

Revisiting Apartheid Social Theology in the Post-New South Africa

4th revised edition © 2024 Mark R. Kreitzer, DMiss, PhD¹

Abstract

Apartheid as a failed social engineering theory was based on a complex but syncretistic social theology, which can be divided into four aspects. Each aspect must be critiqued from a Reformational redemptive-historical perspective. Out of this analysis three aspects of the apartheid social theology must be rejected as anti-biblical, but the fourth, resistance to alien ethnic domination, must be upheld by those maintaining a classic Reformational theology with some careful qualifications. This provides several recommendations for a way forward for the development of a sound African social theology based on a sound biblical ethic and the affirmation of the beauty of created ethno-linguistic identity in Christ.

Introduction

I wish to revisit the end of the grand South African apartheid social engineering tragedy, which ended over three decades ago. In doing so, I must ask again, what were the real issues at stake? All would agree, I believe, that human dignity and justice were crucial issues. I would also suggest that God's love was at stake and especially his love for the ethnic "Other" living under another people-group's imperial hegemony. A second critical issue, I must suggest, is that Christians have unwittingly swallowed a secular and strongly humanist analysis of the problem of Apartheid social theology, and hence rejoice that one syncretistic social theology has now been replaced by the complete opposite agenda of another syncretistic social theology. However, nothing is religiously neutral. We have been deceived into accepting a solution to apartheid (or Jim Crow discrimination and rejection of Aboriginal rights in Latin America, Australia, Oceania and Canada) based upon dreams of secular humanist social activists seeking a non-ethnic, non-sexist, non-classist, and anti-homophobic world order.² As we shall see, I reject apartheid's social theology – and its replacement – not because they violate secular and humanist ideals but because they both violate fundamental, biblical, ethical and theological teaching.

South Africa was and remains a very complicated situation made even more complex because of the similarities in some respects to the race problems of the old American South. In retrospect, the "Apartheid" system developed gradually for about 250 years. The social theory and the resulting legislation putting the theory into practice were developed in part by Dutch Reformed thinkers. Within the race-bound limitations of their culture and the limitations of their Dutch Kuyperian Calvinism, they attempted – and I must add, failed in the attempt—to provide a biblically responsible solution to South

¹ Original, Mark R. Kreitzer, "South African Tragedy Restored?" *Contra Mundum* 5 (Fall 1992).

² Several more "non's" have been added in the last decades as well such as non-speciesism and non-ageism. The common factor is that "equality equals justice" (see Igor Shafarevich, *The Socialist Phenomenon* (foreword, Alexander Solzhenitsyn; trans. William Tjalsma; New York: Harper and Row, 1980). This volume is an outstanding discussion of the historical and philosophical roots of social egalitarian movements throughout that all teach that equality equals justice.

Africa's complicated inter-ethnic problems. The largest Dutch Reformed denomination in South Africa has now totally reversed its original position and adopted an egalitarian, World Council of Churches counter position.³

However, whenever the claim is made that Reformed scholars helped develop Apartheid, some automatically stigmatize these thinkers as being under the influence of a completely heretical social theology and charging that all their ideas were inherently oppressive and racist.⁴ Indeed, several aspects of those policies were oppressive and racist. Let's make no apology for them. However, anyone who attempted to claim that this characterization of every bit of apartheid theory and practice was heresy actually fell into an over-simplified caricature of it. What is most embarrassing, however, is that this caricature is still received by many Reformed thinkers in the Dutch and English-speaking world as truth. That now includes most in southern Africa itself.

Therefore, for those who have such an understanding, often the solution to South Africa's complex ethnic problem is quite simple syllogism: "Apartheid is racism. Racism is a social evil, which must be attacked and completely destroyed. Therefore, the whole evil, racist, apartheid system must be attacked and totally destroyed in all of its forms and manifestations" – for many this also includes the Kuyperian Calvinism they believed bred it. Others would hasten to add that they agree Apartheid was a completely evil system and a theological heresy, yet they still would have liked to have seen it more gradually dismantled. A scattered few would perhaps add that they also deplore the corruption, blatant humanism, and dishonesty of the last twenty-five plus years since Apartheid ended. Most all, however, would still agree, at least those who still even have South Africa on their radar, that every remnant of Apartheid and its syncretistic Christian justification must be demolished if shalom-peace and justice are to prevail there.

I disagree with several aspects of this sentiment. It is my thesis in this paper that the legacy of a three-hundred-year-old Christianized civilization and all its biblical insights are instead being abolished in the New South Africa. The goal, it seems, is to appease a currently raging, anti-Scriptural conception of both justice and peace. I would challenge those who wish to 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 (Prv 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 (Prv 14:12, 15:28, 18:17). Only a proud person, who refuses to consult wisdom, will resent such a correction (see, e.g., Prv 15:12).

Certainly, an understanding of apartheid cannot be reduced to simplistic syllogisms. To demonstrate this thesis, I would like to divide Apartheid social theory into four distinct subcategories:

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

³ See, Mark R. Kreitzer, *When A Theological Shift Changed a Nation: A Kuyperian Analysis of Church and Society 1990, and a Way Forward for South Africa* (New York/Berlin: Peter Lang, 2024).

⁴ See, e.g., John W. DeGruchy and Charles Villa-Vicencio, *Apartheid Is a Heresy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).

Every aspect of this syncretistic-Calvinistic social theory called Apartheid—except aspects of numbers 3 and 4—were indeed inherently racist and an unmitigated evil. Each of these four aspects of Apartheid must be separately judged according to Reformational (i.e., Scripture-derived) principles. I might also hasten to add, in case even in Reformed circles a nerve is being pinched, that we will see that Scripture definitely judges some aspects of Apartheid as unjust, malicious, and evil, though not using the same presuppositions that the humanist uses in its judgments.

Apartheid means Jim Crow type legislation

First, “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 termed Jim Crow laws in the American South. This includes all the bureaucratic regulations mandating separate buses, toilets, beach amenities, sporting facilities, and etc. for different more or less arbitrarily defined race or color groups. Apartheid laws divided the whole of South African society into four basic “race” categories, which gave the pre-1990 South African socio-political scene the similarity to the pre-Civil Rights era South. This first aspect of Apartheid, of course, was and continues to be skillfully portrayed by some to further their own social and political agendas. The Lord be praised that this type of law, so antithetical to the Christian legal principle of “equal protection of law,” was removed from the statute books by the Afrikaner government before the 1994 election that brought in Nelson Mandela as President.

It was exactly this biblical principle of equal protection of law, found in the Roman-Dutch Common Law used in South Africa as well as in our English Common Law that the Boer/Afrikaners⁵ (and 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 covenantally 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

⁵ Note I will deliberately use this dual name for the descendants of the original Dutch settlers. After the Anglo-Boer War (1898-1901), the Boer/Afrikaner people was 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

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 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 divine law. All individuals and ethno-national groups are equally liable to the one law of God (see, Rom. 2:1ff; 3:9-20, 23).

However, contrary to over-simplified syllogisms, which are ultimately derived from the French Revolution, this biblical principle does not mean that all forms of group discrimination are evil. God discriminates – if you will – and teaches His children to discriminate in certain carefully nuanced and biblically defined areas. For example, He does not treat every person as a group-less 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, second, 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 (i.e., make a distinction) between the law-abiding group and the group of “fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, effeminate, thieves, covetous, drunkards, revilers, swindlers,” etc. (see 1 Cor 6:9-10; see Gal. 5:19-21; Eph 5:3-5). One will inherit the kingdom both now and in the new earth and the other will not. Furthermore, God mandates a carefully defined discrimination between the male group and the female group. He also created differing roles in family and church governments (at least) in 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 (see e.g., Is 19:23-25).

Interestingly enough, God, through the Apostle Paul, approved even of a semi-ethnic based summative description: “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 sovereignly allowed differing peoples to develop different national or group characteristics. Contrary to some Western ideologies, all people(s) are not exactly equal, differing only in the amount of education and opportunity. Cultural norms matter.

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 definitely an egregious evil. What makes it evil is that it violates the just legal framework defined in God's Word and only that. We must keep in mind, however, that 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 in British/American Reformed) circles as well.

Apartheid means ethnic residential separation

The second and third aspects of Apartheid were 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/neighbourhoods with others of their own language and/or culture, and second, that of legally mandating ethnic and/or racial residential neighbourhoods 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-background ethnic groups to assimilate into the two dominant Euro-South African ethno-cultural groups. They feared, rightly I believe, the loss of their unique cultural identity and their political self-determination under God.

Again, according to Afrikaner social theory, the non-European peoples were to be only temporary resident aliens (i.e., non-voting, guest workers) in the traditionally European dominated urban areas. The theory 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 due to an anti-Christian economic system that hindered economic growth in the ethnic homelands and that the mine-owners and farmers in the Euro-South African dominated areas needed cheap labor and resented African farmers' competition. Furthermore, because of massive Afro-South African population growth and the fact that the tiny patchwork homeland areas with a very few important exceptions, were not geographically consolidated, a biblically just partition system was not implemented. Furthermore, the partition was imposed by the Euro-South Africans instead of negotiated. For example, if all of what is now Kwa-Zulu/Natal and the Eastern Cape provinces had been consolidated as a Zulu and Xhosa national state, very possibly they would have accepted independence just like Lesotho, Botswana, and Swaziland accepted independence under the British Empire after World War 2.

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 a negotiated, consequent redrawing of borders, granting full (and unmeddled-in) independence, and a withdrawal of all bureaucratic monetary aid. Again, Botswana, Swaziland, and Lesotho are good examples of South African ethnic homelands that survived quite well using this method.⁶

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 Articles 25 and 36 of the Belgic Confession and the Mosaic footnotes of the Heidelberg Catechism. They rejected the concept that civil government was instituted by God *solely* to punish the criminal as defined by Scripture's tôranic wisdom and to protect the law-abider (cf. Rom 13:2ff; 1 Pet 2:13ff; Ps 72; 82; Is 10:1-2; *et al*).

Furthermore, the 20th century Boer/Afrikaner, following a medieval tradition perpetuated by certain many 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 will, which brings good blessings to all groups of humanity (cf. Dt 4:40; 5:16, 29, 3, 12:28). Romans chapter thirteen is best interpreted to say that each level of civil magistrate is God's servant for the citizens' good – as defined by God alone in Scripture in the very near context – and responsible to God to do this work. In my opinion, 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.⁷ At the same time, billions of Rands in tax monies were used to try to develop the ethnic homelands' economies. All of this failed

⁶ See Walter Williams, *South Africa's War against Capitalism* [War] (New York: Praeger, 1989).

⁷ The 1976 Soweto riots, it seems, were the catalyzing factor that motivated this attempt.

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 well-known African American economist claims it was worse than Eastern Europe under the Soviets.⁸

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 of 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 (and the original American Constitution), but as a collection of mere individuals lacking only education and culture. These group-less individuals could perhaps be temporarily segregated for the convenience of the civilized European settler but only until the individual Africans could be educated and assimilated into civilized British cultural norms, and eventually granted an equal vote with Euro-South Africans. This exact theory was also explicitly used by the American federal government to try to Christianize and assimilate the various native American people groups as well.

Unlike the syncretistic Boer/Afrikaner’s somewhat more biblically based theory,⁹ this 19th and early 20th British imperial concept was based, as I experienced it even in the 1980’s when I was an immigrant in South Africa, upon a deep-seated sense of ethnic and racial supremacy still present, I presume, among many Anglo-South Africans today (even though they may 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).¹⁰

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 earth

⁸ Williams, *War*.

⁹ See my critique of this type of social theology as found in, e.g., NGK. 1975. *Ras, Volk en Nasie en Volkeverhouding in die Lig van die Skrif in die lig van die Skrif*. Kaapstad: N. G. Kerk-Uitgewers [*Human Relations and the South African Scene in the Light of Scripture*] and the later documents seeking to reject the former theology: Mark R. Kreitzer, *A Missiological Evaluation of the Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk’s New Social Theology* (Church And Society 1990) (D.Miss. diss., Reformed Theological Seminary, Jackson, MS, 1997). (Available from the author: MarkRKreitzer@gmail.com).

¹⁰ See Mark R. Kreitzer, *The Concept of Ethnicity in the Bible: A Theological Analysis* (Lewiston, NY: The Edward Mellen Press, 2009).

(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.¹¹

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,¹² the most important of which, as we have seen, was that the British were working to reverse a

¹¹ I.e., the 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].

¹² See Otto Scott, *The Other End of the Lifeboat* (Washington, DC: Regnery, 1985) for an excellent discussion of this plan

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 emigrated 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* were excommunicated by their cousins in the Dutch Reformed Church for rebellion against the crown because they emigrated, they did not lose their faith. For example, the vastly outnumbered Boer trekkers fought a series of dramatic battles against the animistic Zulus and their close cousins, the Matabele. In two of these battles (Blood River and Vegkop) the 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 men kept their vows as well as their children for several generations.

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 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 Transvaal Republic, 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 Johannesburg, 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 an 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 ethnic cousins 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 that invaded the Confederation to their south. 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 sacrificed to the globe encompassing 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' strategy (seemingly like F.W. De Klerk's during the transition to the ANC majority government)¹³ 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.¹⁴

From 1948 to the late 1980's, the second generation of nationalistic Boer/Afrikaner Calvinists succeeded in postponing much of Smuts' 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. 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.¹⁵ 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.

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.¹⁶ 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

¹³ De Klerk's men, it seems, were also fatally infected with the humanist New World Order sickness. Perhaps their strategy was 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 Anglo-American dominated world order.

¹⁴ Please refer to C. Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment* (G S G & Associates, 1981).

¹⁵ 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. This is philosophically significant. Those with a holist-unitarian religion/ideology must work their religion out into all of life creating egalitarian social structures of totally equal individuals.

¹⁶ Most interesting is that three countries (Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland) 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.

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 the 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 squatter camp like many other Majority World urbanites is a step up from what they had been experiencing.

A large majority of the new urbanites, freed from external tribal shame-based culture-control mechanism and free from wives and children in the rural homelands have adopted sexual license. For a few decades especially in the late 'sixties to the early 'nineties of the last century, a large percentage of Afro-South African children in several large urban centers have been conceived illegitimately. During this time the Afro-ethnic family structure virtually collapsed greatly due to the separation of men from their families due to Apartheid legislation that did not allow men to bring their wives into the urban centers. That led to vicious youth-led revolutionary violence, and then for the last two decades to an anarchistic wave of robberies, revolution inspired murders of Afrikaner farmers, and urban social chaos. In the lead up to the election in which Nelson Mandela won the Presidency, the National Party dominated government had released Marxist terrorists and about 75,000 other prisoners. The new constitution adopted after the ANC won the first major representative election, explicitly banned the death penalty, allowed X-Rated movies, did not resist abortion on demand, and allowed explicit AIDS inspired sex-education, humanist multi-cultural education, and Look-Say reading methods.

In the decades since that time, the now pragmatic Boer/Afrikaner elite, no longer thinking biblically because of a Barthian paradigm shift opening the door to Enlightenment skepticism has attempted successfully to rejoin the world theological consensus. Recently, after many years of behind the scenes preparation, huge immigration of Afrikaners to English speaking countries, a schism or two, and the loss of many true believers, the largest Afrikaner Reformed denomination has joined the World Council of Churches. Many politicians of all ethnicities will openly admit they are continuing the former regime's attempt to buy the urban Afro-ethnic vote by continuing and increasing massive socialist largess. Billions of RSA Rands of taxpayers' monies are being poured into urban housing, school construction, and making up the social backlog of the Apartheid years.

From my perspective, the formerly syncretistic-Christian, 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 in practice weighing all decisions in favor of the reasonable man and a changing social consensus. In addition, that same year broadcast television was legalized.

This degenerating process, which is much further advanced in Anglo circles, is now moving with frightening rapidity in Afrikaans language literature and media. Afrikaner children learning to read a phonetic language are experiencing reading problems for the first time in history because of the importation of the American Look-Say reading method. Abortion, illegitimacy, homosexuality, Satanism, family murders, and divorce statistics have been escalating steadily. The Anglo-American humanist ideal has become the Afrikaner's idolatrous role model with shades of Oholah and Ololibah, the promiscuous sisters Ezekiel mourned (Eze 23).

The originally Euro-South African cities are rapidly becoming Majority 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 but now African traditional religious practices of polygamy, shamanism, ancestor fear, testing a girl's fertility by bearing an illegitimate child before marriage and other anti-biblical African customs have been permeating the whole urban-suburban complexes so that, for example, large areas of Johannesburg, Durban, and increasingly Pretoria have become a lawless.

In response, the Boer/Afrikaner nor their Anglo-South African compatriots nor even the African ethnic evangelical have not been systematically discipling the cities. The Afrikaner Reformed churches have publicly repented of all aspects of Apartheid, they believe, but in my opinion have not repented of one of the greatest 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 whole-Bible based individual and social ethical system and His one impartial, common law based legal system for all, citizen and alien alike. Instead, the Boer/Afrikaner elite has adopted a version of the West's democratic pluralist civil religion. They are replacing an imperfect Christianized civil faith with a consequently humanist civil religion.

Consequently, 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 privileges are rights, inherent in 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. The alien in Israel was only allowed full citizenship rights in the third generation (cf. Dt. 23:7-8) with full suffrage in the legal assembly upon confession of faith (now 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 that there is no Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male or female "in Christ" mean instead that all groups mentioned have equal access to the throne of grace. In other words, "in Christ" – in covenantal fealty and union with the resurrected and Anointed King of the New Creation – no created gender,

linguistic, or even social class boundaries between the groups are removed.¹⁷ 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 Christ.

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

Was racism a problem in their concept of the covenant? Without a doubt, but not in the way Europeans and Americans might think. Race, or skin color, was a very crude ethnic indicator before the law. This was evil before God because the Boer/Afrikaner seemed to see citizenship as an ethno-covenantal relationship and syncretized this biblical insight with a Germanic idealist racist ideology. 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 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. The Scripture teaches that individuals must come into the kingdom/New Jerusalem with their rulers and ethnic identity (cf. Ps(s) 2; 22:27ff; 67; 87; 96; Is 2:2-4, 19:22-25; Rom 15:7-12; Rev 21:3 [KJV], 21:24, 26, *et al.*). However, in a compromise with rank prejudice and because it made things vastly simpler, they imposed race classification upon the South African ethnic mosaic. That was fatal and evil!

Therefore, although some aspects of ethnic reality did fit into their race-bound theory, Apartheid social theory was a special injustice to the Christianized segments of the so-called Coloured, Indian, and Afro-ethnic people-groups and often caused intense emotional torment and pain.¹⁸ Among those categorized as "Coloured," this was especially bitter. Many were arbitrarily forced into that race-group yet 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 "coloured" status. Those from the several Afro-South African ethnies were never allowed to participate as equal citizens in the Republic of South Africa even though they were more than 80% of the population but allocated only about 20% or less of the land. This inequity also caused immense pain and suffering.

Conclusion

Apartheid theory, then, was a Christo-pagan, syncretistic social engineering vision that miserably failed.¹⁹ However what can we expect now after twenty-five years? Can a

¹⁷ Gal. 3:28; cf. also 1 Cor. 12:12-13 which demonstrates this clearly. See also Isaiah's vision in chapter 19:24.

¹⁸ 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, Afrikaans speaking, somewhat Christianized descendants of the San and Khoi-Khoi peoples that originally inhabited the Cape Province

¹⁹ Apartheid failed because of injustice according to the biblical stranger laws and because of

biblical vision be purified and restored to the land? Yes, but only in the long-term. If the various peoples turn back to the original biblical concept of covenant and apply it consequently to family, church and civil governments, God can and will restore South Africa. To do this, however, will be a long uphill battle. Those with a Reformational biblical world and life view need to continue developing materials to spread this comprehensive biblical view of life without a hint of racism or its opposite, individualism. The late Ds. Dr. Chris L. Jordaan and I developed a concise statement of that worldview now updated in twenty-two short confessional style articles with scriptural proofs, commentary on each article, study questions and recommended readings. I am seeking to re-issue a second edition after a quarter of a century of *A Manifesto for Christians in Africa: Second Study Edition*. It ought to be translated into many African languages and used to help network like-minded groups together to educate and mobilize Christian action cell groups all over the continent. Perhaps we could call these Salt Shaker groups to emphasize their task.

Along with Christian social services and Christian action, however, Christian Africans of all language and ethnic groups should consequently also (re)turn to a biblical mission vision. When we begin to believe and act upon the fact that King Jesus rose again, is seated upon the throne of heaven after finishing His work leading to our justification, then we will begin working again to fulfil His Cultural Mandate and its new covenant version, the Great Commission. He is presently acting through His saints to disciple all peoples, tongues and tribes, bringing them into His New Jerusalem above before the Second Coming. This will give Africa's various peoples a vision to (re)build a godly culture, to disciple their neighboring peoples, and teach them to listen, trust, and follow all our Lord and King commands.

In addition, all need to (re)gain the concept of the universal equity of the Mosaic judicials found in the Three Forms of Unity and Westminster Standards of the Reformed and Presbyterian denominations. This will give believers a tool and a standard for (re)building their cultures over the coming generations without the socialism of the Radical Reformation and with true biblical justice.²⁰

Afrikaner 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 slow working immune deficiency virus found in certain popular forms of Amillennialism and Premillennialism 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 judicial 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.

²⁰ I recommend five volumes to help in this process: 1) Walter Kaiser, *Toward Old Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985); 2) Christopher J. H. Wright, *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2011); 3) John Frame, *The Doctrine of the Christian Life* (A Theology of Lordship) (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2008); 4) Vernon Poythress, *Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1995); and last with some reservations 5) Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*. Three volumes. Vallecito, CA: Ross House, 1973). (Rushdoony gives much useful information but supports mandatory death penalties for all OT capital crimes, which Kaiser and Frame

Lastly, all of what I have discussed above leads to one logical conclusion if a restorative biblical peace and justice are to occur not only in southern Africa but throughout the rest of Africa as well. The process of partitioning the joint Anglo-Boer “empire”, begun by the National Party in 1948 using Kuyperian Social Democratic methods ought to be restarted, this time with consequent biblical justice and solid negotiation. Whoever does this must use the biblical “Stranger Laws”²¹ and the principles of private-property-based economics.²² Furthermore, this process should continue into all of Africa as responsible Christians consider the historic and present settlement and land claims of its various peoples including, especially, the Igbo’s of Nigeria, the Zulus of South Africa, the Matebeles of Zimbabwe, and countless other often oppressed ethnies on the continent. Perhaps then the Boer/Afrikaners can begin to *bewoon*, *bevolk*, and *bewerk* [settle, populate, and work] in a later negotiated homeland of their own without race-based policies just as the Czech and Slovak peoples peaceably negotiated a just partition of their land.

If a just partition of African lands does not occur peacefully, then the greatest probability of what will occur throughout Africa will be a Yugoslavian and now a Ukrainian type scenario in which the various states designed by European empires blow apart in large-scale inter-ethnic war. This has already occurred unsuccessfully in Nigeria, but successfully in Ethiopia and Sudan. Either way a total collapse of any Christianized civilization due to the curse of socialism, social sins, and multiple plagues such as AIDS, malaria, Ebola, and TB could bring this about over the next fifty to one hundred years as well.

Europeans, especially the British, North Americans, New Zealanders, and Australians should watch and be warned. We outsiders must learn the lesson of our smaller sister. The lessons on the covenant, citizenship, and the Stranger Laws need to be applied soon or our civilizations will not last long under the weight of socialism, influx of aliens who have no sympathy with our former Lord and King nor His law, and plagues that He is bringing.

demonstrate was never mandated except in the case of pre-meditated murder. Available on line: <http://chalcodon.edu/research/books/the-institutes-of-biblical-law-voumel-1/>.

²¹ Mark R. Kreitzer, *The Concept of Ethnicity in the Bible: A Theological Analysis* (Lewiston, NY: The Edward Mellen Press, 2009). A second edition is available from the author.

²² We can begin with studying the works of African American free market economists, Thomas Sowell and Walter Williams.