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Introduction

This study is my second research project in exploring the emergence and evolution of the Cape Afrikaner ethnic community in the late nineteenth century. In defining the collective identity and consciousness of Cape Afrikaners as ethnic rather than national, I follow Ernest Gelner, who defines nationalism as 'a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent'. This, as I have shown elsewhere, was not the ideological and political thrust of Cape Afrikaner ethnic assertion at that period. The evolution of a Cape Afrikaner collective identity at that time did not attract the interest of many scholars. When I began my endeavour the main contributions to the understanding of Cape Afrikaner ethnic assertion in the late nineteenth century had been by T. R. H. Davenport and H. Giliomee. In my own attempt at a more systematic analysis I am informed by the theoretical inputs of scholars from different disciplines.

The focus of this study is the impact of the popular response of Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers to the Scab Act of 1894 (the Act), designed to eradicate the disease known as scab, on the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity, consciousness and politics. The origin of this study lies in my previous work on the relations between Cecil John Rhodes, the then Prime Minister, and the Cape Afrikaners. In that study I was particularly concerned with the emergence and evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity, consciousness and politics. I examined this process through the prism of the relations between the Cape Afrikaners and Rhodes. I viewed the Afrikaner Bond as the party representing Cape Afrikanerdom. This vantage point necessarily privileged the Cape Afrikaner political elite that led the party. While pursuing that study I became aware of the outburst of a popular protest movement within the Afrikaner community and the Afrikaner Bond against the Act. Being beyond the scope of my study, I dealt with its impact on Cape Afrikaner mainstream politics rather briefly and superficially. However, I marked it out as an intriguing topic for further investigation.

Originally I had in mind a study in local politics. I thought of dealing with the interaction between the centre and the periphery in the evolution of Cape Afrikaner politics. I soon realised, however, that I got more than I bargained for. The amazingly rich source material allowed me to move beyond the realm of ethnic ideologues and political entrepreneurs. This material guided me to the more fascinating investigation of the role played by Afrikaner farmers belonging to diverse socioeconomic strata in the process of ethnic identity and consciousness formation. In this respect this study is a definite contribution to the study of ethnicity and nationalism among the Cape Afrikaners and perhaps Afrikaners more broadly. Similar voices of ordinary farmers do not normally feature in studies of ethnicity and nationalism. In my study, ordinary
farmers are subjects, not merely objects, in the story of the emergence of the Cape Afrikaners as a community of identity.

Indeed, sheep farmers – especially those operating in hazardous conditions such as prevailed in many parts of the Cape – did not habitually engage in ideological debates on their ethnic identity. This was certainly true of Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers who had been more inclined to tend to their flocks than to get involved in ideological or political discourses affecting the destiny of their volk. This changed dramatically around the mid-1890s with the outburst of protest by Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers against the legislation related to scab. The wealth of material related to this episode is owed to the fact that it relates to the interaction between unwelcome government intervention in their economic pursuit and an exacerbating ecological crisis which pushed many sheep farmers to the verge of ruin. Consequently, many farmers were forced into the public political arena and into taking part in debates on the essence of being Cape Afrikaners.

The wealth of sources also stems from the fact that many Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers were literate and could leave behind them written testimonies. There were numerous newspapers in Dutch and Afrikaans which published thousands of letters or summaries of letters from ordinary sheep farmers. These newspapers also published reports, in certain cases detailed ones, on Afrikaner Bond annual congresses, on Bond district and local executive committee meetings and on public meetings related to the Scab Act crisis. The minutes of the parliamentary debates proved a useful source and the British colonial habit of setting up commissions of inquiry to investigate problems arising in their colonial domains also left a useful legacy. In 1892, the colonial parliament established the Scab Commission (the Commission) to investigate scab as a precursor to drafting prospective legislation to deal with it. The Report of the Scab Disease Commission, 1892–1894 (SCR) was submitted to the Cape Parliament in 1894. In fulfilling their task, the commissioners travelled the length and breadth of the Cape Colony (the Colony) visiting most sheep farming areas. The SCR contained not only their recommendations, but also a verbatim account of the evidence given by about a thousand people involved in sheep farming and wool marketing. Most of them were sheep farmers. This extraordinarily rich source proved most valuable. It contained the evidence not only of Afrikaner sheep farmers, but also English-speaking ones. This afforded me the opportunity of gaining most useful comparative insights. It also included evidence of Afrikaner farmers in almost all income brackets and from most regions. This facilitated a comparative socioeconomic investigation. The reports of the Labour Commission and the Liquor Commission also contained relevant information.

Much of the above material does not relate directly and overtly to the process of Cape Afrikaner ethnic formation. It could be equally used in a study of sociocultural and political ecology. Much of it is about environmental conditions prevailing in the Cape
and affecting sheep farming. It contains a wealth of information about local knowledge and local remedial solutions, about the perception of modern veterinary science and modern animal husbandry, about social networks supporting sheep farming and farmers’ responses to government betterment initiatives. And yet, the thrust of this study is Afrikaner ethnicity rather than ecology. It is not my intention to divorce ethnicity from ecology. My position is that ethnicity, like nationalism, is not simply about political ideologies and cultural concerns in the strict sense. Indeed, ecological concerns determining the daily lives of ordinary farmers can meaningfully impact the ethnic discourse and the process of ethnic identity and consciousness formation. In this as well this study may make a contribution to the study of both academic fields.

It is appropriate at this point to outline my broad theoretical paradigm in studying the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity and consciousness. Any serious attempt at understanding this process must give full cognisance to the impact of British colonial rule. The British, who took permanent possession of the Cape in 1806, ushered in the conditions under which Cape Afrikaner collective identity evolved gradually but surely, attaining full blossom by the end of the century. From 1652 until the British occupation, the Cape was ruled by the Dutch East India Company (the Company), a commercial company with no political colonial ambitions in the southern tip of Africa. The founding of a large-scale settlement colony was certainly not high on the Company’s agenda. Conditions for the evolution of a collective ethnic identity had hardly reached fruition among the white population under the Company’s rule. The Company had no interest in investing money in the Colony that rendered a marginal contribution to its commercial operations in the East. Consequently, the relatively small number of white settlers spread, in search of livelihood, over a tremendously large area, living in isolation and without regular contact outside their immediate vicinity. Communication beyond that was made very difficult by the geographical conditions and by the Company’s unwillingness to invest in the necessary infrastructure to overcome them. Most white settlers lived as trekboere, nomad stock farmers, who were largely isolated from the very few urban centres that existed in the period of Dutch occupation.

Yet, under the Company’s rule there developed a culturally distinct group out of its three ethnic components – Dutch, German and French – that shared common characteristics. They all spoke the Dutch language or its debased local variant. Most of them were farmers, agriculturalists and stock farmers. They adhered to the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC). They also had the indigenous blacks against whom to distinguish themselves as whites. But beyond that the conditions for the emergence of a meaningful collective ethnic identity were absent. Beyond living in isolation, there was no effective, penetrating political centre and there was little economic integration. The word ‘Afrikaner’, that was used in some documents, does not negate the above. The linguistic and cultural proximity between the settlers and their ruler also inhibited the process of ethnic formation. Consequently, Cape Afrikaners by the
end of the period of Dutch occupation had existed ‘objectively’ as a distinct cultural
group, but had not yet developed a ‘subjective’ sense of ethnic community. To use
Anthony Smith’s terms, they were an ‘ethnic category’ rather than an ‘ethnie’.7

In accounting for the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity under British rule, I
am indebted to another theoretical contribution by Smith. British imperialism, which
also brought in its wake aggressive capitalism to the sleepy Cape economy, introduced
to the Afrikaners’ living space the ‘Triple Revolution’ – economic, administrative and
educational – which in Europe, according to Smith, was at the root of ethnic revival and
nationalism.8 In the wake of the administrative ‘revolution’ of the 1920s, the colonial
state became increasingly effective and intrusive, transforming the Colony into a
unified and centralised political and administrative space affecting the lives of most
Afrikaners.9 British capitalism was instrumental in ushering in an economic ‘revolution’
linking the Cape economy to the most vibrant, aggressive global economy of the day.
The large-scale introduction of Merino sheep from the 1930s and the discovery of
diamonds in the late 1860s considerably expanded the scale and horizon of the Cape
economy. The economy was also served by large investments in physical and economic
infrastructures, including roads and railways, post and telegraph networks, banks and
other financial institutions, and a widespread commercial network. The fast-growing
urban sector – from the city to the smallest dorp (village) – provided a focal point for
a much more integrated ‘common market’ which increasingly interacted with the
global economy.10 The third ‘revolution’ effected by the British was educational and
cultural. Education under the Company was very rudimentary and random.11 British
plans for assimilating the Afrikaners through education proceeded very slowly.12
However, with the introduction of the Education Act in 1865, the educational system
began to penetrate rural Afrikaner communities. In 1867, it was reported that ‘there
is scarcely a village or hamlet in the Colony without a public school’.13 More than
transforming Cape Afrikaners culturally, the educational ‘revolution’ contributed to
the development of their distinct ethnocultural awareness. British occupation also
brought in its wake an impressive expansion in the scope of the DRC that had also
suffered from gross neglect under the Company’s rule.14 In 1811, it was reported that
parents feared that ‘their children, growing up without education, without knowledge
of the first principles of religion and morality, would at best be like nothing else than
savages’.15 By 1854 there were 49 DRC congregations spread throughout the Colony.
In 1824, a Synod was established to coordinate the activities of the DRC throughout
the Cape.16 The DRC became the most effective socialising agency among Cape
Afrikaners, instilling in them a sense of a spiritual community.

The ‘Triple Revolution’ had a dramatic effect on the Afrikaner collective identity. The
isolated, parochial Afrikaner farming communities were engulfed by these waves of
radical change, increasingly taking part in overlapping common, colony-wide political,
economic and cultural spaces. This in itself engendered among them a much greater
sense of belonging to a broad, colony-wide ethnic community.
Indeed, throughout the nineteenth century, the British introduced ideal conditions for the evolution of a Cape Afrikaner imagined community, namely a community rooted not in concrete social structures and relations, but rather in the human capacity for sociocultural imagination. B. Anderson's concept of 'print capitalism' as a vital agent in the spread of nationalism in Europe is also relevant to nineteenth century Cape Afrikaners. In the case of the Cape it was manifested in an amazing spread of newspapers catering for the increasingly literate Afrikaners. Towards the end of the century almost every small town could boast its own newspaper serving the local Afrikaner community. There were also newspapers based in the Western Cape that were distributed throughout the Colony. Most of them were in Dutch, but there was also the *Patriot*, founded and edited by S. J. du Toit, that was written in Afrikaans. Du Toit was also the founder of the Afrikaans language movement that sought to transform the local Dutch *patois* into a written literary language. These newspapers promoted ethnic identity and consciousness among Cape Afrikaners, thus engendering in them the sense of belonging to a large-scale 'abstract' ethnocultural community.

Last but not least, the British introduced another vital condition for the enhancement of the process of ethnic identity formation to the Cape Afrikaners' living space. By conquering and ruling the Cape they entrenched a dichotomy between foreign, culturally alien rulers and subservient 'indigenous' colonised Afrikaners. It is difficult to overemphasise the salience of this factor. As T. H. Eriksen pointed out: 'The first fact of ethnicity is the application of systematic distinction between insiders and outsiders; between Us and Them. If no such principle exists there can be no ethnicity, since ethnicity presupposes an institutionalized relationship between delineated categories whose members consider each other to be culturally distinctive . . . Ethnicity is thus constituted through social contact.' The British further sharpened this dichotomy by encouraging British to settle in the Cape. The cultural cleavage was thus not only between rulers and ruled, but also between two settler communities speaking different languages and subscribing to different cultures, historical traditions and world views. These communities lived side by side in conditions of contact and friction.

Eriksen's emphasis on the Us–Them dichotomy is inspired by F. Barth's conception of ethnic identity formation as a process of defining and maintaining boundaries between diverse communities. It goes without saying that in the absence of geographical proximity between different cultural groups ethnic boundaries cannot form. In conditions the like of which pertained in the Cape, the respective groups tend to delineate, reinforce and safeguard the ethnocultural boundaries between them. In this way the presence of the English-speaking settlers in their midst definitely nourished the formation of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity.

It is at this point that the study of the anti-Scab Act movement is directly connected to the study of the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity. In my understanding, the boundaries that consolidate ethnic identities are constructed from the unique
cultural materials of the respective groups. Particular languages, cultural traditions and common collective memories and myths are obvious elements of such social constructions. These existed in abundance in the Cape, distinguishing between the two white ethnocultural groups. But as this study hopes to show, the dichotomy between the two groups went deeper than that. It also involved, as we shall see, with respect to Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers, a deep chasm between respective perceptions of the environment, of science and of a pastoral way of life. In this respect the controversy surrounding the Act sharpened the ethnic consciousness among very many Cape Afrikaners and at the same time also reinforced the identity of the English-speakers and their prejudices towards Afrikaner farmers. Furthermore, because most Afrikaner sheep farmers were involved in the struggle against the Act, the process of ethnic identity and consciousness formation was not limited to the upper and middle social echelons, as is often the case in societies in a similar stage of their evolution. Indeed, the process engulfed the Afrikaner grass roots as well. This facet of the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity is the focus of the first chapter.

In Chapter Two, I deal with another important aspect of the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity and consciousness, to which I referred only marginally in my previous study. For much of the period I have previously studied, the emerging Cape Afrikaner political community seemed to speak in one voice on most issues on their agenda. It is true that in the 1880s there raged a fierce controversy between those guided and led by Du Toit – who advocated a radical pan-Afrikaner, republican, anti-imperial stance – and the more moderate political stream inspired by J. H. Hofmeyr – who favoured a more moderate ethnic assertion within the confines of the Cape and under the wings of the British Empire. However, by 1887 the latter line won a resounding victory and by the early 1890s even Du Toit had converted, becoming a staunch supporter of the alliance between Rhodes and the Afrikaner Bond.

The rift within Cape Afrikanerdom on the issue of scab legislation ran deep in the midst of the ethnic community. It was manifested in a struggle on the essence and meaning of being Cape Afrikaners and on the best way to guarantee their survival. It was a controversy on the economic survival of the Cape Afrikaners as much it was about their ethnic morality, and highlights an important broader salience in the emergence and maintenance of ethnic identity. Essentially, as we have seen, this process is primarily about constructing sociocultural boundaries. However, it is very often a multi-voiced and deeply controversial process. From this point of view, it is important to note that ethnicity and ethnonationalism are ideologies of identity and not sets of common economic strategies or social and political programmes. Consequently, the march toward ethnic identity formation is marked more often by sharp internal divisions than by unity and unanimity. Yet, the ethnocultural boundaries with the others render these divisions an integral – even important – part of the process of ethnic formation and assertion.
As we shall see, the Scab Act controversy sheds light on the contradictory nature of the process of galvanising Cape Afrikaner collective identity. 'Unity is power', the ultimate slogan of ethnic entrepreneurs, had a definite appeal for most Afrikaners. Yet, the Scab Act controversy within the Cape Afrikaner community also tended to highlight the divisions within that community. This was so because Cape Afrikaners were not simply atomised individuals identifying unreservedly with an emerging imagined ethnocultural community. They were concurrently also members of sub-ethnoeconomic groups. Furthermore, the Afrikaner Bond as the vehicle of Cape Afrikaner ethnic assertion was articulated as an alliance between three ethnoeconomic sub-groups, whose interests did not always coincide. The Scab Act controversy widened the fault lines between the groups, particularly between sheep and wine farmers. It even caused a rift within the sheep farming community.

In accounting for this phenomenon among Cape Afrikaners I have benefited from a comparative African perspective. It has to do with the uneven impact of the waves of modernisation, an important salience of colonial experience, on local pre-modern societies. The majority of Cape Afrikaners — certainly the sheep farmers — were, at the time of the British conquest, pre-modern and pre-scientific. The case of the Kikuyu who were subjected to very strong currents of modernisation is relevant and insightful. The strong impact of modernisation was at the root of the early evolution of a broad Kikuyu ethnic identity. However, this process also carved deep cleavages within Kikuyu society based on divergent socioeconomic interests and sociomoral concerns. Consequently, the Mau Mau rebellion launched by members of this ethnic group in the early 1950s was as much an ethnic civil war as it was an anti-colonial revolt. As in the case of the Kikuyu, the impact of the forces of modernisation on the Cape Afrikaners was deep but uneven. This, in turn, created sharp divisions and contradictions among them. The anti-Scab Act movement highlighted these contradictions because it was engaged in the interface between pre-modernity and modernity, and because it was perceived as being existentially critical.

In interpreting these intra-ethnic contradictions we must also consider one important aspect distinguishing Cape Afrikaners from most African ethnic communities. The agents of modernisation in the Cape were not simply foreign colonial rulers. Members of the English-speaking settler community, farmers and others, were no less powerful agents of modernisation. White settlers were also important agents of modernisation in some African colonies. However, in such cases the white settlers formed part of the colonial front premised on the suppression and exploitation of African resources and labour. This was certainly not the case of the Colony. The boundary between English-speakers and Afrikaners was particularly porous, not only because they lived in close proximity and were engaged in similar agricultural pursuits, but also because they were all members of the white privileged settler community. There was no racial boundary between them. They also shared similar interests with regard to
the indigenous population. The penetrability of this boundary also exacerbated the modernisation gaps within Afrikaner society.

It could have been expected that the sharp intra-Afrikaner contradictions and conflicts would have a devastating effect on the strength of Afrikaner identity and on the cohesion of the Afrikaner community. This was not the case, because the conflicts were engaged within the ethnic boundaries and on the meaning and essence of Cape Afrikanerdom. Thus, paradoxically, the internal conflict sharpened ethnic awareness among Cape Afrikaners as much as it exposed intra-ethnic divisions.

In delving into deeper social levels of the process of ethnic formation, this book makes a definite contribution to the study of this process among Cape Afrikaners. It can also provide analytical insights for scholars studying this subject in other societies.

Chapter Three of this book deals with the politics of the anti-Scab Act movement. This is what attracted me to the subject in the first place. It struck me as odd when dealing with the macropolitics of Cape Afrikaners that a small insect aroused much more interest and enticed much more intense political responses than other – supposedly more salient – ethnic issues. Indeed, the anti-Scab Act movement that spread like wildfire was the biggest and most intensive political agitation Cape Afrikaners had ever experienced. This becomes less surprising in the wake of the first two chapters. For opponents of the Act, the struggle was not merely for economic survival, no small matter in itself. More than that, as has been seen, it was a struggle for the essence and moral soul of Cape Afrikanerdom. It is hardly surprising that such a struggle stirred the habitually apolitical sheep farmers into political mobilisation against those responsible for the Act.

The opponents of the Act were resisting government intervention that was aimed at improving the fortunes of sheep farming in the Cape. This is not the only case of local resistance to colonial governments' betterment projects. It was a common phenomenon in colonial Africa. It was particularly salient in settler situations. Yet, black resistance to betterment projects in settler colonial states like South Africa or Southern Rhodesia was of a different sort. Government betterment projects were strongly linked to the project of settler political domination and economic exploitation rather than to a genuine intention to improve the lot of African peasants. African peasants certainly viewed it that way.

The British Government’s betterment policies in Black Africa in the wake of the Second World War (WW II) can provide a better comparative perspective. The British improvement onslaught, dubbed 'the second occupation', was conceived as part of a broad strategy of leading Africans from colonialism to self-rule. It was genuinely conceived and implemented with better intentions. And yet, these betterment projects encountered resistance in most African colonies. It would not be an exaggeration to claim that this opposition to the colonial governments’ well-intended
interventions provided the main source of political mobilisation in the African's struggle for decolonisation. This was so because although the British had a broad strategy of political decolonisation, there were some serious bones of contention regarding their timetables and modalities. Resistance to the betterment projects enabled the African political elites to divert peasant resistance to their struggle for liberation.

Useful insights may be gained from such a comparative exercise. What is striking at first glance is that while in many cases British development projects in black Africa met with almost instant violent resistance, Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers, on an issue considered by many of them to be one of life and death, shed many words but no blood. In accounting for these different outcomes the respective natures of colonialism and the different social structures that underpinned farming pursuits have to be taken into account. The most important difference between post-WW II British Africa and the late nineteenth century Cape Colony was that 'colonialism' for Cape Afrikaners was neither a nefarious ideology nor an oppressive political experience. On the contrary, 'colonialism', as opposed to imperialism, was their ideology. It underlined their full integration into the imperial system. The Government that initiated the Act was to a large extent their government and the British Empire was perceived as a highly valued extension of their political home. In this respect their political response to the Act was a net response to the economic and environmental implications of government intervention.

Further, the social basis of their farming operation was markedly different from that of post-WW II colonial Africans. Whereas many of the latter lived within the framework of traditional peasant communities, Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers were individualists, their dependable social production unit being the nuclear family supported by a broader but loose and fragile social network. This, as shall be seen, had a definite impact on the scope of their political response.

As the above shows, with regard to environmental politics, insight can be gained from a broader African and South African comparative perspective. This underlines the fact that more broadly this study can be located in the interface between ecology and ethnicity. In this respect I have been enlightened by the contributions of an increasing number of scholars in the emerging field of environmental history in South Africa.

Much of the research on environmental history in South Africa relates to conservation and to African societies and their response to government interventions in matters concerning their handling of natural resources. There are, however, a few important studies that are closer to my interest in the Cape Afrikaners of the late nineteenth century. There are the old studies of P. J. van der Merwe on the evolution of sheep farming in the Cape that provide historical depth and insights. There is William Beinart's article on the impact of the threat of jackals' predation on the Cape pastoral economy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It also deals with the response of the white settlers and the government to this unwelcome intervention on
the part of nature. In Beinart’s *The Rise of Conservation in South Africa* there are also a few relevant chapters to this study. I have also found Lance van Sittert’s articles on the eradication of noxious weeds and on the invasion of the prickly pear into the Cape both interesting and useful. There is also the study of Dan Gilfoyle on ‘Veterinary Science and Public Policy at the Cape Colony, 1877–1910’.

I have benefited from these contributions and I am indebted to them. My own interest is complementary rather than totally different. The nature of the crisis and the amazingly rich sources have enabled me to focus in great depth on the response of Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers both to the ecological challenges and to government intervention in their attempt to deal with them. As has been indicated earlier, I am interested in the Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers’ understanding of the environment rather than in the related contemporary scientific position. I am concerned with the perception of Cape Afrikaners regarding the origins of scab rather than veterinary science’s diagnosis thereof. I am concerned with the Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers’ ways of dealing with scab rather than the veterinary surgeons’ prognosis thereof. I deal not so much with the performance of the veterinary services as with the Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers’ view thereof. Indeed, local knowledge versus modern science is a dichotomy that runs through the study. I am also interested in the strategies and social networks that the Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers developed in their struggle to survive, especially in times of ecological adversity. I am equally concerned with the moral discourse that underpinned the social survival networks they evolved over generations of adjustment to an often hostile environment. I am interested not so much in government efforts to eradicate scab, as in the Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers’ response and resistance thereto.

In all this, I hope, I am making a contribution to the study of sociocultural and political ecology. The important contributions to the Cape environmental history lack somewhat in sociocultural depth. This is so because of a lack of sufficient sources and perhaps scholars’ particular interests. We learn that Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers opposed government initiatives to eliminate jackals, but we remain ignorant about their social differentiation, their motivations and their discourse with regard to this major impediment. In the case of the prickly pear there is no thorough discussion of the position of different interest groups regarding the fate of this massive botanical invader. In Van Sittert’s article on the eradication of noxious weeds, he speaks of ‘gentry’ and ‘landowners’ in an undifferentiated manner and without sensitivity to their socioeconomic standing or ethnic origins. My interest is exactly in these aspects of environmental history. It is in this respect that my study is complementary and can offer a substantial contribution to this emerging scholarly field.

Above all, however, I am interested in the way the attitudes of Cape Afrikaner sheep farmers specifically, and Afrikaners more generally, to government responses to
environmental challenges impacted the evolution of Cape Afrikaner ethnic identity and politics.

Notes to Introduction

1 For the first research project see, M. Tamarkin, *Cecil Rhodes and the Cape Afrikaners: The Imperial Colossus and the Colonial Parish Pump* (London: Frank Cass, 1996).


23. See, for example, Dovers, Edgecombe and Guest, *South Africa's Environmental History*.


