

South African Tragedy Restored?

By Mark R. Kreitzer

Contra Mundum, No. 5, Fall 1992

Copyright ©1992 Mark R. Kreitzer

The South African tragedy. Is it curable? What are the real issues? Have we unwittingly been swallowing the media elite's politically correct analysis? Have we been deceived into accepting their solution based upon the illusory 'dream' of civil rights activists? South Africa is actually a very complex situation with only a few superficial similarities to the race problems of the old American South.

The so-called "Apartheid" system developed gradually for about 250 years. The social theory and the resulting legislation was developed by godly Reformed thinkers who, within the limits of their culture and their school of Dutch Calvinism, were trying to provide a biblically responsible solution to South Africa's complicated inter-ethnic problems. But whenever the claim is made that Reformed scholars developed Apartheid, the politically correct automatically stigmatize these thinkers as heretics, charging that all their ideas are inherently oppressive. Of course, to stand up against this PC inquisition of Apartheid has been unpopular in Christian circles. What is most embarrassing, however, is that this PC propaganda is so unflinchingly and naively swallowed by many (most?) Reformed thinkers in the Dutch and English speaking world. That now includes South Africa itself!

For the politically correct, the solution to South Africa's complex ethnic problem is simple: "Apartheid is racism. Racism is a social evil which must be attacked and completely destroyed. Therefore, the evil, racist, apartheid system, along with the Calvinism that breed it, must be attacked and totally destroyed in all of its forms and manifestations." Reformed thinkers would hasten to add that they agree that Apartheid is a social evil and a theological heresy, yet they would have liked to see it gradually destroyed ("dismantled"). A few would perhaps add that they deplore the undue haste and dishonesty of the present regime. Yet most would still agree that the total destruction of Apartheid must be accomplished if shalom-peace and justice are to prevail.

Ought this to be? Must a three hundred year old Christian civilization and all its biblical insights be annihilated to appease the current politically correct conception of justice? I would challenge those who think biblically to remember that a man's ways seem right in his own eyes. Only a few prudent and wise men act out of carefully gained scriptural knowledge (Prov. 13:16). To become biblically wise always forces one carefully to weigh both sides of an issue before giving an answer to those who ask (Prov. 14:12, 15:28,

18:17). Only a proud fool, who refuses to consult wisdom, will resent such a correction (cf. Prov. 15:12).

It is for this reason that I can claim that not all aspects of the Calvinistic social theory called Apartheid are racist and certainly not all aspects are an unmitigated evil. An understanding of apartheid cannot be reduced to simplistic PC mantras and (il)logical syllogisms. It can, however, be divided into at least four distinct subcategories:

1. Petty Apartheid or social segregation.
2. Residential Apartheid in towns and cities.
3. Grand Apartheid or partition-ing of the land.
4. Boer/Afrikaner resistance to alien ethnic domination.

Each of these four aspects of Apartheid must be separately judged according to Reformed (i.e. Scripture derived) principles. I might also hasten to add, in case even in these circles a PC nerve is being pinched, that we will see that Scripture definitely judges some aspects of Apartheid as unjust and evil, though not using the same presuppositions that the humanistic elite uses in its judgments!

Apartheid Means Jim Crow Type Legislation

“Apartheid” in both Afrikaans and Dutch simply means “separateness” or “apartness”. (For this reason most equate it with the mass of petty social segregation laws pejoratively termed Jim Crow laws in the American South. This includes all the bureaucratic regulations mandating separate buses, toilets, amenities, sporting facilities, etc. for different groups.) Apartheid laws divided the whole of South African society into four basic “race” groups and gave to the South African socio-political scene the surface similarity to the pre-Civil Rights era South. (This first aspect of Apartheid, of course, has been skillfully portrayed by the unscrupulous Jesse Jacksons and Randall Robinsons of this world to further their own thinly veiled neo-Marxian political agenda.) The Lord be praised that this type of law, so antithetical to the Christian legal principle of “equal protection of law”, has been removed from the statute books by the present Afrikaner rulers.

It was exactly this Biblical principle, found in the Roman-Dutch Common Law used in South Africa as well as in our English Common Law, that the Boer/Afrikaners (and the Americans) ignored when they passed segregationist laws. The universal principles of justice (i.e. “general equity”) found in every one of God's laws teach that “*The community is to have the same rules for you [i.e. citizens related by descent and covenant faithfulness] and for the alien [i.e. the covenantly faithful non-citizen, not related to the covenant group by blood descent] living among you; this is a lasting ordinance for the generations. You and the alien shall be the same before the Lord: The same laws and regulations will apply both to you and to the alien living among you*” (Num. 15:15-16, cf. 15:29-30; Lev. 24:22; Dt. 1:16-17; Lev. 19:15).

God designed this judicial legislation, collectively termed the “Stranger Laws” to prevent the same type of exploitation that Egypt excelled in, especially in its illegal enslavement

of the whole Israelite people: “*When an alien lives with you in your land, do not ill-treat him. The alien living with you must be treated as one of your native-born. Love him as yourself, for you were aliens in Egypt. I am the Lord your God*” (Lev. 19:33; cf. Ex. 22:21, 23:9). The Boers, so ill-treated and wickedly oppressed by the British Empire should have learned from this. However, they forgot their Reformed heritage which had always stressed using the universal equity of God's judicial law in building a Christian civil and legal system. This was due to several factors, the most important of which was their strong attachment to the otherwise excellent theology of Abraham Kuyper. Kuyper rejected the disputed Article 36 of the *Belgic Confession* mandating that the civil magistrate use both tablets of the law. In the fourth commandment, God makes a distinction between the alien and the citizen but applies the one law to both groups equally. Kuyper and his South African followers also ignored the theonomic footnotes of the *Heidelberg Catechism* which used the equity of the Mosaic judicials to instruct in social righteousness. If they had studied and applied these so-called “stranger laws” this evil aspect of Apartheid would have been rejected. Sadly, this biblical principle is being violated by the newest form of Apartheid being imported from America, Affirmative Action (it is more honestly called Reverse Discrimination).

In addition to this, God designed this common law principle to teach that His Law had universal applicability for all peoples (cf. Dt. 4:5-8). When ethnic strangers came into the covenant land they were obligated to obey God's law, just as the citizen was. God destroyed the covenant breaking peoples from the land because they did those abominable things forbidden in the law. It was for this reason that covenant keepers, both faithful ethnic aliens and native-born members of the covenant, “... *must keep my decrees and my laws. The native-born and the aliens living among you must not do any of these detestable things, for all these things were done by the people who lived in the land before you, and the land became defiled.*” God is an impartially just God, a principle repeated continuously in both testaments (cf. NT: Acts 10:34ff; Rom.. 1:32-2:11; 3:9-24, 10:12; Eph. 6:9; Jas. 2:1-11): “...*if you defile the land, it will vomit you out as it vomited out the nations that were before you*” (Lev. 18:26ff).

In summary, then, Scripture teaches that there is one God and one divinelow. All individuals and groups are equally liable to the one law of God (cf. Rom. 2:1ff, 3:9-20, 23).

However, contrary to PC propaganda, which is ultimately derived from the French Revolution, this Biblical principle does not mean that all forms of group “discrimination” are evil. God discriminates and teaches His children to discriminate. He does not treat every individual person as a groupless individual. The concept of non-discriminating, totally equal, “individual rights” without any recognition of God-defined group differences is certainly anti-Biblical. This is clear if by “discrimination” we mean first of all,

- to discern God-created moral and natural distinctions and secondly,
- to treat people differently according to God-defined group role distinctions and according to the differing penal standards God has mandated for just versus aberrant behavior.

For this reason God commands Christians to discriminate (ie. make a distinction) between the law-abiding group and the group of unrepentant abortionists, sodomites, thieves, idolaters, etc. Furthermore, God mandates a carefully defined discrimination between the male group and the female group. He also mandates differing roles in family, church and civil governments that each gender group is authorized or forbidden to perform (1 Tim. 2:8-15; Eph. 5:21ff; Is. 3:12). The same is true of God-mandated distinction between the parental and child groups, between the young and old, the elect and reprobate, covenantally faithful families and peoples and those families and peoples who are hostile to His covenant law.

Interestingly enough, God, through the Apostle Paul, approved even of a “discriminatory” ethnic based “stereotype”: “*Cretans are always liars, evil brutes, lazy gluttons. This testimony is true*”, Paul declared. Upon this basis, Titus was to sharply rebuke the Cretans' aberrant actions: “*Therefore, rebuke them sharply, so that they will be sound in the faith...*” (Tit. 1: 12-13). Anthropologists have long noted that peoples and cultures have a strong tendency to share certain character, attitude and behavior traits. Some are positive and some are evil depending on whether they conform to or are hostile to the norms of Scripture. God has sovereign-ly allowed differing peoples to develop different national or group characteristics. Contrary to the politically correct analysis of South Africa (and the “Third World”), all people(s) are not exactly equal, differing only in the amount of education and opportunity!

Thus, the biblical analysis of this first form of Apartheid teaches us that legal social discrimination such as has been found in South Africa and the USA is only wrong if it occurs in violation of the just legal framework defined in God's Word. Furthermore, just as it is not evil for a mother rushing to the scene of a bus accident to first care for her own children before helping the other children, so it is not wrong to naturally prefer one's own family and people if the command to “love the alien as oneself” is obeyed and if this does not mean placing one's own family and people above one's covenant loyalty to God (Lk. 8:19-21, 11:27-28, 12:49ff). Sadly, however, this occurs all too often in Boer/Afrikaner (and American Reformed!) circles.

Apartheid Means Ethnic Residential Separation

The second and third aspects of Apartheid are residential segregation in every town and village (i.e. the Group Areas Act) and the Grand Apartheid vision of partitioning the land between each ethno-cultural group.

Throughout the world, geographical and urban-residential segregation occurs in two forms,

- first, a natural process of people preferring to live in areas/neighborhoods with others of their own language and/or culture, and
- second, that of legally mandating ethnic and/or racial residential neighborhoods and geographical areas.

According to Apartheid theory, the purpose of legally mandated urban residential

segregation was to allow each non-Euro-South African ethnic group to maintain its own distinctive group identity, values and language while sojourning in the urban areas. The ruling National Party did not want the non-European ethnic groups to assimilate into the two dominant Euro-South African ethno-cultural groups. They feared, rightly I believe, the loss of their unique Christianized cultural identity and their political self-determination under God.

Again, according to Afrikaner social theory, the non-European peoples were to be like the Turks and Yugoslavs in Germany, only temporary resident aliens (i.e. non-voting, guest workers) in the traditionally European dominated urban areas. The theory rightly held that these large cities were originally settled and developed by Euro-South Africans (beginning with Cape Town in 1652 by the Dutch) and thus belonged to them. The Boer/Afrikaner reasoned that just as a house guest is not given a mandated share in family decisions or of the family property, so non-Euro-South Africans ought not to be given the franchise, which inevitably would be used to expropriate Afrikaner property and destroy their political self-determination.

The guest workers were to have been resettled back into their own ethnic homelands where they were to exercise their political rights. There the problems of culture breakdown and social anomia springing from the loss of cultural and linguistic identity in the big anonymous Euro-South African cities were to have been avoided. The great problem came, naturally, when the workers were not resettled quickly enough due to an anti-Christian economic system that hindered economic growth in the ethnic homelands. Furthermore, because of massive Afro-South African population growth and the fact that these patchwork homeland areas, with a couple of very important exceptions, were not geographically consolidated, a biblically just control system could not be enforced. Lastly, the consolidation of the homelands was pursued by the biblically illegal method of expropriating land and using expropriated taxpayer's monies to support huge parasitic homeland bureaucracies. What should have occurred is the consequent redrawing of borders, granting full (and unmeddled-in) independence, and a withdrawal of all bureaucratic monetary aid. Botswana, Swaziland, and Lesotho are good examples of South African ethnic homelands that survived quite well using this method.

The theory failed, I believe, not because it was unjust, but because the Boer/Afrikaner, dominated by Kuyperian Dutch Calvinism, had little concept of a civil government strictly limited by Biblical law. In other words, the Afrikaner civil governors practically (but not officially) rejected Article 36 of the Belgic Confession and the theonomic footnotes of the Heidelberg Catechism. They rejected the concept that civil government was instituted by God solely to punish the wicked as defined by Biblical Law and protect the law-abider (cf. Rom. 13:2ff; 1 Pet. 2:13ff; Ps. 72, 82; Is. 10:1-2; et al). The 20th century Boer/Afrikaner, following a Medieval tradition perpetuated by certain Dutch Calvinist thinkers, misinterpreted Roman 13:4 to mean that the civil governor is supposed to think of the "general or common good" in an almost utilitarian sense, "the greatest good for the greatest number of people". Of course this was reading something into the text not exegeting it. The "good" certainly means, contextually (cf. Rom. 13:9-10, 7:12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20-25), that which is according to God's law, the obedience to which

brings good blessings to men (cf. Dt. 4:40, 5:16, 29, 33, 12:28).

Because the Boer/Afrikaner National Party used an anti-biblical interpretation, they reaped the bitter fruit of the resulting socialism. Since they forcibly expropriated (i.e. stole) tax monies to uplift their own people, they could not easily resist the guilt-pressure to spend huge amounts on social upliftment programs for non-European South Africans in the Euro-South African urban areas. This was especially true in the later years of Apartheid (1976-1992) as the National Party began frantically trying to appease the outside world and to stave off internal disaster.¹ At the same time, billions in tax monies were used to try to develop the ethnic homelands' economies. All of this failed miserably because all property and businesses in both the ethnic homelands and in the non-European townships were so fettered with bureaucratic red tape one economist claims it was worse than Eastern Europe! Lastly, this vision of residential and geographical Apartheid was the exact opposite of the Anglo-American imperial ideal which served as the social blueprint during the 150 years British domination of the sub-continent. For the pre-1948 British-South African voter, legal segregation was only to be a temporary phenomenon. The British, with their individualistic ideologies of Classic Liberalism and Social Democracy, did not see the “natives” as members of various God-created ethno-cultural based “nations” as did the Boer/Afrikaner, but as a collection of mere individuals lacking only education and culture. These groupless individuals could perhaps be temporarily segregated for the convenience of the civilized European settler but only until the individual “barbarian” Africans could be educated, assimilated into “civilized” British cultural norms, and eventually granted an equal vote with Euro-South Africans.

Unlike the Boer/Afrikaner's biblically based theory, this 19th and early 20th British imperial concept was based upon a deep-seated sense of ethnic and racial supremacy still present among many (most?) Anglo-South Africans today (even though they hotly deny it). The Boer/Afrikaner Calvinist, however, traditionally had a very simple and Biblical rationale for this type of geographical separation. God “*formed all the peoples*” from “*one blood*”, placed them in a specific geographical area (“*determined the boundaries of their habitation*”) and has given each people a sense of religious and cultural (Reformed thinkers say, “covenantal”) solidarity (“*that they should seek God...*”) (Acts 17:26) even though that covenantal solidarity is perverted by all pagan peoples to make a covenant with a false god (cf. Mic. 4:5; Num. 21:29; Is. 10:10, 28:15, 18; Ps. 96:5; Jer. 48:46).

Paul (Acts 17:26) and Moses (cf. Dt. 32:8) refer the phenomenon of separate peoples to the events at Babel (Gen. 10 and 11). Inerrantist Boer/Afrikaner theologians correctly attributed this long passage in Genesis to Moses and interpreted it to mean that when rebellious mankind refused to spread out over the face of the earth at Babel they were rejecting God's sovereignly instituted Dominion (or Cultural) Mandate to spread out over the earth and rule it as vice-gerents of God. Rebel mankind stated explicitly that the reason for their disobedience was “... *lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth*” (Gen. 11:4). This was in open and knowledgeable defiance of their Creator's explicit, twice repeated command to “*multiply and fill the earth*” (Gen. 1:28, 9:1). For Boer/Afrikaners, because God created the separate ethno-linguistic groups of the

¹ The 1976 Soweto riots, it seems, were the catalyzing factor that motivated this attempt.

earth (Ps. 86:9), it was total Anti-Christ rebellion to try to unite them into one unitary imperial State (cf. Rev. 13) in which all would be de-culturalized and forced to adopt one culture and language (i.e. English).

Boer/Afrikaner Reformed thinkers have long noted that ethno-cultural residential segregation naturally occurs in all multi-ethnic countries apart from any legal coercion. This is the commonly recognized human social phenomenon that ethno-cultural groups have a strong tendency to group together where each group can be with “their own kind of people” in church/religious, sporting, and social activities. They noted that like all other peoples, Euro-South Africans naturally tend to live in separate suburbs dominated by their own people—one dominated by Boer/Afrikaners the other by Anglo-South Africans. In fact, this phenomenon was well noted among all ethnic groups in Southern Africa years before legal segregation was imposed with such zeal in the sixties and seventies.

Apartheid Means Resistance to Alien Ethnic Domination

To understand the reasoning behind “Group Areas” legislation and geographical partition, it is necessary to grasp the fourth aspect of Apartheid, that of Boer/Afrikaner resistance to alien ethnic domination. This was at first a strong reaction to British Imperialism, then against the threat to their freedom and self-determination in their own land from the massive influx of Afro-ethnic aliens demanding the voting right. To understand this, requires some biblical, historical and cultural background.

Since 1948, the whole of South Africa, with the exception of the ethnic homelands, has been run as a virtual Boer/Afrikaner fiefdom. The Boer/Afrikaner people considered themselves an ethno-covenantally bound citizen group. Anglo-South Africans were grudgingly granted voting status due to the events surrounding the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902). In other words, these two groups were alone considered citizens, all others were aliens, or guest-workers. How did this all come about?

First of all, it is necessary to note that South Africa does not have one totally dominating language and social group into which all immigrants are expected to eventually assimilate, such as the USA, the UK, Holland and Germany have. Southern Africa is actually the remnant of diverse multi-ethnic, multi-national British empire. At the turn of the century, Britain took the final steps in completing a 100 year old plan, begun in 1806 with the occupation of the Dutch Cape Colony. They deliberately and brutally forced the two independent Boer Republics to join two European colonies and several African kingdoms (e.g.. the Sotho, Tswana, Zulu and Xhosa) into one administrative area in which the 'civilized' and 'superior' English language and culture was *supposed* to dominate.²

2 I.e. two independent Dutch-Afrikaner Republics—the Zuid-Afrikaanse Republiek of Pres. Paul Kruger [ZAR] and the Oranje Vrijstaat [OVS], several independent African ethnic kingdoms—e.g. the kingdoms of the Zulu [now Kwa-Zulu], Sotho [now Lesotho], Xhosa [now Transkei and Ciskei], Swazi [now Swaziland and KaNgwane], Tswana [now Botswana and Bophuthatswana], etc., and two Anglo-Dutch colonies [e.g. Natal and Cape colonies].

It is to the Lord's glory that this English domination process was never finished as the British globalist-imperialists had planned. This was due to several factors,³ the most important of which, as we have seen, was that the British were working to reverse a divine Creation ordinance (Gen. 1:28). If, after the flood, mankind had spread out over the earth as God had ordained, they would have developed separate lingual-cultural groups in each area where they settled. Geographical isolation over time creates new dialects and eventually cultures. Linguistic and ethno-cultural diversity, it seems, was God's plan from the beginning.

God's plan, however, crushed Britain's plan. One means He used was the fiercely independent Boer (Afrikaner) people. Of all the imperially dominated groups in Africa, they resented this plan the most. They had deliberately emmigrated from the eastern zone of the British occupied Cape colony beginning about 1837-8 to escape English domination and to escape the endless round of wars with the marauding Xhosa people who had been slowly migrating from south-central Africa along South Africa's present east coast during the same period that the Boers were trekking north-east from the original Dutch settlement at Cape Town.

Even though the Boer Voortrekkers (pronounced Foortrekkers) were excommunicated by their cousins in the Dutch Reformed Church for rebellion against the crown because they emmigrated, they did not lose their faith. For example, the vastly outnumbered Boer trekkers fought a series of dramatic battles against the pagan Zulus and their close cousins, the Matabele. In two of these battles (Blood River and Vegkop) the godly Dutch Reformed lay leaders made vows before the Lord of hosts that if He would rescue them from the attacks of these heathen peoples they would honor Him in a special way. The Lord did deliver them and these godly men kept their vows (even until today with the annual national Sabbath Day on December 16th).

Most importantly, the Voortrekker leaders did not interpret the victories as the defeat of inferior sub-humans but as a struggle of the Gospel against Paganism. In their eyes this was a defensive battle of a Christian people coming in peace against pagan demonized peoples. For example, the victorious Battle of Blood River in Natal occurred immediately after dictator Shaka Zulu's powerful imperial kingdom broke a treaty to allow the Boers to settle in unoccupied land. He murdered Boer leaders in the middle of the treaty signing ceremony and then had his troops slaughter a large group of Boer men, women and children left behind in a wagon train. In a defensive counteraction, about 350 Boers in a circled wagon train won a miraculous victory against about 15,000 attacking Zulus. This broke the Zulus' resistance to the gospel which American and British missionaries had experienced up to then.

After the Zulu defeat, though virulently against British missionaries such as David Livingstone, who they interpreted as agents of the imperialists (which sadly was often true), the Boer trekkers invited German and American missionaries into their areas. They were to evangelize the remnants of the "natives" that remained there and to use the Boer areas as stepping stones to reach the peoples living further in the African interior. At this time they invited the Princeton graduate and Southern Presbyterian missionary to the

³ See Otto Scott, *The Other End of the Lifeboat* for an excellent discussion of this plan.

Zulus, Rev. Daniel Lindley, to be their first Pastor. He founded the first Reformed Church in the interior of Africa among the Boers who still hold his memory in great esteem. It was he who catechized and helped disciple Oom (Uncle) Paul Kruger, the godly Calvinist President of the northern most of the two independent Boer Republics founded in the interior. This faith upheld him as he struggled against almost impossible odds to maintain the freedom of his people against British imperial aggression.

After diamonds, gold and fabulous mineral wealth were discovered in the virtually depopulated areas in north-central South Africa where the Boers settled, they had to fight two wars against Britain. They were valiantly trying to protect their independence against Britain's imperial attempts to annex them and bring these so-called "rebel subjects back under the rightful authority of the Queen"!

To understand Boer/Afrikaner resistance to giving voting rights to any other people besides themselves and the Anglo-South Africans, it is necessary to note that the British used the theme of voting rights to further justify their aggression. The imperialists demanded that the British migrants, who had so very recently entered the land with gold fever, must have their "right" to vote. These migrant guest workers, concentrated mostly in the tiny area around the fabulous goldfields of Johannes-burg, had become a small majority in the Zuid-Afrikaanse Republiek of Oom Paul Kruger. He correctly realized that these "immigrants" did not want to accept the covenantal faith of the Boers, adopt their language or (in the "Brits" perspective) the Boers "inferior" culture. The imperialists wanted only to annex the riches of the land, destroy the freedom of the people and force them again into an alien faith and culture. Oom Paul illustrated the injustice of this with the analogy of a old Boer riding on an oxcart into Pretoria. Upon seeing two Brits wanting a ride, he picked them up. These Brits upon whispered discussion, declared that since they were now the majority, the oxcart belonged to them! Oom Paul concluded, "It is not the voting rights these men want but my land!" Historically, this is exactly how the Boer/Afrikaner rightly saw the demand by the non-voters for their "inherent" right to vote.

In the Boer War, ostensibly fought to give the guest workers their right to vote, a deeply divided population of Boers, fielding an army of about 35,000 13 to 65 year olds against 20,000-30,000 of their own traitorous countrymen and 450,000 British troops, held out for about three and a half years against this mightiest of empires. The British only subjugated them after using a technique perhaps learned from Gen. Sherman of the American Army of Northern Aggression. They burned all the Boer fighters' farms, slaughtered their animals, and rounded up the old men and women, mothers and children into 'concentration camps' (they invented the word). One third of the population was brutally sacrificed to the Molech of British imperialism. In this Boer holocaust people succumbed to dysentery, cholera, typhoid fever, and the plague, including a huge percentage of their "breeding machine". Some scholars estimate that due to this loss of Boer mothers, they lost about one and a half to five million potential Boers.

After losing their independence in this valiant but almost hopeless war against the world Superpower (1898-1901), the Boers began an eighty-five year struggle (1901-1985) to regain their political and economic self-determination. The Boers teamed up with their

Cape Colony based Afrikaner ethnic cousins, who together made up about 60% of the Euro-South African population. The only intact institutions they had were strong and growing families and two large inerrantist and biblically Reformed Churches. The largest of these Churches had recently won a fifty year battle against Enlightenment influenced rationalism and was especially a willing ally. Together these men formed many Reformed, *Dutch* speaking schools. Young scholars educated at Kuyper's Free University in Amsterdam in turn founded or strengthened already existing *Dutch-speaking*, Christian-dominated Universities. They deliberately resisted the British who planned to Anglicize and make humanists of their children by controlling a solely *English* medium public school system.

In 1948, their hard work bore fruit. Their Boer/Afrikaner National Party succeeded in wresting the power of State from the pantheist Anglophile and Anglo-Boer War General, Jan Smuts, who as a proto-New Ager wrote a New Age classic, *Holism and Evolution*, and as a humanist-internationalist wrote the preamble to the *UN Declaration of Human Rights*. Smuts's strategy (seemingly like De Klerk's today)⁴ had been to forge an alliance between the divided Boer/Afrikaners and a unified Anglo-South African people to bring South Africa into the gradually evolving New World Order that he and his fellow planners were struggling to create.⁵

From 1948 to the late 1980's, the second generation of nationalistic Boer/Afrikaner Calvinists succeeded in postponing much of Smuts's plan. At the end of this second period (after about 85 years of struggle), they succeeded in establishing a Boer/Afrikaner military hegemony over Southern Africa and established Afrikaans as the primary language of State and Defense.⁶ English language and humanistic values, however, according to the imperialists' master plan, still retained a very strong position throughout the whole area. In some regions it is virtually dominant. Indeed, Anglo-South Africans and Nelson Mandela's Xhosa-dominated African National Congress talk of undoing the fruit of this 85 year old struggle.⁷ They desire to build a new coalition of forces and to make English once again the sole national language and humanism the dominant religion. Sadly, the children of the Boer/Afrikaner Calvinists have no spiritual means to resist this as their own churches and schools have been successfully infiltrated and are now dominated by humanism.

4 De Klerk's men, it seems, are also fatally infected with the humanist New World Order sickness. It seems that their strategy is to forge another alliance of peoples, led by Afrikaans speakers (i.e. including the two and one half million Creole-Afrikaners, the so-called colored people), to control the subcontinent in close interaction with the World System.

5 Please refer to Prof. C. Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment*.

6 Note I have deliberately been using this dual name for the descendants of the original Dutch settlers. At the present time, the use of the name Boer (i.e. 'farmer') is regaining popularity among secessionist minded Northerners. The Boer/Afrikaner people is actually an increasingly unstable coalition of two closely related peoples, similar to Judah-Benjamin and Israel, living in the North and the South of the country.

7 The leadership of the African National Congress is dominated by the Xhosa people who have been the chief domestic antagonist of the Boers for the last 200 years. Nelson Mandela is himself from the traditional ruling clan of the Xhosa. Interestingly, when an ANC leader is not Xhosa, however, he is almost inevitably a Marxist, philosophically unitarian Jew (cf. Joe Slovo) or a Marxist Indian from a unitarian Muslim or pantheist, unitarian Hindu background!

After 1948, the Boer/Afrikaner correctly saw that ethnic aliens would try to subvert their hard won self-determination using the argument of voting rights. To preserve their freedom, they deliberately tried to unscramble the ethnic mess British domination of the subcontinent from 1806 to 1948 created. They embarked on a plan to gradually divide the country into several, independent, mono-lingual Afro-ethnic homelands similar to what Swaziland, Botswana and Lesotho are today.⁸ The influx of Afro-ethnics from their traditionally settled homeland areas was controlled by a desperately hated Pass Law system. The Afro-ethnic peoples in the large urban centers, carefully segregated ostensibly to preserve their cultures, were to have been mostly shipped back to their homelands. In the remaining land Boer/Afrikaners and their Anglo-South African co-citizens would exercise self-determination.

This strategy looked practical in the fifties and sixties but the huge increase of Afro-ethnic population dimmed its practicality by the early seventies. In 1901, at the end of the Anglo-Boer War, the native African population was about 3,000,000 whereas the combined population of Euro-ethnics was about 1,000,000. In 1948, the Afro-ethnic population had tripled to 9,000,000. That still looked manageable to the approximately 2.75-3 million Euro-South Africans; after all, South Africa is a huge country.

However, by the mid-eighties the Boer/Afrikaner elite had given up hope that their strategy could succeed with more than 40 million Afro-ethnics and only about 5 million Euro-ethnics. They acquiesced to the removal of all alien influx controls and what they long anticipated is now occurring. Cities have begun collapsing under a massive influx of rural peoples from throughout all of Southern Africa. All these peoples have in turn refused to return to a home they no longer want. What with the glitter and higher standard of living in the city, even living in a filthy squatter camp like most other Third World urbanites is a step up from what they had been experiencing.

These new urbanites, freed from external tribal shackles, have adopted the heroin-like addiction of sexual license. 80% of Afro-South African children in several large urban centers have been conceived illegitimately for at least the last decade and a half. During this time the Afro-ethnic family structure virtually collapsed in an orgy of vicious youth-led violence, anarchistic wave of robberies, revolution inspired necklace murders, and social chaos.

The now pragmatic ruling Boer/Afrikaner elite, no longer thinking biblically because of the plague of Barthian mysticism and Enlightenment skepticism, has desperately tried to rejoin the world the last two and one half years. They have released Marxist terrorists and about 75,000 prisoners so that the world can't claim they are still holding "political prisoners". They have suspended the death penalty, allowed X-Rated movies (though not yet such magazines), not resisted abortion on demand (held off by Christian action), and allowed explicit AIDS inspired sex-education, humanist multi-cultural education, and Look-Say reading methods. They are trying to buy the best appeased "peace, prosperity, and security" they can. Many politicians will openly admit that they are also

⁸ Those three countries, formerly under South African legal domination when the country was controlled by the English, remained under British imperial hegemony after 1948 when the Boer/Afrikaner National Party came to power and have since had their independence internationally recognized.

trying to buy the urban Afro-ethnic vote by massive socialist largess. Billions of taxpayers monies are being poured into the black hole of urban housing, school construction, and “making up the social backlog of the Apartheid years”.

Evan the formerly Christianized Euro-South African civilization is collapsing. The watershed year was 1975 when several biblically based laws were changed. The law banning abortion was changed to allow several exceptions (rape, incest, etc.). Laws forbidding divorce except for adultery and abandonment were changed to bring in no-fault divorce. The very strict anti-pornography law was replaced with one giving mere lip service to Christian values but actually weighing all decisions in favor of the 'reasonable man' and a changing “social consensus”. In addition, that year the Boer Calvinists lost the decades old battle to keep out broadcast television from the land. Their dire predictions about this medium have come true!

This degenerating process, which is much further advanced in Anglo circles, is now moving with frightening rapidity even in Boer/Afrikaner areas. The result is a massive increase of suburban crime (still overwhelmingly dominated, however, by the various Afro-ethnic groups). Afrikaner children learning to read a perfect phonetic language are experiencing reading problems for the first time in history because of the importation of the American Look-Say reading method. “Living together”, illegitimacy, homo-sexuality, Satanism, family murders, divorce statistics second to none except the USA, their adulterous-idolatrous role model, are reaching terrifying proportions. There are shades of Oholah and Ololibah (Ez. 23)!

The originally Euro-South African cities, with the possible exception of Pretoria and Bloemfontein, the former Boer Republican capitals, are rapidly becoming Third World urban centers. The segregation of peoples into race based townships allowed a sort of pluralist value polytheism to descend upon these large urban centers. Polygamy, shamanism (African witchcraft), demon inspired Ancestor worship, testing a girl's fertility by bearing an illegitimate child before marriage and other pagan African customs so rampant in the townships are moving into suburbia with the removal of group areas. Huge areas of central Johannesburg and Durban are becoming a Brooklyn and Harlem virtually overnight.

In response, the Boer/Afrikaner is not repenting of one of the great sins of Apartheid, the sin of allowing multiple law systems for various peoples, implying the existence of multiple gods. They are not returning fully to the one true God, His one true biblical law and His one impartial, common law based legal system for all, citizen and alien alike. Instead, the Boer/Afrikaner elite is adopting a “moderate” version of the West's democratic pluralist civil religion. They are replacing an imperfect Christianized civil faith with a consequently humanist civil religion. That civil religion, at present, is wearing the garb of pietistic Christianity, but that can't last for but a couple of years.

Thus the Boer/Afrikaner is throwing out the best of his Reformed-Protestant insight and completely adopting the pagan humanist critique of his social system. Instead of building on the concept that citizenship, as in Israel, must be ethno-covenantal, they have adopted the humanistic, French Revolutionary concept that citizenship and voting are rights, inherent in the human nature. They have rejected their implicitly held, though not

consequently acted upon concept, that being born within a geographic area does not automatically make one a citizen. After all, Israelites were never considered citizens after several generations in Egypt, nor were the Canaanites within Israel, nor were Amerindian nations in the American constitution. In the third generation (cf. Dt. 23:7-8), *with full suffrage in the legal assembly*, upon confession of faith (sealed by baptism replacing circumcision) and faithful identification with their new law, God, their new language and people and destiny (cf. Ruth 1:15-17, 2:11, 4:11). They correctly saw that the passages so misused by humanistic Christians, e.g. “*In Christ* [i.e. in covenantal fealty with the resurrected and Anointed King of the New Creation] *there is no Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male or female,*” mean that all groups mentioned have equal access to the throne of grace, not that the created boundaries between the groups are removed.⁹ However, they could not bring themselves to allow black or brown true immigrants (i.e.. one fulfilling Ruth's type of identification) to be adopted into the large extended family which is the nation/people. This was a failure of biblical love which fulfills the law of God.

Furthermore, the Boer/Afrikaner Calvinists could not bring themselves to cut off from the covenant their disobedient and rebellious children. There has been a breakdown of their covenantal churches and civil government order. Without the covenant as defined by the equity of divine Law as Standard, they had to turn to man's humanistic norm and they are reaping the fruits of turning away from the God of the covenant.

Was racism a problem in their concept of the covenant? Definitely yes, but not in the way Americans would think. Race, or skin color, was a crude *ethnic* indicator before the law. This was very unfortunate because the Boer/Afrikaner seemed to see citizenship as an ethno-covenantal relationship. Following their Reformed thinking but again not consequently acting upon it, they saw their people as a covenantal people within the overarching unity of the Renewed Mankind in Christ (cf. Is. 19:23-25). They did not agree with the basic individualistic assumption of the anabaptistic American culture that the New Covenant moves from family and group covenantal solidarity to a mere individual relationship with God. They saw correctly that the New Covenant includes all peoples, that is individuals come into the kingdom/New Jerusalem with their rulers and ethnic identity (cf. Ps. 2, 22:27ff, 67, 87, 96; Is. 2:2ff; Rom. 15:7-12; Rev. 21:3 [KJV], 21:24, 26, et al). However, in a compromise with prejudice and because it made things vastly simpler, they imposed race classification upon the South African ethnic mosaic. That was fatal!

Thus, not all aspects of ethnic reality fit into their theory. This was a special injustice to the Christianized segments of the the so-called Colored people.¹⁰ Many of this people had a pure European parent or grandparent(s) and in many families some children were classified as first-class 'whites' while their siblings were relegated to second class 'colored' status.

⁹ Gal. 3:28, cf. also 1 Cor. 12:12-13 which demonstrates this clearly.

¹⁰ The race classification, coloured, in South African law lumped together at least four separate though closely related ethnic groups: brown Anglo-South Africans, brown Afrikaners, Muslim Malays, and what are colloquially called Capeys, small Afrikaans speaking, somewhat Christianized descendants of the San and Khoi-Khoi peoples that originally inhabited the Cape Province.

Conclusion

Apartheid theory, then, was a noble vision that failed.¹¹ What must we expect? Can a biblical vision be purified and restored to the land? Yes! If the various peoples turn back to the Boer/Afrikaner's original biblical concept of covenant and apply it consequently to family, church and civil governments. To do this will be a long uphill battle. The Afrikaans speaking group that I worked with, the Center for Reformed and Contemporary Studies (CERCOS) in Pretoria, has been developing materials to spread the Reformed, biblical World and Life view. We have developed a concise statement of that Worldview in twenty short confessional style articles with scriptural proofs. We entitled it, *A Manifesto for Christians in Southern Africa*. It is being translated into several major languages and is being used by several networking groups together with CERCOS to help educate and mobilize Christian Action cell groups all over the country. We call these Salt Shaker groups to emphasize their task. We have had several important victories in the last year and a half such as getting soft-porn magazines removed from two major super market chains and the postponement of an abortion on demand bill!

Along with Christian action, however, Christian South Africans must also return to a consequently biblicalmissiological vision. They must begin to believe and act upon the fact that King Jesus rose again and is seated upon the throne of heaven after finishing His work leading to our justification. He is presently acting through His saints to bring all peoples, tongues and tribes into His New Jerusalem above, before the Second Coming. This will give the various peoples a vision to (re)build a godly culture, and to disciple their neighboring peoples.

In addition, all need to (re)gain the concept of the universal equity of the Mosaic judicials found in the Three Forms of Unity of the Reformed Churches. This will give them a tool and a standard for building their culture over the coming generations without socialism and without injustice.

Lastly, all of what I have discussed above leads to one logical conclusion if a restorative biblical peace and justice are to occur in Southern Africa. The process of partitioning the joint Anglo-Boer "empire", begun by the National Party in 1948 using Kuyperian Social Democratic methods, must be continued, this time justly and consequently. Whoever does this must use the biblical, reformational "Stranger Laws" and the principles of private

11 Apartheid failed because of socialism. It failed because of the breakdown of biblical morality. It failed because the Boer/Afrikaner population growth, greatly impeded by the slaughter in the British concentration camps, vanished completely in the early 1970's under a Rockefeller Foundation financed onslaught of Population Bomb propaganda. It failed because the Calvinist elite lacked a consequently Biblical eschatological blueprint that gave the people a dynamic hope of the conversion of the peoples under the Lordship of King Jesus (cf. Ps. 2) to give an alternative to the New World Order's vision of a centralized neo-Babel. This was due to the slowworking immune deficiency virus of certain forms of amillennialism and pre-millennialism that infected the Boer/Afrikaner people. Consumed with this pessimistic eschatological virus, the children of the godly Boers are turning increasingly to escapist Charismatic sects or total secularism. Lastly, Apartheid failed because it forgot the Reformational emphasis on the equity of biblical law. This alone could have given their theologians, politicians and lawyers a specific standard to judge whether legislation was just or oppressive. Without this legal blueprint, the Boer/Afrikaner intellectuals have easily succumbed to the humanist critique of Apartheid.

property based economics. Furthermore, all responsible must take into account the *historic and present* settlement and land claims of the various peoples including, especially, the Boers. There are several groups among the Boer/Afrikaner people who plan to do just this. They are thoroughly studying where their people settled and are drawing carefully studied maps of the possible borders of their restored Boer Calvinist Republic based upon the land in the Northern Natal, Transvaal around Pretoria, Northern Cape and Orange Free State provinces that they historically owned and settled. They intend to claim their just inheritance peacefully under their chosen representatives, but fully intend to invoke the Reformed doctrine of the Resistance of the Lesser Magistrate that President Paul Kruger used against the British, if and when that may become necessary.

If a just partition does not occur peacefully and soon, then the greatest probability of what will occur is a Yugoslavia type scenario in which the “empire” blows apart in a large-scale inter-ethnic war. Either way a total collapse of Christian civilization due to Socialism, social sin and the multiple plagues that AIDS is bringing is a distinct possibility as well.

We Americans should watch and be warned. We must learn the lesson of our smaller sister. The lessons on the covenant, citizenship, and the Stranger Laws need to be applied soon here or the Union will not last long under the weight of socialism, influx of aliens who have no sympathy with America's former Lord and King nor His law, and plagues that He is bringing!