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Abstract

This study, building on longstanding debates on “German” national socialist (“Nazi”) and “Dutch” Calvinist influences on Afrikaner nationalism, examines the latter’s intersecting relationships with Dutch neo-Calvinist “Christian nationalism” and pan-Netherlandic or Diets nationalism (embracing Dutch, Flemings and Afrikaners). Like similarly-minded Dutch (or Flemings), Afrikaners most drawn to Diets nationalism were often those most attracted to German-inspired Romantic volks-nationalism, of which national socialism was the most extreme variant. Diets nationalism, volks-nationalism and “Christian nationalism” were not mutually exclusive, but part of an overlapping transnational web which influenced not just such outliers as volks-nationalists Piet Meyer and Hans van Rensburg or neo-Calvinist Hendrik Stoker, but “mainstream” Afrikaner nationalists such as Daniel Malan, Dutch-trained and, like the pre-eminent Dutch neo-Calvinist, Abraham Kuyper, a conservative Reformed churchman-turned-politician. Like volks-nationalism, Diets nationalism had a wider appeal than German national socialism, but later often took on a far right authoritarian aspect which in World War II discredited it in the Netherlands, as did Afrikaner nationalist opposition to fighting Hitler. While orthodox Dutch Calvinists moved toward a more internationalist perspective, breaking with their South African cousins over “apartheid”, “Christian nationalism” survived among Afrikaner nationalists, although looking more like volks-nationalism than anything recognizably neo-Calvinist, but neither could it meaningfully be labelled “Nazi.”
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Introduction: Debating “German” and “Dutch” influences on Afrikaner nationalism

Scholars have long debated possible influences on Afrikaner nationalism of “related” peoples’ ideologies, notably ones associated with the Netherlands or Germany. Afrikaners’ ancestors arrived in South Africa from Europe when the Dutch East India Company ruled the Cape, entrenching the Dutch
language and Reformed Church. After British conquest ended the formal Dutch connection and dissatisfied Afrikaners founded new “Boer” republics in the interior, Dutch officials, preachers and teachers had a disproportionate role in the Transvaal “South African Republic” in particular. German ties, however, were also longstanding. Many Afrikaners, including National Party (NP) leaders JBM Hertzog and PW Botha, had German ancestry; although nationalists such as Hertzog or Daniel Malan studied in the Netherlands, others did so in Germany. Germany backed the Transvaal after the Jameson Raid, although German sympathy, like that in the Netherlands, did not translate into assistance in the ensuing Second Anglo-Boer (South African) War. After the unification of South Africa, Afrikaner nationalists opposed fighting against Germany in both world wars. Some scholars made much of this, noting that the post-1948 NP government, led at first by Malan, included some former pro-German hardliners, arguing that the new “apartheid” regime adopted “Nazi-like” policies. Many scholars rejected such claims, although some favored a modified version. More recently Hermann Giliomee argued that Malan’s more moderate Cape southerners shaped the pre-1948 NP far more than northern hardliners, who he conceded sometimes showed ethnic exclusivism, anti-Semitism, and biological racism. Several authors substantially agreed, but others were more critical.

---

1 H Giliomee, *The Afrikaners: Biography of a people* (Cape Town, Tafelberg, 2003), pp. 4-5, 11-12.
Other scholars stressed “primitive Calvinism,” Afrikaner frontier farmers’ alleged use of Reformed concepts such as predestination of the elect (God’s determining who were to be saved), encouraging belief in being a “chosen people” to justify racial conquest. Critics such as Gerrit Schutte and André du Toit countered that in South Africa politicised Calvinism emerged much later, linked by Irving Hexham, Dunbar Moodie and Charles Bloomberg to the influence of Dutch Prime Minister Abraham Kuyper. Kuyper (1837-1920), like Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer (1801-76), sought a revived Reformed faith, free of Enlightenment or French Revolutionary liberalism or secularism, a “neo-Calvinism” rooted in the 1616-18 Synod of Dort’s teachings, stressing Biblical authority, human fallenness, and God’s sovereignty over all of life. Their “Anti-Revolutionary” politics united Calvinist ultra-orthodoxy with Dutch nationalism, Groen using the term “Christian-National” to tie past Dutch greatness to doctrinal faithfulness, proclaiming the need for orthodox Dutch Protestants, who Kuyper viewed as the nation’s core, to bring all of life under God’s rule. When ultra-orthodox Calvinists such as JD du Toit and Willem Postma brought “Christian nationalism” to South Africa, they too declared God’s sovereignty over all of life, but now viewed Afrikaners as a whole as the faithful, chosen core, opposed to “liberal, anti-national, foreign elements and ideas”, especially ones associated with Britain.

Albrecht Hagemann argued that, as neo-Calvinist “Christian nationalism” influenced most 1930s and 1940s Afrikaner nationalists more than German national socialism, too distant from their Calvinist values, “apartheid” arose from “pre”-Nazi segregation. Giliomee, however, dismissed even neo-
Calvinist influence, especially in Malan’s Cape NP circles;\(^\text{18}\) Pieter de Klerk noted that no Afrikaner political party tried like Kuyper’s Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP) to base all policy on Christian principles.\(^\text{19}\) Agreeing, Schutte asserted that when the modern Afrikaner movement evolved in the 1930s and 1940s, German-inspired secular \textit{volks}-nationalism was more influential, but Giliomee viewed the latter as atypical of mainstream Afrikaner nationalism, especially in Malan’s Cape NP.\(^\text{20}\) Saul Dubow usefully defines this \textit{volks}-nationalism as the “Romantic tradition of authoritarian nationalism” inspired by JG Herder, FED Schleiermacher and JG Fichte, “marked by a strongly idealised view of the nation or \textit{volk} as a collective organism with its own distinctive spirit or soul”.\(^\text{21}\)

This study contributes to this debate by examining the intersecting relationship with Afrikaner nationalism of Dutch neo-Calvinist “Christian nationalism” and pan-Netherlandic or \textit{Diets} (Afrikaans and modern Dutch spelling; older spelling: “Dietsch”) nationalism, the belief that Dutch, Flemings, and Afrikaners shared a common identity.\(^\text{22}\) Like similarly-minded Dutch (or Flemings), Afrikaners most drawn to \textit{Diets} nationalism were often those most attracted to German-inspired \textit{volks}-nationalism (of which national socialism was the most extreme variant). Pan-Netherlandic nationalism, \textit{volks}-nationalism and “Christian nationalism” were not mutually exclusive, but part of an overlapping transnational web, influencing not just such outliers as \textit{volks}-nationalists Piet Meyer or Hans van Rensburg and neo-Calvinist Hendrik Stoker, but “mainstream” nationalists such as Daniel Malan, Dutch-trained and, like Kuyper, a conservative Reformed churchman-turned-politician. Like \textit{volks}-nationalism, \textit{Diets} nationalism had a wider appeal than national socialism, but later often had a far right authoritarian aspect which in World War II, like Afrikaner nationalist opposition to fighting Hitler, discredited it in the Netherlands. While orthodox Dutch Calvinists moved toward a more internationalist, non-Kuyperian perspective, “Christian nationalism” survived among Afrikaner nationalists in a form more like \textit{volks}-nationalism

---

\(^\text{18}\) H Giliomee, \textit{The Afrikaners...}, pp. 327-328.
\(^\text{22}\) The sources used in this article use both variants, as the period which is the main focus of this study was one of transition, first in South Africa from written Dutch to Afrikaans and later in the Netherlands from an older to a simplified form of Dutch spelling.
than anything recognizably neo-Calvinist, but was not in any meaningful sense “Nazi”.

**Stamverwantschap and the Afrikaner cause**

After Britain conquered the Cape, Dutch historians such as JWG van Oordt urged an “Afrikaner” identity, including the “Cape Dutch” and the republics’ “Boers”. The Anglo-Boer wars (1880-81, 1899-1902) aroused a Dutch sense of *stamverwantschap* (kinship), aided by the Reformed churches and Nederlandsch Zuid-Afrikaansche Vereeniging (Dutch-South African Union/NZAV), founded in 1881. In both wars Abraham Kuyper championed the Boers, whose struggle recalled that against Spain; Dutch Queen Wilhelmina had a warship evacuate Transvaal president Paul Kruger. In 1885 the NZAV set up a fund to aid Afrikaner students studying at Dutch universities. After the second or “South African” war, money of the liquidated Netherlands-South Africa Railway Company funded the Zuid-Afrikaansche Stichting Moederland (South Africa Motherland Foundation/ZASM), which paid for NZAV publications and aided Dutch immigrants to South Africa. Malan later recalled fondly that when no British ship would carry his NP deputation to the 1919 Paris peace conference, it was a Dutch shipping company that stepped in.

The republics’ defeat, ending any dream of their becoming a “New Netherlands”, and the creation of a self-governing Union of South Africa,


still under the British Crown, undercut such ties. Afrikaans, of which Kuyper had a low opinion, had long replaced spoken “High” Dutch; in 1908, addressing the Afrikaanse Taalvereniging, even the Netherlands-educated Malan urged the same for written Afrikaans. In 1925 he piloted through Parliament a bill redefining Dutch so as to include Afrikaans as an official language. That same year the Cape Town branch of the Low Country-based Algemeen Nederlandsch Verbond (Pan-Netherlandic League/ANV), founded in 1895 to promote ties between Flemings, Dutch, and Afrikaners, warned that teaching of Dutch was disappearing in South Africa. NZAV membership dropped from over 7000 in 1902 to under 1000 in the 1920s; in 1924 the NZAV monthly Hollandsch-Zuid-Afrika became simply Zuid-Afrika.

Pan-Netherlandic links and the emerging modern Afrikaner nationalist movement

Nevertheless, secular pan-Netherlandic (Diets) nationalism and Dutch Calvinism, notably neo-Calvinism, helped sustain ties, aided by influential Afrikaners studying in the Netherlands, often with NZAV aid. In the 1890s NP founder Hertzog, the first Afrikaner with a doctorate, did his at the secular University of Amsterdam; moving to the Transvaal, he supported President Kruger’s controversially appointing Dutch officials as building on Afrikaners’ Diets background. GD Scholtz, who later edited the NP daily Die Transvaler, also did a doctorate at Amsterdam. Nico Diederichs, future Afrikaner Broederbond head, NP cabinet minister and state president, did

31 L Koorts, DF Malan and the rise of Afrikaner nationalism..., pp. 213-214.
33 BJH de Graaff, De mythe van stamverwantschap..., pp. 310-317.
34 LMCN de Jongh, “Beelaerts bij de Boeren: De betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Zuid-Afrika in de jaren dertig” (Masterscriptie, University of Utrecht, 2012), pp. 28, 41.
his at Leiden. Daniel Malan undertook his at Utrecht,\textsuperscript{38} praising the value of study in the Netherlands (from which, he asserted, Afrikaners had sprung) for developing their own nationality.\textsuperscript{39} Others studied at Kuyper’s neo-Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam (Vrije Universiteit/VU), including Piet Meyer, later Broederbond and state broadcasting corporation head.\textsuperscript{40} On the other hand, the first history department head (1905-10) at Stellenbosch, the first Afrikaner university, was Dutch: Everhardus Godée Molsbergen, who urged teaching the history of Afrikaners’ struggle. His successor, the Belgian Willem Blommaert (1910-27), later University Rector (1927-34),\textsuperscript{41} who at the University of Ghent had promoted Dutch-Flemish against French dominance, encouraged Afrikaner students to push similarly for their language rights.\textsuperscript{42}

The early \textit{Diets} movement, including the pan-Netherlandic student congresses,\textsuperscript{43} NZAV, and ANV, backed by figures such as Kuyper, Dutch ex-Transvaal State Secretary Willem Leyds, and ex-Orange Free State President Francis Reitz, dreamed of a purely cultural \textit{Groot Nederland} (Greater Netherlands), embracing Afrikaners, Flemings, and Dutch,\textsuperscript{44} but became more “political”. In the South African War the ANV declared support for the Boer republics as peoples of the \textit{Diets stam} (tribe) fighting for independence;\textsuperscript{45} some Flemish \textit{Diets} nationalists sought political union with the Netherlands, as did the Dietsch Studenten-verbond (DSV), founded in 1922.\textsuperscript{46} Despite the challenges noted earlier, notable \textit{Diets}-Afrikaner nationalist links persisted: the NZAV preferred Hertzog’s NP to the more pro-British Louis Botha or Jan Smuts and after the failed 1914 Afrikaner rebellion sought clemency for captured rebels from prime minister Botha.\textsuperscript{47} In 1915 the new NP daily,
De Burger, using a NZAV subsidy appointed Johann Visscher, editor of the NZAV’s Hollandsch-Zuid Afrika, as its first foreign correspondent.  During two 1920s visits the NZAV’s JW Pont found the NP so sympathetic to increasing Dutch immigration that it appointed a commission to study the topic. In 1928 prime minister Hertzog based his first envoy to western Europe at Den Haag. He appointed HDJ Bodenstein, ex-University of Amsterdam professor, Die Burger assistant editor and co-founder of the Dietsche Bond, which split in 1917 from the ANV to push harder for Dutch-Flemish union; Hertzog was the Bond honorary co-chairman. When the NP won a seat plurality in 1920 the Bond cable him, praising this triumph of the “Dietsch-Afrikaans ideal” and expressing the hope that it heralded reunification of all “Dietsche’ Afrikaners”, benefitting the “whole Dietsch stam”.

By 1933 the University of Amsterdam was considering a special chair in Afrikaans language and literature, while the DSV organized a “Dietsch” student trip, hosted by the Federatie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge (Federation of Afrikaner Cultural Organisations); the “honorary committee” included ANV, NZAV, and Dietsche Bond leaders, the Dutch education minister, Pretoria’s envoy to Den Haag, and Malan, then South African education minister. Schutte points out that rapid interwar modernisation led to nostalgia for an idealised past, encouraging interest in the stamverwante Afrikaners, going beyond a few hobbyists; South Africa’s new sovereign dominion status also made it easier for the Dutch government to embrace it as part of a cultural “Groot Nederland” without alienating Britain. By the late 1930s Kuyper’s heir as ARP leader, prime minister Hendrikus Colijn, was attending South African events such as Kruger’s birthday; he sent a congratulatory radio message to the Pretoria Trek centenary celebration and Queen Wilhelmina a written one, while Frans Beelaerts van Blokland, her Council of State Vice-president, gave one in person. The next year South Africa’s envoy, HD van Broekhuizen, gave the Diets student congress opening address; Diederichs was an invited speaker.

48 BJH de Graaff, De mythe van stamverwantschap..., pp. 127-128.
49 BJH de Graaff, De mythe van stamverwantschap..., p. 309.
50 LMCN de Jongh, “Beelaerts bij de Boeren...”, pp. 28, 38, 41.
51 BJH de Graaff, De mythe van stamverwantschap..., pp. 147, 156, 291; Anon., “Dietsche Bond”, De Tijd, 26 March 1929, p. 9.
53 Anon., “Leerstoel voor Afrikaansche taal te Amsterdam”, Algemeen Handelsblad (Amsterdam), 16 May 1933, p. 4.
56 GJ Schutte, De Vrije Universiteit en Zuid-Afrika: Deel 1..., pp. 281-284.
Dutch neo-Calvinism and the emerging modern Afrikaner nationalist movement

Afrikaners shared Dutch Calvinists’ Bible and Psalm edition, but not necessarily the “orthodoxy,” still less the “neo-Calvinist” “Christian nationalism” of Abraham Kuyper, theologian and prime minister (1901-05), who saw Calvinism as the basis of the Dutch nation’s character. He rejected liberal Protestants’ accommodating the secular state, but as God’s “general grace” allowed engaging with a sinful world, he built up his orthodox Calvinist ARP which, along with parallel confessional bodies in spheres such as education, he regarded as key to returning the Dutch to their former greatness.

The first native-born Afrikaner clergy studying at Dutch universities, JJ Kotze and TF Burgers, adopted liberal, not orthodox Calvinist theology, which survived in the “mother” Afrikaans Reformed church, the Cape Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK), largely due to Scottish Presbyterian clergy imported by the British authorities and Afrikaners studying at Scottish universities. The Transvaal Nederduitse Hervormde Kerk had a more liberal theology, partly due to its many imported Dutch ministers having studied at secular universities. The ultra-orthodox Cape NGK minister SJ du Toit, who pushed a South Africa-wide pan-Afrikaner identity, introduced “political Calvinism” there. Kuyper impressed him in a visit to the Netherlands, as did neo-Calvinist private “Christian-National education”, inspiring “Christian-National” Dutch-language schools to thwart Anglicisation. Kuyper idealized the “thoroughly Calvinist“ Boers – no mere ethnic kin (stamverwant), like Anglicised North American emigrants, but spiritual kin (“geestverwant”), free of liberalism and unbelief. His daily De Standaard charged that missionaries depicted Boer racial policies unfairly. As NZAV founder, he advised the

63 J Gerstner, The thousand generation covenant..., p. 170, note 213.
68 See A Kuyper, De crisis in Zuid-Afrika..., pp. 8-9.
69 GJ Schutte, De Gereformeerde wereld..., pp. 9-10.
Transvaal’s 1883-84 London delegation;\footnote{GJ Schutte, “The place of Dutch historians...” pp. 27-28; R Elphick, “‘The most superficial method imaginable’: White critics of Anglo-Saxon missions,” DL Robert (ed.), Converting colonialism: Visions and realities in mission history, 1706-1914 (Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2008), pp. 123-124.} \textit{De Standaard} noted Du Toit’s acknowledging that his proposed 1882 program for his Afrikaner Bond party was based on that of Kuyper’s Anti-Revolutionary Party.\footnote{Anon., “Buitenland”, \textit{De Standaard}, 3 April 1882, p. 1.}

Yet, unlike the ARP, Du Toit sought not a place for orthodox Calvinists in national life, but a united Christian Afrikaner national home,\footnote{GJ Schutte, “The place of Dutch historians...”, pp. 28-29; GJ Schutte, \textit{A family feud}, pp. 15-22; GJ Schutte, \textit{De Vrije Universiteit en Zuid-Afrika: Deel 1...}, pp. 37-43.} alienating Kuyper as he, from 1881 Transvaal education superintendent, promoted state, not private confessional “Christian-National” education (a key ARP concern) and Afrikaans over Dutch, refusing to mandate the VU as Transvalers’ university.\footnote{GJ Schutte, \textit{A family feud}... pp. 27-31; GJ Schutte, \textit{Nederland en de Afrikaners}... pp. 157, 178-179; GJ Schutte, \textit{De Vrije Universiteit en Zuid-Afrika: Deel 1...}, pp. 65-69.} Transvaal president Paul Kruger shared Kuyper’s ultra-conservatism. He wanted a state primarily Afrikaner and “Christian-national” in character, but space for those not sharing his strict Calvinism; a Transvaal patriot, he upset Kuyper when he proposed a local university rather than send students to the VU. No pan-Afrikaner nationalist, he also opposed Du Toit’s Bond. Du Toit’s pan-Afrikaner ideas had little support even in the Bond, becoming the major “Cape Dutch” political party, promoting Dutch rather than Afrikaans language rights.\footnote{GJ Schutte, “The Netherlands, cradle of apartheid...” pp. 399-400; GJ Schutte, \textit{Nederland en de Afrikaners}... pp. 179-180, 190; I Hexham, \textit{The irony of apartheid...}, p. 32.} It is thus difficult to identify a 19th century South African analogy to Kuyper’s “Christian nationalist” ideal of an orthodox Calvinist politico-religious movement preserving their values as the core of the nation by remaining separate from those who were thought to have lost their way to liberal and secular influences.

Still, when after the South African War SJ du Toit’s theologian-poet son JD du Toit (the poet “Totius”) helped revive Afrikaner nationalism, Dutch neo-Calvinism and “Christian nationalism” were surprisingly influential. Like Kruger and some one tenth of Afrikaners, JD du Toit belonged to the small, ultra-Calvinist Gereformeerde Kerk (GK), organized from 1858 by Rev. Dirk Postma, sent by the Dutch ultra-orthodox Separated Christian Reformed Church (which later merged with Kuyper’s supporters in the state Hervormde Kerk to form the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland); Postma promoted similar separation from “anti-Christian” “liberal” influences but rejected the political engagement favoured by Kuyper. Du Toit and Postma’s grandson
Ferdinand studied at Kuyper’s VU, which due to exceptional wartime support for the Boers by Kuyper and his followers became more acceptable to Afrikaners, even Stellenbosch NGK Seminary professors, for advanced studies. At the VU Du Toit adopted the ultra-Calvinist notion of self-isolation to preserve identity and values; a leader of the second Afrikaans language movement, in 1905 he and Ferdinand were founding professors of what became the GK-affiliated, Potchefstroom University College,76 which aspired to be like the VU.77 With Rev. Postma’s son Willem, who linked religious and racial purity, Du Toit helped flesh out an anti-British Afrikaner nationalism that fed into the early NP,78 in which GK members were disproportionately present. Dutch immigrant GK member Jan Kamp, a longtime editor of Kuyper’s De Standaard, edited Potchefstroom’s pro-Hertzog Het Westen; when it moved to Bloemfontein as the NP organ Het Volksblad in 1916, Kamp became first editor of the Pretoria NP newspaper Ons Vaderland.79

In the 1930s Afrikaners who had studied in the Netherlands revived neo-Calvinism, notably Kuyper’s view that God’s sovereignty over life required “Christian politics”, with the state respecting “social spheres”, given sovereignty by God.80 The biggest advocates were at Potchefstroom. Here Hendrik Stoker, building on Postma and SJ and JD du Toit, linked Kuyper’s ideas to nationalism by adding an ethnic aspect.81 Afrikaner theorists used Kuyper’s language on diversity as rooted in creation, nation as organism, and “sovereignty of separate spheres” of life to substitute more idealist notions of nation, volk, and culture for crude biological determinist justifications of segregation and white supremacy.82

Schutte points out, however, that as that most Afrikaners favored a broad movement to mobilise the volk, the GK was so small a minority, and Afrikaners had relatively minor religious differences, unlike the more numerous Dutch neo-Calvinists (who broke with the larger “national” Dutch movement, linked

76 Compare PF van der Schyff, Wonderdaad...! die PUK tot 1951: Wording, vestiging en selfstandigheid (Potchefstroom, PU vir CHO,2003), pp. 20-57; 64-68; 102-107;129-130; 136-149.
78 I Hexham, The irony of apartheid..., pp. 1-64, 128-188.
79 I Hexham, The irony of apartheid..., pp. 176-177.
81 TD Moodie, The rise of Afrikanerdom..., pp. 160, 162.
to the liberal state Hervormde Kerk), Afrikaner neo-Calvinists remained to guide and lead their people from within. This required modifying “Christian nationalism,” seeking to unite the whole national movement, regardless of social vision or religious viewpoint, on the basis of a more or less “Christian national” basis far vaguer and more individualistic than that preferred by most GK members. Afrikaners had their own nationalist political party, trade unions, and cultural and economic organisations, but there was no equivalent of confessional Dutch bodies such as the ARP and its affiliated organisations such as the Christelijk-Nationaal Vakverbond (Christian-National Trade Union), or professedly Christian universities, with the partial exception of the Potchefstroom Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys (PU vir CHO).

**Diets nationalism, the authoritarian right and German volks-nationalism**

Schutte argues that despite efforts, in light of this modification, to recast various actions in Kuyperian terms, in the 1930s and 1940s neo-Calvinists had less influence on Afrikaner nationalism than volks-nationalism, which belonged to a secular, conservative, authoritarian nationalist tradition, significantly influenced by contemporary German examples. The Afrikaner neo-Calvinist revival certainly coincided with an increasingly authoritarian shift in *Diets* nationalism. The Dutch Nasionaal-Sosialistiese Beweging (National Socialist Movement/ NSB), like the Flemish Verdinaso (League of *Diets* National Solidarists) and Vlaamsch Nationaal Verbond (Flemish National League/VNV), sought an authoritarian *Diets volk* state merging Flanders and the Netherlands. The DSV and the Afrikaans-Nasionale Studentebond, led by volks-nationalists Nico Diederichs, Piet Meyer, and JFJ van Rensburg, organized “*Diets* student tours” of each other’s countries from 1935 to 1938; only interest in authoritarian regimes explains including in the itinerary both Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Meyer told the 1937 ANS Congress that dictatorship was the true form of democracy.

---

84 GJ Schutte, *De Gereformeerde wereld...*, p. 22.
87 LMCN de Jongh, “Beelaerts bij de Boeren...”, p. 47.
89 Anon., “Diktatuur is demokraties”, *Die Transvaler*, 4 October 1937, p. 4.
informed a German Foreign Office official that he favored replacing liberal-democratic parliamentarism with an authoritarian state. Van Rensburg later headed the fascistic Ossewabrandwag (Ox-Wagon Guard/OB). In his inaugural oath as OB Commandant-General he swore to uphold the traditions of “our Diets-Afrikaans volk connection and the struggle for an “independent Diets-Afrikaans volk existence”, mirroring Diets-related language in all new OB members’ oath.

Diets nationalism was not inherently Nazi but was closely linked to German-inspired Romantic volks-nationalism; “Dietsch”, old Flemish for “Dutch,” could also broadly mean “German”. Diets enthusiasts’ talk of shared blood and Germanic ties thus opened the door to extremism. The 19th century Diets nationalism celebrated both pan-Netherlandic links and ties to a broader Germanic community: activists such as CJ Hansen had sought a pan-Low German as much as a pan-Dutch movement. After a 1890 concert Netherlands Performing Artists’ Union chairman Willem Nicolaï stated that the featured German-born composer Gustaf Heinze could claim Diets blood, uniting both peoples’ Germanic traits. In World War I Dutch historian Frederik Gerretson sought a Greater Netherlands in a German Mitteleuropa (central Europe). Under Nazi occupation Diets enthusiasts such as the NSB’s Anton Mussert and VNV’s Staf de Clerq veered between seeking a Greater Netherlands and Greater Germany, as did the ANV’s Neerlandia editor, Jan de Vries, believing the war might enable a Netherlands-Flanders union, but drawing closer to the “great German idea”, he joined the pro-Nazi Dutch Cultural Council and SS.
Radical Afrikaner *Diets* nationalists such as Diederichs or Van Rensburg were also Romantic *volks*-nationalist Germanophiles; pan-Netherlandic nationalism as a close cousin, even variant, of German-inspired Romantic *volks*-nationalism allowed a bridge to sympathy with Nazism. 1930s *Diets* tours led by ANS figures such as Diederichs or Meyer visited Germany after Belgium and the Netherlands;

101 Meyer recalled accepting Rudolf Hess’s offer to ski on the Alpine slopes and see Hitler close up. 102 Van Rensburg’s admiration for Germany and national socialism led to favorable Nazi comment when he visited in 1936. 103 Diederichs argued like a classic German Romantic nationalist in *Nasionalisme as lewensbeskouing en sy verhouding tot internasionalisme* (Nationalism as a worldview and its relationship to internationalism) that full human self-realisation was only possible through the nation, “the fulfilment of the individual life”, 104 language also akin to that of Nazism.

Mainstream Afrikaner nationalists’ stance was murkier, not least due to Nazi treatment of the churches, although more moderate figures could also interpret *Diets* broadly. Malan had earlier used the term in the sense of the “general language” to which Afrikaans belonged, 105 but after World War II he and other top Afrikaner nationalists were patrons of a Dietse Kinderfonds (*Diets* Children’s Fund) enabling adoption of a Dutch or (like Malan) a German war orphan.106

**Malanite nationalism, “Christian nationalism”, and *volks*-nationalism**

Giliomee thinks Kuyperian influence on the NP exaggerated, at least on Malan’s inner circle, as he drew on anti-Kuyperian thought at Utrecht, the Cape NGK evangelical focus on prayer, mission, education, and a puritanical life-style, and George Berkeley’s ethical emphasis (his Utrecht thesis subject), encouraging modernization and social activism, whereas neo-Calvinism

103 See USNAMS, T-120, reel 3017, frame E491148, Herr Dieckhoff to J Smuts, 20 August 1936; reel 3017, frame E491215, B Stiller to German Foreign Office, 28 April 1937.
105 DF Malan, “Afrikaans as amptetlike taal: Toespraak voor die verenigde sitting van albei huise van die parlement op 8 Mei 1925”, SW Pienaar (ed.), *Glo in u volk…* p. 182.
grounded all life in biblical doctrine.107 At Utrecht, more theologically liberal than the VU, Malan grew suspicious of combining religion and politics as neo-Calvinists did, although he himself later entered politics.108 Koorts sees Malan as more liberal than Kuypersians on evolution or the use of higher criticism to read the Bible.109 Malan’s NP also allowed women a larger role long before Kuyper’s ARP did so.110

Giliomee argues that Malan favored more the volkskerk (people’s church) approach: the NGK as the Afrikaners’ church had to help them overcome poverty and preserve their culture and ethnic character.111 Ironically, this aligned him in part with radical, German-influenced volks-nationalist northerners such as Diederichs and Meyer, reflecting German idealist and Romantic nationalist influences in his education and interests, from the anti-rationalist Reveil Reformed movement at Utrecht, where he did his doctorate, and at the Stellenbosch seminary, where several of his professors were Utrecht graduates. They included NJ Hofmeyr, influenced by the German Romantic philosopher Schleiermacher, who stressed religious experience over doctrine. Malan was influenced by three other German Romantic philosophers: Kant, his MA thesis subject, Hegel and Fichte, who stressed the link between nationalism and language, Malan’s concern as a champion of Afrikaans.112 Another expression of volkskerk theology was German missionary societies’ influence on Malan’s own NGK’s missionary policy, favoring separate “national” churches based on language and culture, which also reflected German Romanticism.113

Was Malanite nationalism thus more aligned with German volks-nationalism or at least Diets nationalism than Kuyperian Dutch “Christian nationalism”? Malan never showed much interest in Kuyper’s theology.114 Yet, his 1915 last sermon, justifying entering politics, cited Kuyper as a churchman also feeling called to serve in the broader terrain of volk life, as its problems could only
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be solved by acknowledging God’s lordship there too. Both wanted each church to care for its poor. Their parties praised democracy and criticized capitalism and socialism, but wanted the state to aid the poor, opposing individualistic liberalism. Like the ARP, most Afrikaner nationalists opposed liberal secularism, creating a network of “Christian-National” youth, educational, cultural, recreational, and economic bodies, which may seem like a “Calvinist society within a society” like the Dutch Gereformeerde volksdeel (Reformed people’s sector), although they differed in one key aspect: they were not limited to ultra-orthodox Calvinist circles.

New NP members swore to seek to develop volk life “along the Christian-National path”. In 1935 the Transvaal NP executive used a Kuyperian term in urging asserting the government’s duty, “taking into account the sovereignty in own sphere”, to honor Sunday as a day of rest. Pieter de Klerk notes even the OB claimed a “Christian-national” basis for a future republic. He posits that for most Afrikaners “Christian national” was just a hackneyed term. Yet, Malan insisted that opening the NP program of principles by acknowledging the “supreme lordship of Almighty God” was no mere decoration. In his memoirs he noted that his 1942 motion on a republic required it to be “Christian-national” in essence (wese) and character; he told Parliament, “We want to base our state on the Christian religion”. This statist stress was admittedly less Kuyperian than “volks-nationalist”, but he intended more than a vague cliché, asserting that they (the NP) wanted to adopt for their state the Christian “world conception” and that they wanted “to adopt it fully”.
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Like Giliomee, as noted earlier, Schutte discounts Kuyperian influence; he contrasts German-oriented “volks-nationalists” like Diederichs or Meyer, who he argues most affected Afrikaner nationalism in the 1930s and 1940s, with Kuyperians like Stoker, who asserted that “volks-nationalists” idolized the nation, subjecting individuals too much to society. Kuyper himself rejected the idea of the sovereignty of the state, which he tied especially to Germany, for placing the state above God. Yet, even Meyer, a VU alumnus, tried to blend authoritarianism, Calvinism, and Kuyper’s idea of “sovereignty in own spheres”, arguing that the “totalitarianism of the volks-beweging” (people’s movement), subordinate to God’s Word, meant seeking an “organic community” and the “independent existence” of spheres such as those of the individual, family, and church. Ironically, Stoker preferred the fascistic OB as a home for Calvinists to the “liberal” NP, which wanted the OB to be a purely “cultural” organization, separate from party politics. Dubow argues that even Diederichs’s “Nasionalisme as Lewensbeskouing” may be viewed as “a remarkable fusion of the German statist tradition with Dutch neo-Calvinist thought” in stressing how the diversity of nations “enhances the richness and beauty” of God’s creation.

Distinctions between neo-Calvinism and volks-nationalism or Diets nationalism were thus not firm. WN Coetzee, former editor of Koers, during the early years of the PU vir CHO’s neo-Calvinist bi-monthly, hailed Kuyper’s VU as a source of strengthening the Afrikaner, “in his deepest being a ‘Dietsman’ and a Calvinist”. Koorts, who stresses that Malan was no Kuyperian, admits he combined Calvinism and Romanticism. To him the Afrikaner volk was a creation of God with a divine calling, and nationalism, like Christianity, was a belief-system and not just an ideology; church and politics had to be kept formally separate, but the political sphere, like the church, had to be brought under God’s supervision and authority. She agrees that this seems close to Kuyper’s “sovereignty of spheres” but stresses that Malan, influenced by Romanticism, seeing society as organic, spoke instead of branches of the same tree. Dubow argues that even Kuyper tried to reconcile Calvinism
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and German Romanticism, for his version of Christian nationalism and volks-nationalism are not easily separable, sharing Romantic cultural idealism, anti-rationalism, and “the organic link between culture and nationhood, the idea that the creativity of the individual is best expressed through the collectivity of the group”.

Already in 1884 Kuyper’s De Standaard ran a piece in Flemish dialect on a Transvaal delegation visit to Antwerp, noting how much Dutch, Flemish, and Afrikaners shared, with languages all rooted in what had once been called “Dietsch”.

Nor was neo-Calvinist influence in the Afrikaans churches limited to the GK; by the mid-20th century the many VU-trained Afrikaner clergy chiefly belonged to the mainstream NGK. Future NP Prime Minister BJ Vorster’s brother Koot, later Cape NGK moderator, co-edited the first major Afrikaner presentation of neo-Calvinist Christian nationalism, “Koers in die Crisis” (“Course/Trajectory direction in the Crisis”, a 1930s scholarly essay series). Kuyperian creation-based sovereignty of separate spheres fit too with Lutheran “orders of creation” in German missionary thought, which influenced NGK (and NP) racial policy. Even Malan’s 1930s flirtation with anti-Semitism had a precedent in Kuyper’s writings, like Malan, Kuyper was ambivalent, rejecting persecuting Jews, but denounced their alleged links to liberalism, notably in editorials in De Standaard, of which he was longtime editor-in-chief.

The impact of World War II

The 1940 Nazi occupation of the Low Countries did not sway Afrikaner nationalists against staying out of Europe’s and especially Britain’s wars. Many deplored attacking neutral lands, but noted that Dutch pro-Boer sympathy
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had not led to help in the Anglo-Boer wars.\textsuperscript{139} A \textit{Burger} editorial rejected prime minister Smuts’s claim that “Holland” was “sacred ground”, as only half of Afrikaners’ ancestry was Dutch.\textsuperscript{140} Malan told Parliament that the Dutch and Belgians were “bound culturally and genealogically to South Africa,” but argued that the NP followed “the example which Holland herself has set”, neutral in World War I even when Belgium, “bound by ties of language and culture”, was overrun.\textsuperscript{141}

Afrikaner nationalist opposition to aiding the Allies and the discrediting of \textit{Diets} nationalism during the Nazi occupation hurt the Afrikaner connection, for committed Calvinists were disproportionately active in the Dutch Resistance.\textsuperscript{142} The liberal \textit{Diets} nationalist Dutch historian Pieter Geyl, pro-Afrikaner nationalist when he visited South Africa in 1937,\textsuperscript{143} had even before the war feared extremist Afrikaners were pressing Malan to adopt a pro-Nazi stance,\textsuperscript{144} growing disenchanted with the \textit{Diets} vision as so many Dutch and Flemish backers aided the Nazi occupier.\textsuperscript{145} Dutch collaborationist newspapers stressed their Afrikaner \textit{Diets} cousins’ “Nordic Germanic blood” and past suffering at British hands.\textsuperscript{146} Anton Mussert, whose NSB claimed ideological links with Abraham Kuyper,\textsuperscript{147} even selectively cited Afrikaner racial views to show “Dutch” openness to Nazi racism.\textsuperscript{148}

Some Dutch neo-Calvinist Afrikaner allies were also compromised. In 1940 ARP leader and ex-prime minister Hendrikus Colijn urged a “National Front”
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with concessions to the Nazis to save Dutch autonomy.149 Valentijn Hepp, Aart van Schelven and Abraham Kuyper’s son, Herman, all VU faculty who had visited South Africa, shared many Afrikaner nationalists’ ambivalence about Nazi Germany.150 “Great-Dietsland” backer Van Schelven, showing pre-war pro-fascist leanings, joined the National Front; Hepp and Herman Kuyper urged obeying the occupiers’ God-given rule (most at the VU disagreed).151 Volume I of “Koers in die Krisis”, co-edited by Stoker, included essays by Van Schelven (wartime NZAV vice-chair and its study fund chair),152 and Hepp, supervisor of PG Badenhorst’s 1939 VU thesis justifying race segregation in Kuyperian terms, and which H Kuyper had endorsed.153

Given this background, the Dutch press reacted negatively to the pro-Allied Smuts’ defeat by Malan’s NP in 1948, especially when he named as Minister to the Netherlands and Belgium ex-OB member Otto du Plessis, regarded by many there as pro-German.154 Both governments refused the nomination,155 forcing reconsideration by Pretoria.156

The aftermath

As the Cold War worsened and Malan’s government rejected criticism of Dutch colonial rule, relations warmed somewhat, boosted by postwar Dutch immigration and the Dutch-South African cultural accord, formalised in 1953.157 In 1950, in a faint echo of the old Diets enthusiasms, Transvaal NP leader JG Strijdom endorsed his government’s encouraging Dutch immigration, as he put it, to strengthen the “Hollands-Afrikaner” section
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of the population and uphold the *Diets* culture.\(^{158}\) Even in that leading South African neo-Calvinist vehicle, “PU vir CHO”-related journal *Koers*, an academic DCS du Preez hailed the cultural accord as a great event for the “Diets connection”, building on existing cooperation based on common language, belief and worldview – especially among the Calvinist section of the people.\(^{159}\)

The post-1948 NP government was not obviously “neo-Calvinist”. “Christian-nationalism” survived in South Africa, but in an attenuated form.\(^{160}\) Schutte argues that from 1948 the NP hijacked “Christian national education” to mobilize the *volk* in an Afrikaans “generally Christian” state system, rather than Kuyper’s private, orthodox Calvinist model.\(^{161}\) The only link with post-South African War “Christian national education” was insisting on mother tongue education. The 1952 federal NP program applied vaguely the old language on developing the *volk* on “Christian-national” lines, but now to the whole South African nation, insisting that the authorities “oppose all unchristian practices in the national life”.\(^{162}\) Schutte cites 1980s Conservative Party leader Andries Treurnicht to show that Afrikaner nationalists embedded “Kuyperian” ideas such as “sovereignty of spheres” in a *volks*-nationalist system, with *volk* the determining sphere, whereas Kuyper’s ARP segregated itself from other Dutch with differing religious views.\(^{163}\) Afrikaner “Christian nationalism” was now more *volks*-nationalist than anything recognizably neo-Calvinist.

The Netherlands, on the other hand, was rapidly changing in its view of South Africa. As in Belgium, despite differences from the Netherlands such as in colonial and wartime occupation experiences and past suppression of the Flemish form of Dutch,\(^{164}\) official Dutch hostility toward the NP regime gradually grew to match that of the local anti-“apartheid” movement.\(^{165}\) Although Malanite nationalism had favoured democracy (albeit all-white and all cultural groupings
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having their own governing power) over the OB’s quasi-fascist dictatorship, growing Dutch rejection of colonialism and of anything linked to Nazi ideas as well as the weakening of Dutch nationalism, now thought outdated.

This undercut the idea of a Netherlandic *stam* and *stamverwantskap.*

“Christian-national” South Africa seemed to hold onto the past and isolation, rejecting the outside world’s solutions just as Dutch society underwent a “silent revolution”, abandoning old divisions and orthodoxies.

Even ARP politicians embraced this shift. By the 1970s the VU, like the Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, had dropped Kuyperian theology. Between 1974 and 1979 the VU gradually ended ties with “PU vir CHO” in Potchefstroom over its “apartheid” ideology, for although Potchefstroom was widely associated with NP reformists, but that was not enough at the time.

In 1978 the NGK in turn severed ties to the Gereformeerde Kerken over supporting the World Council of Churches’ Program to Combat Racism.

Even once apartheid ended, the worlds of *Diets* nationalism or neo-Calvinism were gone. White rule in South Africa was over, the Low Countries ever more multi-cultural, and neo-Calvinism as much a niche Afrikaner viewpoint as in the secular Netherlands. In 2012 Dutch historian Bart de Graaff insisted that despite the same pedigree (*stamboom*), the *Diets* tribe (*stam*), Afrikaners and Netherlanders could not speak of *stamverwantschap.* The renewed relationship now embraced all of South
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Africa, not just Afrikaners.\textsuperscript{174}

\textbf{Conclusion}

Assessing the complex intersections between Afrikaner nationalism and the Netherlands, in particular neo-Calvinist “Christian nationalism” and pan-Netherlandic or \textit{Diets} nationalism, offers an alternative to linking Afrikaner nationalism crudely to Calvinism or Nazism. Even nationalists who showed sympathy with Nazi Germany, such as the OB’s Hans van Rensburg, found it politic to associate themselves with \textit{Diets} nationalism. \textit{Diets} nationalism, however, due to its kinship with German-inspired \textit{volks}-nationalism, provided a bridge between Afrikaner nationalists who admired Hitler’s achievements in Germany or even wanted to borrow some of his model, and more conservative nationalists whose sympathies with Europe, if any, lay more with the Low Countries. The equally complex links between \textit{Diets} nationalism and Kuyperian “Christian nationalism” were evident not only in Kuyper’s own thought but in the later efforts of Piet Meyer (and arguably even Nico Diederichs) to blend fascist-inflected \textit{volks}-nationalism with Kuyperian neo-Calvinism. Even many less radical NP supporters, despite concerns about Nazi treatment of the churches or the wartime German occupation of the Low Countries, at least hoped that an Axis victory would make possible an independent republic free of the old British foe.

Daniel Malan’s approach is especially illuminating. He was neither an admirer of Kuyper’s theology nor of the radical \textit{volks}-nationalists who, like so many \textit{Diets} nationalists in the Low Countries, blurred devotion to their own people and to the German cause. Nevertheless, while no pan-Netherlandic enthusiast, he valued the historical connection with the Netherlands and identified to a degree with a broader view of \textit{Diets} identity in adopting a German orphan under the \textit{Diets} banner. He was also essentially a \textit{volks}-nationalist in his view of the church and devotion to the Afrikaans language, more influenced by German Romantic nationalist philosophers, who the radical Afrikaner \textit{volks}-nationalists admired, than by Kuyper’s writings. Yet, he had surprisingly much in common with Kuyper’s political views and embraced at least a modified hybrid Christian nationalism although, as practised by the NP, this looked more like \textit{volks}-nationalism than Kuyper’s

neo-Calvinist model. Afrikaner nationalism, especially the Malanite variety, drawing on such disparate influences, could never fit easy labelling such as “Calvinist” or “neo-Calvinist”, much less “Nazi”. Our understanding can nevertheless be enriched by a nuanced analysis of transnational connections and influences, especially in relation to the mythical stamland.