without its possessing prestige, as for example in the case of anti-white language loyalty"²⁰. This is most evident in Indonesia with its 200 languages and dialects and the former British African Terri-

ories with at least 369 languages, the majority of which have no written form.

The rise of the national tongues in Europe is often ascribed to the new spirit of nationalism, inspired by the French Revolution, but in fact the use of the vernaculars and the concurrent decline of Latin preceded nationalism in the modern sense by many centuries. As early as the 9th century the Moravians were worshipping in the vernacular. But the Latin idea of privileged languages had taken root so deeply among the Germans that many centuries and the advent of the Reformation were required to make them recognize the sovereign rights of a national language. The new European literary languages, which the Reformation stirred into life, are all a late reflex to the same current, which had its source in Byzantium, and which in the 9th century had awakened the self-consciousness and national movement of the Slavs.²¹

It seems probable that the growing participation of the surgent bourgeois class in intellectual pursuits helped to deprive scholars and churchmen of the ancient language prerogatives. Indeed, it seems as if the new spirit of nationalism is in part at least founded on the language factor. As each language emerged as a literary medium, each national group began to feel itself a nation in the modern sense. From the 14th century it became common practice for nations to sing the praises of their tongues and to disparage foreign languages.

A point of controversy between linguists has been whether there is an intrinsic link between language and race, in particular whether there is a definite connection between a language and the mentality, psychology and behaviour pattern of the people speaking the language, an idea first propounded by Leibniz in the 17th century. This concept was expanded by W. von Humboldt in the 19th century, when he formulated the theory that language is the outer manifestation of a people's soul, and even the creator of their thought patterns. This view is disputed in the present century by eminent linguists such as De Saussure and Vendryes. There may be a link between race and language in origin, but to-day this is mean-

ingless because of the degree of racial intermingling which has occurred and the wholesale adoption of alien languages by individuals and groups. However, one modern linguist, Whorf, has revived some of the ideas of Leibniz. The main contention in his "linguistic relativity hypothesis" is that every language or every type of linguistic structure carries "its own metaphysics or basic concepts—in our case those of Euclidean space and time—by which the world of our experience is ordered and systematized. A different language, involving a different metaphysics, may give a different account of reality, as is apparently the case in our own culture within the technical languages of non-Euclidean geometry and subatomic physics".²²

Ogden and Richards to some extent share his view and suggest that instead of grammar—the structure of a symbol system—being a reflection of the world, any supposed structure of the world is more probably a reflection of the grammar used. They make the interesting observation that "the recent advances in mathematics and physics are partly due to the breaking through of previously unnoticed bonds of language, which were proving a hindrance to scientific statement of observed data. The important factor is the predisposition to impose on phenomena unconsciously the patterns most natural in one's own language since it is those patterns which shape our thinking and analysis".²³

In the 20th century which has witnessed the conquest of distance by technology and the growing interdependence of the nations of the world for economic and technological reasons, an international language has become a necessity, but the spirit of nationalism has largely prevented this from coming to pass. In ancient times Latin and Greek sufficed to care for all the needs of Western civilization, and as the language of Western Christendom and Western scholarship Latin remained in international use throughout the Middle Ages and until the Renaissance was well over. In the 17th century Comenius made the revolutionary pronouncement of advocating modern tongues for international use, Russia for the East, French and English for West. He showed remarkable foresight, for French, which as a result of the Crusades had enjoyed a European vogue since the

13th century that made it the universal vernacular of Christendom, in the 17th century became the tongue of polite international intercourse and later of diplomacy, while English became the language of trade. At the present time English has replaced German as the language of science, for which position it is being challenged by Russian. The different languages serve as a check upon one another, and the emergence of one national language as the international language of the world seems as remote as ever.

In limited areas various semi-artificial tongues have fulfilled the rôle of international languages, especially as the language of trade, such as various pidgin languages, e.g. Hausa and Swahili of Africa, or the lingua franca of the Mediterranean basin of former centuries, consisting of a conglomeration of Italian, Arabic, French, Greek and other languages.

The 17th century also saw the first attempts at artificially constructed languages. Between the time of Bacon and the present day some 500 attempts have been made to construct artificial languages for international use. The best known are Esperanto, Volapük, Novial, Interlingua, and Interglossa. Of these only the first two have achieved any measure of success. Esperanto is to-day used by several million speakers, and by international associations of doctors, teachers, scientists, etc. It is also the only one to gain some measure of official recognition as along with Latin it is the language which by international agreement must be accepted for telegrams throughout the world. But it will never fill the vacuum created by the disappearance of Latin as an international language. In the fields of diplomacy, trade and science the language which at present has the highest international currency is a mixture of different languages which became the national language of Britain, English, the language which for a century was also the dominant language in a former Dutch colony.

LANGUAGE, RELIGION AND POLITICS IN THE SOUTH AFRICA CONTEXT

This brings me to the rôle of these social factors in South African history, in particular the rise of Afrikaner nationalism and of the Afrikaans language.

During the period of the East India Company, Dutch had remained the dominant language at the Cape, partly as a result of a definite policy followed at the Cape of discouraging the use of other languages such as Portuguese and the French of the Huguenots. Even the slaves were taught to speak Dutch. In due course all the other language groups learnt a form of Dutch and by the time that the Cape became a British possession Dutch was the only language in use at the Cape. But while the administrative language was Dutch, the vernacular had developed a new form which was generally referred to as Cape Dutch. From the fusion of Dutch dialects spoken by the first settlers had developed a simplified form of Dutch, which was in time to receive the name of Afrikaans. But for political events it may have remained a Dutch dialect and never have become an independent cultural language.

After the permanence of British occupation had been secured by a treaty in 1815, the British Government decided to ensure that the Cape would remain British by means of a cultural conquest through the introduction of British governmental institutions, the substitution of English for Dutch as the official language of the legislature, the civil service and the courts, as the medium of instruction in schools and through the introduction of English and Scottish teachers and ministers of religion. This process of anglicization aroused little resentment. Many in the Cape Peninsula became anglicized, while the Afrikaners in the interior were not much affected by these measures at first as they had little contact with officialdom. Though they did not realise it at the time, these measures seriously discriminated against the Afrikaners by subjecting them to civil disabilities, which became more serious when Parliamentary Government was introduced at the Cape in 1864 with the English as the only language for the legislature, which

meant that in the main the representatives of the Afrikaners were excluded.

During this period of anglicization the Dutch language was kept alive by the Dutch Reformed Church, a Dutch language press in Cape Town and certain private schools using Dutch as medium of instruction. Cape Dutch or Afrikaans remained the spoken language of the Afrikaners, but it was not used as a written language except occasionally by certain writers like Boniface for comic effect, being put into the mouth of Hottentot characters. The first to use Afrikaans deliberately as a normal written language was L. H. Meurant, who founded the *Graham's Town Journal* in 1831 and *Het Kaapsche Grensblad* in 1844. In the latter paper, published in Grahamstown, he wrote several articles in Afrikaans during the period 1844-50. In 1861 Meurant took a step which had far-reaching effects on the future of Afrikaans. He used Afrikaans for political propaganda in a pamphlet advocating the separation of the Eastern Cape from the jurisdiction of the Cape Parliament. This gave a tremendous impetus to the use of Afrikaans in the press.

The Great Trek had had the effect of scattering the Afrikaners over a large area. North of the Orange River two independent Afrikaner Republics had come into being, with Dutch as the official language. There was hardly any bond between the Cape Afrikaners and those in the Republics, despite the fact that they shared a common heritage, religion, language, etc. *Het Volksblad*, however, saw the preservation of the Free Republics as a means of making the Cape Afrikaners feel that they did not in the least have to be ashamed of their language and their forefathers.²⁴ In the 1850's the other Dutch newspaper in Cape Town, *De Zuid Afrikaan*, expressed the expectation that the Afrikaner nationality and language would be assimilated into that of the English. Political events in the 1860's, however, evoked among the Afrikaners a sense of insecurity, of suffering injustice and accordingly a national consciousness.

By the conventions of 1852 and 1854 Britain had recognized the independence of the Afrikaner Republics, thereby

withdrawing from the northern territories, but in the sixties it embarked on a policy of imperial expansion. In 1868 Britain annexed Basutoland and in 1871 the Diamond Fields. This caused resentment not only in the Free State, but also among Cape Afrikaners. During the period 1868 to 1881 the Afrikaners became conscious of their history; they began to reflect on their past, relive old grievances and develop a national consciousness. The latter was stirred by the policy of establishing British paramountcy by a policy of confederation, of which the grant of responsible government to the Cape Colony in 1872 and the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877 were aspects.²⁵ Most South African historians agree that Afrikaner nationalism was mainly a reaction to the Imperial Factor in South Africa. Undoubtedly the victory of the Transvaalers in the First War of Independence had a powerful effect in stimulating the feeling of national worth of the Afrikaners, who found a binding element in the ideal of a united South Africa, apart from blood relationship and a common language and religion. The Second War of Independence greatly intensified this Afrikaner nationalism. Thompson states: "The Anglo-Boer War, in fact, did more to unite Afrikanerdom and infuse it with purpose and determination than any other single factor before or after."²⁶

In 1875 an Afrikaans language movement started with the main purpose of achieving the recognition of Afrikaans as the written language of the Afrikaner. It was, however, religious rather than political considerations which formed the immediate cause of the movement. In 1872 a Hollander by the name of Pannevis made a public appeal for the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans because many Afrikaners and most of the Non-whites could not understand Dutch. This led to extensive correspondence in the Dutch press on the language question and two persons came to the fore as champions of Afrikaans, who were to play the leading rôles in the first stage of the language movement, Rev. S. J. du Toit and a Dutch schoolmaster, C. P. Hoogenhout. In 1874 Pannevis approached the British and Foreign Bible Society with the request that it undertake the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans and suggested Rev. S. J. du Toit as a suitable translator. Unfortunately Pannevis referred

to Afrikaans as a jargon. The Bible Society was not prepared to agree to his request and the matter was referred to a meeting of D.R.C. ministers at Wellington, who rejected the idea, because Dutch was the language of their church. Rev. S. J. du Toit then called a meeting of persons who were well-disposed to Afrikaans and on 14th August, 1875, they formed the *Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners* with Du Toit as chairman. The Genootskap decided that Afrikaans had first to develop into a literary language before a translation of the Bible could be undertaken, and that their immediate duty was to strive to have Afrikaans recognised as a written language. But the movement was also cultural and political. As Davenport states: "To limit a discussion of the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners to its efforts to propagate the Afrikaans language would be to ignore its more fundamental significance. The recognition of Afrikaans was, of course, an end in itself. But the Afrikaans language was also the vehicle of a bigger idea, as yet only vaguely formulated, which involved the self-conscious cultivation of a distinctive Afrikaner outlook rooted in the religion and the history of the people, to be attained by an all-embracing programme of popular education".²⁷

Though the movement was strongly religious and members had to be professing Christians, it had from the start to contend with strong opposition for the conservative clergy of the D.R.C., while it also had to contend with a rival campaign for the recognition of Dutch in public life, which got under way in 1878, inspired largely by J. H. Hofmeyr, editor of *De Zuid Afrikaan*. In 1876 the Genootskap established its own newspaper, *Di Afrikaanse Patriot*, with S. J. du Toit as editor. It soon built up a considerable circulation in the Cape, and later also in the Republics because it condemned the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, while the Dutch newspapers in Cape Town were equivocal at the time. After the victory of the Transvalers in the First War of Independence the Patriot enjoyed a boom. René de Villiers states: "Thanks to the men of Paarl, the Afrikaans language was for the first time being printed with pride—and it was being used, simply but forcibly, to disseminate a nationalist mystique".²⁸

Another important publication of the Genootskap was a history of S.A., entitled *Die Geskiedenis van ons land in die taal van ons volk*. "The *Patriot* and the *Geskiedenis* were seminal. Their central concept, set out simply in the *Patriot* and by historical examples in the *Geskiedenis*, was that the Afrikaners were a distinct people or nation, occupying a distinct fatherland, South Africa, speaking a God-given language, Afrikaans, and endowed by God to rule South Africa and civilize its heathen peoples".²⁹.

During its early years the Genootskap concerned itself mainly with the promotion of Afrikaans, but the language questions could at any time become a political issue. As Davenport states: "It was in fact during the course of the discussion in the press on the language question that S. J. du Toit first developed his political programme".³⁰. In 1879 du Toit launched a political organization known as the Afrikaner Bond. This was not the first attempt to organize the Afrikaners politically for in 1878 J. H. Hofmeyr had formed the Boeren Bescherminings Vereniging. In 1883 the two movements were amalgamated and Hofmeyr was henceforth the real leader of the Bond. This was the first real political party in South Africa and existed until 1911. Davenport states: "The Afrikaner Bond was thus the chief lineal ancestor of both the government party and the major opposition party of the mid-twentieth century South Africa".³¹.

S. J. du Toit remained the leader of the Afrikaans language movement though his poor standing in the Cape D.R.C. adversely affected his political activities, while his political views estranged many supporters of Afrikaans, especially his support of Rhodes, even after the Jameson Raid. However, du Toit continued to edit the *Patriot* until its demise in 1904, and from 1896 also *Ons Klyntji*, the Genootskap's literary publication. The outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War brought the language movement to an end. Though it had succeeded in making the Afrikaner conscious of his language and producing a considerable amount of writings in Afrikaans, it had achieved no official recognition of Afrikaans. The campaign for the recogni-

tion of Dutch had, however, gained some success. In 1882 Dutch was permitted in Parliament and before 1890 Dutch also gained rights in the schools, law courts and the civil service, mainly because the government was not prepared to alienate Afrikaner support on this issue.

The disappearance of the two Afrikaner Republics as a result of the Anglo-Boer War was not to mean the disappearance of the Afrikaner people as a separate nation with its own language, religion and culture. The Free Staters and the Transvaalers retained their sense of nationhood and were determined to retain their language and culture, and therefore established two hundred Christian-National Education schools to counter Milner's attempt at anglicization. What is more, the war had restored the bond between the Afrikaners at the Cape and those of the ex-republics, for they were now in the same boat, subjects of Great Britain in colonies in which English was the official language. The flame of Afrikaner nationalism continued to burn during the period of reconstruction leading to Union. After the grant of responsible government to the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal the position of Dutch was secured in the schools by the Smuts and Hertzog Acts of 1907 and 1908. Hertzog carried through the O.R.C. legislature a law which made the English and Dutch languages strictly equal in the schools. The Smuts Act left Dutch in a subordinate position, mother tongue instruction being provided for only up to Std. III. There are some historians who maintain that Smuts' eventual political downfall was in part due to his failure to identify himself with the Afrikaans language movement.

The Afrikaans and Dutch language movements both revived after the war. In 1903 Hofmeyr and a group of Cape Afrikaners revived the Taalbond for the purpose of developing knowledge of the *volks taal* and the creation of a sound national feeling by the holding of yearly examinations in the Dutch language in South African history. The Afrikaners were faced with the question: which language should they encourage, simplified Dutch or Afrikaans. Hofmeyr and the Taalbonders decided for Dutch because of its literary tradition which Afri-

kaans lacked, and of its place in the religion of the people and the educational system. But the champions of Afrikaans argued that only Afrikaans was the language of the people, the only language in which it could fully express itself, and the only one with a future in the face of the policy of anglicization. In 1905 an *Afrikaanse Taalgenootskap* was established in Pretoria and an *Afrikaanse Taalvereniging* in Cape Town in 1906. The Afrikaans language movement, which had been largely confined to the Cape before the war, now became a national movement.

In 1907 members of the Taalbond and the Taalvereniging conferred at Paarl and agreed to work for the establishment of a central organization to preserve and promote the "Dutch-Afrikaans" language. In 1908 Dr. D. F. Malan, the Chairman of the Taalvereniging, urged reconciliation in the Afrikaner national interest, and added: "Give the young Afrikaner a written language which comes easily and naturally to him, and in that way you will have set up a bulwark against the anglicization of our people . . . Raise the Afrikaans language to a written language, make it the vehicle of our culture, of our history, our national ideals, and you thereby also raise up the people who speak it." In 1925 Dr. Malan introduced the Bill which recognised Afrikaans as one of the two official languages of South Africa, thereby replacing Dutch.

The Afrikaans language movement achieved remarkable success after the establishment of Union. This was in part due to the fact that the Afrikaans language became the central symbol of the nationalist movement. In 1914 the National Party was formed. This was the result of Hertzog's break with Botha's South African Party and his advocacy of a two-stream policy for the two language groups by which he hoped to prevent the anglicization or absorption of his own people by the rest. "Afrikaner Nationalism thus for the first time became a co-ordinated country-wide movement and vehicle of the strivings and aspirations of a people who wanted to retain their separate identity and their independence".³³ Another factor which played a continuing rôle in uniting the Afrikaner people and shaping their political philosophy was the Calvinism

preached by the Dutch Reformed Churches of which the vast majority of Afrikaners were adherents. René de Villiers claims: "Although there was never any formal or official relationship between church and party, the Dutch Reformed Church became in a very real sense the National Party at Prayer".³⁴ This is rather exaggerated, but it is a fact that the D.R. Churches have consistently given their blessing to the policies of the National Party.

The D.R. Churches, which had been the strongest bulwark of Dutch, had to surrender in the face of the national support, which the Afrikaans language movement gained, and between 1916 and 1924 the different Dutch Reformed churches all recognized Afrikaans as the official language of the church. In 1933 the complete Afrikaans translation of the Bible was published, to be followed in 1937 by the Afrikaans Metrical Psalms and in 1944 by the Afrikaans Hymn Book. So Dutch had been fully displaced by Afrikaans in the churches, and Afrikanerdom seemed to have achieved harmony between language, religion and politics, but this was already being disturbed by a world upheaval.

Though some may disagree, the co-existence of Afrikaans and English has been fortunate as far as Afrikaans is concerned, especially because of the fact that English is one of the major world languages. The contact between the two languages has greatly stimulated the Afrikaans language and literature, and the struggle for equality with English has resulted in the unusually rapid development of the Afrikaans language, which has attained stability of form and usage, developed into a medium of instruction for higher and technical education, and in a relatively short period has acquired a literature of considerable size and merit.

The achievement is all the more remarkable if we compare it with other and older languages. Though Afrikaans was introduced as a medium of instruction in schools only in 1914 and as a university subject in 1918, it has since the forties served as medium of instruction for all subjects in the humanities and the sciences at university level. A Unesco monograph on "*The use of*

the Vernacular Languages in Education, 1953", stated that only a minority of the languages of the world had textbooks adequate either for elementary school classes or for adult literary courses, and that the majority of languages did not have a vocabulary adequate for higher and, especially, technical education. These include old and extensively used languages such as Arabic and Malay. More than 800 languages are spoken on the African continent, but less than a dozen languages are used for higher education and, apart from Afrikaans, they are mainly European languages such as English, French and Portuguese.

Afrikaans has suffered remarkably little interference as a result of close contact with English. For more than a century it existed in a situation of diglossia. Normally this means the co-existence of a high and a low variety of the same language. Until 1925 we may regard Afrikaans and Dutch as varieties of the same language, for the difference between the two is no more than that between Standard Dutch and some Dutch dialects. There was constant borrowing from Dutch, especially in the academic and technical fields. But in South Africa there existed in reality a linguistic triangle and the superior, the prestige language was English. In actual fact the cultural borrowing from English by the Afrikaner was more extensive than the linguistic.

In the case of languages in contact, bilingualism is seldom if ever mutually balanced between the two groups of speakers, especially if one is regarded as the dominant or upper language, used by the ruling or privileged group. Many kinds of pressure induce the speaker of the lower language to learn the upper language, with the result that those who do become bilingual, are mainly speakers of the lower language. This is true of Afrikaans speakers during the period when English was the dominant language in the political, commercial and social spheres. The extent of linguistic interference suffered by Afrikaans from contact with English is, however, far less than one would have expected having regard to the former difference between the two languages in prestige and use in the administrative and cultural fields. To quote Bloomfield in this regard: "In all cases . . . it is the lower language which borrows pre-

dominantly from the upper. Accordingly, if the upper language survives, it remains as it was, except for a few cultural loans, such as it might take from any neighbour . . . ; if the lower language survives, it bears the marks of the struggle in the shape of copious borrowings".³⁵ This does not hold good for the linguistic interference resulting from contact between Afrikaans and English. Material collected for the Dictionary of South African English, at present being compiled as a project of the Institute for the Study of English in Africa at Rhodes University, has provided proof that the influence of Afrikaans on English in South Africa has been considerable and that the degree of interference suffered by both languages as a result of contact over a long period differs very little, at least as regards educated speech and the written language.

There are different reasons for this phenomenon. In sociolinguistics at present a favoured contrast is between "power" and "solidarity" as determined by verbal behaviour. "In a sense, any functional attribute of a language confers power on the user. The high variety in a situation of diglossia, if indeed it is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation, must correspondingly lack power of a certain sort—the fate of Sanskrit and Latin in particular among high-status literary languages are examples".³⁶ This is the reason for the displacement of Dutch by Afrikaans as the "high" variety of language of the Afrikaner.

In relation to English, Afrikaans as a vernacular derived strength from small-group solidarity, the power that comes from social cohesiveness and feeling of identity. In other words, Afrikaner Nationalism proved to be an effective safeguard against Afrikaans being supplanted by English as the spoken language of the Afrikaner, and through the purity movement it inspired, counteracted excessive English influence on Afrikaans.

Since the Second World War the Afrikaans language has made rapid progress in the technical and commercial fields, and of course in the cultural field. Politics have both promoted and bedevilled this progress. We repeatedly hear demands from politicians and others for the use of Afrikaans in all spheres of

life, from council chambers to bar counters, from reception desks to the labels on sardine tins. At a conference of the *Afrikaanse taal- en Kultuurbond* last year delegates complained that some Afrikaners were still calling their dogs "Jock," their daughters "Cathy" instead of "Katrina", and a certain variety of peach "Early Dawn" instead of "Sonop", while there was no soap powder with an Afrikaans trade-name. This insistence on the use of Afrikaans by the Government and others has not always been to the benefit of the Afrikaans language. It has given rise to the attitude that the use of Afrikaans is the important thing, not the quality of the language. The result is that the Afrikaans heard in the council chambers of the land and even over the radio is often deplorable, while notices, memoranda and other documents emanating from national and local government offices are sometimes framed in atrocious Afrikaans. The same, of course, applies to the use of the English language by officialdom.

It is a great pity that language sentiment has so consistently been exploited for political purposes. Over the years individual politicians have appealed for the recognition of Afrikaans as the sole official language of our country. The Draft Republican Constitution published in 1942 by nationalist organizations provided for a mixed authoritarian-parliamentary structure with Afrikaans as the principal language. Since the victory of the National Party in the 1948 election Afrikaans has been the main language used in the public service. Despite the position of full equality with English attained by Afrikaans, appeals were again made to the language sentiment of the Afrikaner during by-election campaigns held last year. One Cabinet minister stated that "the time had come for the Afrikaner once again to draw his sword and wield it in earnest on every front and at every place where his tongue was slighted".³⁷ This caused an Opposition spokesman to express the fear that Afrikaner nationalism was changing into Afrikaner imperialism, while a columnist of an Afrikaans newspaper, referring to the atrocious English in an official publication, suggested that the ghost of Milner was again stalking the land, but this time it was dressed in velskoens.³⁸

The recent demands for bilingualism in the private sector made by the Government conflict with the Government's policy of mother tongue education and single medium schools. As there is no geographical language boundary in South Africa, such as exists in Belgium and Canada, South Africans are in the fortunate position of being able to learn both languages by ear at an early age, but the official policy of separating the youth into two camps at school has largely nullified this advantage. The main sufferers because of this have been the Afrikaans-speaking section. They are all the poorer for limited contact with, and knowledge of, the language and culture of the world's premier language. And this also applies to the Afrikaans language and literature. It is significant that some of the premier Afrikaans writers such as Elisabeth Eybers, Karel Schoeman and Breyten Breytenbach, who have been living in Europe for a number of years, continue to write in Afrikaans, and that the quality of their work has been maintained.

The division of the Whites into two language and political groups is largely an artificial one. There is no basic hostility between them. The former hostility and prejudice towards the Afrikaans language, to which many English formerly referred as a bastard language, a patois or uncouth dialect without grammar or literature, has disappeared. We find little evidence of the attitude exemplified by the following quotation from a book published in 1914 and written by a British immigrant, who had spent some years in this country: "The Taal, the jargon used by the Cape Dutch, that hideous, abominable satire on a language used by the Cape Dutch, which we ought to have crushed out of existence after the last war, the Taal is anathema to every decent Home-born man, but it contains one good, comprehensive word, "Schelm". A schelm is any noxious creature. As a rule the word is used for wild animals, from lions down to owls, but really it is equally applicable to Colonial politicians and their kind."³⁹.

The fact that the political division between the Whites in this country is largely on language lines, is mainly the result of the nefarious activities of politicians, newspapermen and even some churchmen, who continue to exploit the difference in

language for their ignoble ends. It is significant that the Afrikaans and the English churches are similarly divided, the Afrikaans churches supporting the Government's policy of separate development and the larger English churches opposing it.

What of the future?

I believe that whatever the political future of this country, the Afrikaans language will continue to survive alongside of English, and that the two languages will not merge to form a single mixed language. I also believe that in spite of this the division of the Whites on a language basis will disappear. The Afrikaner people was forged in the crucible of the Anglo-Boer War. From the present crisis will emerge a united South African nation, fused by the heat of the threat of Communism and the militant nationalism of the African states to the north. A powerful contributory factor will be the international hate campaign against South Africa, which is arousing a common sense of nationality and a feeling of injustice because of the double standards applied by South Africa's attackers. Though the campaign purports to be an attack on the racial situation in this country, it is in essence a campaign dictated by expediency, a new scramble for spheres of influence in Africa with the West vying with the East for the favour of the African nations.

It almost looks as if the rest of the world has chosen to make South Africa the scapegoat for all the ills of Africa. The blame for the civil wars, the military take-overs, the atrocities in the Congo, Biafra and elsewhere really lies with the former colonial powers who, by abdicating from their positions of authority and abandoning their responsibilities, sowed the winds of change, and Africa is reaping turmoil and the East wind of Chinese Communism. In a recent article in *The New Statesman* its former editor Paul Johnson writes: "The movement towards the liberation of Africa has been halted. The last two decades have seen the emergence of every variety of misrule: military dictatorship; petty satraps sustained by foreign investors and, in some cases, foreign troops; savages like General Amin; ferocious theocrats like Ghadafi of Libya; and almost everywhere the

stench of corruption, the resurgence of racism. Life and property are at the mercy of ruling cliques, decked out, to be sure, in ideological verbiage and modern weaponry, but otherwise exhibiting all the vices and few of the virtues of the tribal monarchies which imperialism dethroned." It is accordingly not surprising that most South African are grieved because their country has, in such company, been singled out for censure. The fact that the U.S.A. and not the Communist aggressor has in like manner been made the scapegoat for the agony of Vietnam, provides poor comfort.

This international campaign against South Africa which, *inter alia*, manifests itself in the form of boycotts and exclusion from international bodies and meetings, thereby harming the Non-white as much as the Whites, is in my opinion in a large measure the result of two accidents of history, one concerning politics and the other language.

At the time of the 1948 election the National Party unwisely chose to make the racial question the main election issue, thereby focussing the attention of the electorate and the outside world on the racial situation in this country, which had remained largely the same for a period of 150 years. Though the Cape and Natal had been British colonies until 1910, nobody in Britain except Exeter Hall had concerned themselves with the position of the Non-Whites in this country, while during the Anglo-Boer war the former Republic enjoyed international sympathy and goodwill. Contrary to its own expectations the National Party won the election, in spite of polling a minority of votes. It was accordingly committed to giving effect to this policy. Dr. Malan had chosen as his party's slogan the word "Apartheid" to replace the old term "segregation". This word has never ceased to fascinate the outside world or to embarrass the National Party, which has unsuccessfully tried to replace it with "Separate development". Both the slogan and the policy it represents lend themselves to distortion, and the spelling "aparthate" is quite common in the American press.

The accident of language is that one of the two official languages of the country happens to be a premier world language. If Afrikaans had been the sole official language,

the outside world would possibly have been as little concerned about inequalities in this country as it is about the caste system in India or about the disabilities of the Basques. The same would very likely have been the case if English had been the only language. In support of this contention I mention Australia, which, despite its White Australia policy and its aboriginal reserves, did not incur the wrath of the outside world. Or the U.S.A., where race riots are no longer news and the Red Indian revolt at Wounded Knee because of discrimination against them, has been treated with levity by the press.

The position in South Africa is different in this respect that in 1948 the first purely Afrikaner Government took office, and this Government had come to power by appealing to the racial sentiment. The English language press in its attacks on the Government obviously concentrated on its racial policy, and this attack was taken up by the world press, while the Communist countries were quick to exploit this in the hope of gaining the support of the African countries. This attack has escalated to the point where the mass media of communication have lost all sense of perspective. Within a few weeks the genocide in Biafra, the slaughter in Bangladesh, the massacre in Burundi and the expulsion of Asiatics from Uganda were forgotten, but not the unfortunate incident at Sharpeville twelve years ago. A contributory reason in my opinion is that the South African English language press, completely obsessed with the colour question, has fanned the attack on the racial situation in this country from outside, inter alia by the great prominence given to anti-South African statements and demonstrations by persons and agencies overseas, however ill-informed.

There is another respect in which language may influence South African politics. The Government's policy of separate development of the different ethnic groups draws its main support from the Afrikaans-speaking section of the White group. There is, however, one non-White group which does not constitute a separate ethnic group, viz. the Coloureds. This group is in the main Afrikaans-speaking, and some Coloured writers such as Adam Small, S. V. Petersen and P. J. Philander have made significant contributions to the Afrikaans litera-

ture. In the cultural and particularly literary field there is a fair measure of contact between Afrikaners and Coloureds, and it is possible that community of language between Afrikaners and Coloureds may be a decisive factor in bringing about a new deal for the Coloureds in the political set-up in this country, by their being recognized as part of the European nation in this country as distinct from the various African nations.

CONCLUSION

Historians, politicians and others are inclined to make the mistake of considering these forces in isolation. They are elements in the structure of society and each has a field— analogous to a magnetic field. It is the intermingling of fields of force which is creative and causal in nature and in society, and rarely the action of a single force which disturbs the course of history. Harold Goad in his book "Language in History" states: "Thus the Wars of Religion (in Europe) were largely Wars of language—wars for the right and the means to express the thoughts and aspirations of new-born secular classes. The differences were always there, the new language only expressed them. It was the greatest tragedy of all history that these inevitable linguistic divergencies should have awakened racial prejudices and that natural inborn psychological differences should have caused doctrinal quarrels and broken the spiritual unity of Europe".⁴⁰ This is an illustration of the profound effects of the interplay of fields of force.

In the political sphere today we see numerous instances of misconceptions due to failure to recognize the significance of the interaction of forces. One of the myths of our time is that political equality is all that is required for a harmonious, contented human society. The history of the African continent over the last decade provides ample proof of the fallacy of this idea. Any ideology or political settlement which does not provide for the action and interaction of a number of social forces, which condition the thought and determine the actions of men, is doomed to fail.

In his treatise "Holism and Evolution" a famous namesake distinguishes Matter, Life, Mind and Personality as a more or

less connected, progressive series in the same great process of evolution.⁴¹ In the chapter on "Mind as an organ of wholes" he states: "The human mind can make its own combinations and correlations from the materials with which it finds itself surrounded. It can, therefore, in a large sense make or mould its own environmental conditions, and thus eliminate or neutralise hostile influences and reinforce favourable conditions Thus is freedom at last achieved over the dominance of the countries of life, and Mind assumes the sovereignty to which it had been destined from the beginning as the successor to Life and Matter".⁴²

"In the exercise of its free and unhampered right of self-determination, Mind on the human level proceeds to create to a large extent the appropriate conditions for its own development. Instead of remaining dependent on the natural environment, Mind builds up a vast social environment for itself. It builds up a far-reaching social structure with institutions of all sorts which are intended to develop and educate the human groups and individuals, intellectually and morally, to facilitate intercourse and co-operation among them, to declare and safeguard their rights, and to protect them against hostile influence of the animate or inanimate environment and of other groups of humans. Thus language arises as well as the institutions of marriage and the family, of religion, law and government, and all the other numerous forms in which social beliefs and practices are embodied. The very laws of organic Evolution seem to be modified by this great transformation".⁴³

These forces, language, religion and politics, which have a controlling influence on human life and society, are therefore evidently of man's own creation, elements of social structuring by the mind.

I have used the term "triangle of forces" not in the technical sense of a triangle whose sides represent forces in equilibrium, but as a figure representing three interacting forces in a dynamic state. The relationship between man and these forces, historic and otherwise, on the other hand, suggests to me a mobile spiral on an ever changing social plane.

less connected, progressive series in the same great process of evolution.⁴¹ In the chapter on "Mind as an organ of wholes" he states: "The human mind can make its own combinations and correlations from the materials with which it finds itself surrounded. It can, therefore, in a large sense make or mould its own environmental conditions, and thus eliminate or neutralise hostile influences and reinforce favourable conditions Thus is freedom at last achieved over the dominance of the countries of life, and Mind assumes the sovereignty to which it had been destined from the beginning as the successor to Life and Matter".⁴²

"In the exercise of its free and unhampered right of self-determination, Mind on the human level proceeds to create to a large extent the appropriate conditions for its own development. Instead of remaining dependent on the natural environment, Mind builds up a vast social environment for itself. It builds up a far-reaching social structure with institutions of all sorts which are intended to develop and educate the human groups and individuals, intellectually and morally, to facilitate intercourse and co-operation among them, to declare and safeguard their rights, and to protect them against hostile influence of the animate or inanimate environment and of other groups of humans. Thus language arises as well as the institutions of marriage and the family, of religion, law and government, and all the other numerous forms in which social beliefs and practices are embodied. The very laws of organic Evolution seem to be modified by this great transformation".⁴³

These forces, language, religion and politics, which have a controlling influence on human life and society, are therefore evidently of man's own creation, elements of social structuring by the mind.

I have used the term "triangle of forces" not in the technical sense of a triangle whose sides represent forces in equilibrium, but as a figure representing three interacting forces in a dynamic state. The relationship between man and these forces, historic and otherwise, on the other hand, suggests to me a mobile spiral on an ever changing social plane.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Mario Pei: *Voices of man*, Allen and Unwin (1962), p.5.
2. R. H. Robins, "General linguistics within a liberal education," in *Diversions of Bloomsbury*, Amsterdam (1970), p.5.
3. Mario Pei, *op. cit.*, p.30.
4. F. Bodmer: *The Loom of Language*, Allen and Unwin, London (1943), p.17.
5. Mario Pei: *The story of language*, London (1952), p.46.
6. Karl W. Deutsch, "The trend of European nationalism—the language aspect", in *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, ed. J. A. Fishman, Mouton, The Hague (1968), p.599.
7. Mario Pei: *The story of language*, p.196.
8. Arnold Toynbee: *An historian's approach to religion*, O.U.P., London (1956), p.75.
9. Arnold Toynbee: *Christianity among the religions of the world*, O.U.P., London (1958), p.9.
10. Arnold Toynbee: *An historian's approach to religion*, p.27.
11. Thomas Molnar: *Nationalism in the space age*, S.A.B.C. (1972), p.8.
12. Hans Kohn: *Nationalism—its meaning and history*, New York (1955), p.31.
13. Thomas Molnar: *op.cit.*, p.8.
14. *Ibid*, p.8.
15. *Ibid*, p.15-16.
16. Hans Kohn, *op.cit.*, p.89.
17. T. Hodgkin: *Nationalism in colonial Africa*, New York (1957). p.176.
18. Mario Pei: *The story of language*, p.254.
19. Karl W. Deutsch, *op.cit.*, p.603-4.
20. Dell Hymes. "Functions of speech: an evolutionary approach," in *Anthropology and Education*, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press (1961), p.62.
21. R. Jakobson, "The beginning of national self-determination in Europe", in *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, Mouton, The Hague (1968), p.577.
22. L. B. Whorf, "An American-Indian model of the universe", in *IJAL* (1950).
23. Ogden and Richards: *The meaning of meaning*, Kegan Paul, London (1946), p.96.
24. F. A. van Jaarsveld: *The awakening of Afrikaner Nationalism*, Cape Town (1961), p.104.
25. R. H. Davenport: *The Afrikaner Bond (1880-1911)*, O.U.P., 1966, p.31.
26. L. M. Thompson, "Great Britain and the Afrikaner Republics", in *Oxford History of South Africa*, Vol. II, 1971, p.302-3.

27. R. H. Davenport, *op.cit.*, p.31.
28. R. de Villiers, "Afrikaner Nationalism", in *Oxford History of South Africa*, Vol. II. 1971, p.370.
29. L. M. Thompson, *op.cit.*, p.302-3
30. R. H. Davenport, *op.cit.*, p.35.
31. *Ibid.*, p.ix.
32. *Ibid.*, p.267-8.
33. R. de Villiers, *op.cit.*, p.370.
34. *Ibid.*, p.372.
35. L. Bloomfield: *Language*, New York (1933), p.464.
36. J. B. Pride: *The social meaning of language*, O.U.P., 1971, p.18.
37. Eastern Province Herald, 8.6.1972.
38. *Rapport*, 26.8.1972.
39. S. P. Hyatt: *The Old Transport Road*, London (1914), p.213.
40. Harold Goad: *Language in History*, Penguin Books (1958). p.89.
41. J. C. Smuts: *Holism and Evolution*, London (1927), p.22.
42. *Ibid.*, p.259.
43. *Ibid.*, p.260.