



History of Anthropology Newsletter

Volume 31
Issue 1 *June 2004*

Article 3

1-1-2004

Anthropology in the World Court: The 1966 South-West Africa Case

Robert J. Gordon

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han>

 Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), and the [History of Science, Technology, and Medicine Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gordon, Robert J. (2004) "Anthropology in the World Court: The 1966 South-West Africa Case," *History of Anthropology Newsletter*. Vol. 31 : Iss. 1 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss1/3>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol31/iss1/3>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE WORLD COURT: THE 1966 SOUTH-WEST AFRICA CASE

Robert J. Gordon
University of Vermont

The 1966 International Court of Justice's refusal to hear a complaint against South Africa for not administering South-West Africa according to the League of Nations Mandates charter might be a minor blimp in the Court's history, but it generated an exceptional amount of mental and intellectual effort and energy. The source of the conflict lay in South Africa's refusal to recognize the United Nations as the legal successor to the League of Nations. Thus, South Africa refused to hand over its Mandated Territory of South-West Africa to the United Nations to be administered as a Trusteeship Territory, and continued to administer South-West Africa as if it were still a Mandate. Six years before, in 1960, Liberia and Ethiopia, two countries that had been members of the League of Nations and thus had the necessary *locus standi in judicio*, had taken South Africa to the World Court. Charging that the United Nations was the legal successor to the League of Nations, Liberia and Ethiopia had demanded that the Mandate awarded to South Africa by the League to administer South West Africa be revoked on the grounds that South Africa had acted in bad faith by neglecting to fulfill Article 2 of the Mandate—"To promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of the inhabitants of the territory." South Africa's rejoinder was that the ultimate end it was pursuing in the Territory—*Apartheid*--was in accordance with enlightened and liberal opinion.

The South African Government took this case seriously. Not only did it believe that Namibia represented its Achilles heel in international affairs but it also saw the Court proceedings as an important occasion to justify *Apartheid* to an increasingly skeptical international audience. As the leader of the South African legal team, D.P. de Villiers, put it, their task was to "restore some objectivity to the matter." The Applicants' 62 page *Memorial* resulted in a ten volume *Counter-Memorial* that sought to refute the allegations against South Africa and demonstrate that "self-determination" was the most "practical course"; it claimed that Namibians were educationally and economically better off than residents of other African countries, that South Africa's policies enjoyed the support of the "great majority," and that existing policies did not represent expressions of racist ideology "but merely practical recognition of existing differences between various groups in culture, language modes of living, outlook and stages of development"(de Villiers 1968:14). Sparing no expense, South Africa presented copious documentation to substantiate its case, justified on the grounds that the Applicants' charges were broad and vague, and failed to provide a background for a "proper appreciation of the issues raised." South Africa's legal volumes contain a wealth of material, not only on the Territory but also on the rest of Africa. Indeed, they provide an ironic update of Hailey's famous *African Survey*. Moreover, South Africa presented a list of 38 "Expert Witnesses" who could be called to testify about the situation in the Territory. In public hearings held from July 1 to October 21, 1965, thirteen of these were called, including three anthropologists.

The three anthropological witnesses, Messrs Eiselen, Bruwer and van Zyl, all Afrikaans-speaking, identified themselves not as *volkekundiges* or even as ethnologists, but as social anthropologists, in a move considerably at variance with conventional representations of South African anthropology.¹ The most important anthropological witness, and the focal

point of this brief paper (which is part of a larger, ongoing project), was Johannes Petrus van Schalkwyk Bruwer, who was the State's resident ethnological expert on Namibia, the first Commissioner-General for the Native Peoples of South West Africa, a member of the so-called Odendaal Commission (South Africa's 1964 *Commission of Enquiry into South West African Affairs*, which developed a comprehensive plan for the socio-economic development of the Territory), and later Foundation Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Port Elizabeth, Bruwer was called to provide expertise on the crucial question of differences among various Namibian population groups, their consciousness of separate identities and their wishes to maintain them, and the likely effects of removal of measures to ensure "differentiation"--in essence, the ideological justification of *Apartheid*. Bruwer was examined and cross-examined more extensively than any of the other expert witnesses. Throughout the proceedings, he constantly stressed his anthropological expertise. His testimony was littered with the qualifier, "As an anthropologist . . ."

Namibia, Bruwer claimed, was divided into two main groups, the Khoisan and Bantu, who were distinguishable not only linguistically but also on "perceivable physical differences." Khoisan consisted of Bushmen and Nama, while among the Bantu would be classified the Herero, the Kaokoveld cluster, the Ovambo people, and the Kavango and Eastern Caprivi people. But this classification was befuddled by the Damara, who were linguistically Khoisan but physically Negroid. And while the Bantu-speakers had preserved their oral traditions, the Khoisan had not. All these groups spoke mutually unintelligible languages (ICJ 1966 Vol X:246). In addition to linguistic differences, there were major differences in kinship: the Ovambo-Kavango cluster were matrilineal, Herero practiced double-descent and the Nama were patrilineal. Moreover, in terms of subsistence, Ovambo-Kavango people were agriculturalists, Herero were cattle pastoralists, Nama were sheep pastoralists, and Bushmen and Damara were hunters. Save for a few isolated individuals among them, these diverse peoples had no inclination to form an overarching single "integrated unit." Separate development, he concluded, was the only workable policy: it represented respect for the achievements of African peoples, allowed flexibility in adaptation in an evolutionary way to changing situations, and did not necessitate abandoning people's "sacred heritage" (ICJ 1966, X:263).

Integration, defined by Bruwer as "where you create a society by giving rights and privileges to members of other groups, who have already got their rights and privileges in another area", had not occurred because people lacked political and property rights, or more precisely, legal rights (ICJ 1966 X:296). Fundamental to Bruwer's view was the notion of a dual economy, a modern cash-sector controlled and dominated by Whites, coexisting with the multitude of "traditional" ones found in the reserves. Conceding that the White economy was dependent upon natives, he denied that it was an "integrated one": it was simply a "school for learning for these people" (ICJ 1966, X:277, 300) as the cash economy was "alien to these (Herero) people" because their "basic" culture was pastoralist and thus not "a money type of economy." He denied that Namibia had an integrated economy because all groups did not have rights and privileges connected to the economy, e.g. land rights (ICJ 1966, X:297). Bruwer insisted that "traditional economies" emphasized group rights, and that "group membership" could not be lost in a life-time as ties of lineage and clan linked individuals to the larger group. Group rights were necessary to protect members of the group against other groups, although individual rights could be exercised within the group.

With mantra-like regularity, Bruwer reiterated his position that "differentiation" was necessary to protect a group against other stronger groups; while measures designed to

preserve it imposed limitations on individual freedom, it was for the good of the group and in the interests of all the people. This, in a nutshell, was Bruwer's expert testimony. He was well prepared and practiced for it, having done extensive ethnographic fieldwork in the Territory, and having served as a key member on the Odendaal Commission.

The Life and Striving of Johannes P van S Bruwer ²

Bruwer represents an important figure in the second-generation of South African anthropologists. Born in the Cape in 1913, and educated at the Wellington Teachers Training College, he had spent fifteen years as a Dutch Reformed Church missionary in Northern Rhodesia and to the end of his life he remained a devout Christian. He became fluent in Chewa, and occupied a number of important mission positions. Like most Afrikaner anthropologists, he earned all of his degrees from a single University, which in his case was the University of Pretoria. He obtained a BA degree through extra-mural study, then earning an MA in 1949 (cum laude) and a doctorate in 1955, with a thesis on the kinship basis of social organization among matrilineal Bantu communities with special reference to the Kunda. (He apparently had no direct contact with the famous Rhodes-Livingstone Institute located in Northern Rhodesia.) In 1951, he was appointed Senior Lecturer in *Volkekunde* at the University of Stellenbosch, and three years later, he was promoted to Professor.

Stellenbosch in those days was an intellectually exciting place. An important influence there was F.D.Holleman, a South African-born Dutchman who had been a Judge in Indonesia and had succeeded the famous Adat law scholar, van Vollenhoven, at Leiden University, before taking early retirement and accepting the Chair of Bantu Law at Stellenbosch. Holleman brought to the discussion of *Apartheid* a concern for "jural communities." His 1952 mimeographed notes on *Bantoeregs-gemeenskappe* (Bantu legal communities) were still being used for teaching in the late sixties, and were derived from his study, not of Calvinism, but of Indonesian "Adat Circles." Holleman also informed Stellenbosch academics about Furnivall's conceptualization of Plural Societies, and this probably accounts, at least in part, for the rhetoric that Bruwer used in his marathon evidence at the ICJ. At Stellenbosch Bruwer was also heavily involved in SABRA, the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs, an Afrikaner think-tank which was trying to provide a scientific rationale for *Apartheid* and the *Afrikaanse Broederbond*, the secretive organization which sought to consolidate Afrikaner nationalism and saw *Apartheid* as one of the crucial mechanisms in achieving this. Bruwer rapidly rose to prominence in this powerful organization, serving at one stage as acting Chair of the *Broederbond*.³ From at least 1963 to his untimely death in an airplane crash in 1967, he served as convener of the Oversight Committee on Bantu Affairs, one of the committees whose recommendations to the *Broederbond*'s Executive Council invariably become Government policy.⁴ It is especially notable that the Minister of Native Affairs was invariably a *Broeder* (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:196-201). Bruwer was heavily engaged in *Volksdiens* (Service to the Afrikaner nation): not only did he author two editions of a Standard Eight (Grade Ten) school text on *Race Studies* for the Transvaal Education Department, but he also gave a series of radio lectures on topics like *Ons Mandaat, Suidwes-Afrika*, later published in pamphlet form (Bruwer 1961), and wrote *Die Bantoe van Suid-Afrika* (1957), which was the first ethnographic textbook in Afrikaans.

Bruwer became enamored of South-West Africa during his first study tour in December 1954. Undoubtedly, professional interests figured in its appeal for him. Its

Ovambo and Kavango inhabitants were part of the so-called matrilineal (kinship) belt, which extended to Mozambique and of which he had first-hand experience. Moreover, he grasped the strategic importance of the Territory for South Africa. It formed a wedge-route to and from the rest of Black Africa, and thus the goodwill of the indigenous population was crucial. During this first trip he recalled being struck by the “backward nature of indigenous society,” and by officials’ lack of interest in and ignorance of it. Subsequently, he made periodic visits to the Territory as a tourist and speaker at (*Broederbond*) meetings and Day of Covenant celebrations. In December 1958, Bruwer undertook his first research tour aimed at making closer contact with indigenous peoples, and even then he felt that it was apparent that indigenes were moving away from supporting the South African government and would unavoidably continue to do so, unless strong action was taken to counter their increasing alienation, the activities of SWAPO (the fledgling liberation movement that would form the first government in independent Namibia in 1990), the continued “interference” of the Reverend Michael Scott, and the increasing number of petitions by local individuals to the United Nations. All of these phenomena, he claimed, were only the **visible** signs of deep undercurrents that were increasing in strength. In particular, two things caught his attention in Ovamboland: first, the poverty and stagnation symbolized by the South African flag flying over a termite-eaten *rondawel* office; and second, the growing success of SWAPO, exemplified by nightly meetings about which white officials were blissfully unaware. So concerned was Bruwer that he wrote a confidential report to various Cabinet Ministers about the deteriorating situation, suggesting options for action.

Early in 1959, he commenced six months work in Omedi, Kuanyama Tribal Area, selecting it as his field site because he believed that SWAPO agitation was greatest there. He traveled extensively to “get to know the people” and assess SWAPO’s activities, and in the expectation that he could neutralize SWAPO through personal contact. Thus, he traveled east to the Kavango River region and west to Kaokoveld, where he found individuals who were traveling to Botswana to meet priests, ostensibly for religious-nativistic reasons but, he felt, really to consolidate ties with Herero exiles. And he determined that it was the situation in Kuanyama, the most populous area in Namibia, that required urgent attention in order to divert interest from SWAPO. For this purpose, Bruwer proposed two strategic actions: organizing an agricultural show, which would keep people busy and give them something to talk about; and erecting an imposing building for the Kuanyama Tribal Council in order to bolster the prestige of the Headmen. These suggestions were enacted by a sympathetic (Afrikaner) Bantu Affairs Commissioner. The first show was held in May 1959: “As researcher I could propagate the matter objectively and it was quickly apparent that the matter had a calming influence.” It took many visits to neutralize the SWAPO-inspired “under-currents.” Bruwer justified these visits as being part of his clan survey. In two months, he visited 333 wards and met groups representing 11,234 households. He worked an average of 17 hours per day, and claimed to have made contact with more than 25,000 people in Kuanyama, 31% of the total population.

Bruwer spent the second half of 1959 as a visiting professor at Johns Hopkins University courtesy of USSALEP (United States Leadership Exchange Program), and was unable to return to Namibia until December 1961. He found that the situation had deteriorated further, and expressed his concerns to de Wet Nel, the South African Minister of Bantu Administration who had oversight responsibilities for South West Africa. He repeated his concern about subversive “under-currents” and the need to mobilize goodwill, and reiterated his plea for a well-organized plan of development as soon as possible. Bruwer also pleaded for an experienced anthropologist to be appointed, preferably as a

Commissioner-General⁵, who could liaise and co-ordinate the development plan. The Commissioner-General should have broad and intensive contact with indigenes in order to promote acceptance of South African overrule. He should be a person, Bruwer wrote, who would be willing to work tirelessly, who would know how to interact with local people, and who would have the necessary status in his relations with the central government to be able to act effectively. The government approach the struggle wholeheartedly, and should take steps to attract foreign sympathizers. Bruwer concluded, "We will never satisfy the UN and the leftists, but if we can get the large majority of the population on our side, we can achieve much despite all our problem" (letter to de Wet Nel, Minister of Bantu Administration, January 15, 1962).

The Minister responded quickly, arranging for Bruwer to return to Namibia almost immediately, leaving his teaching post at Stellenbosch. His ostensive purpose was to do research, but he was specifically charged with promoting goodwill and cooperation, especially important in view of the impending visit of the United Nations Carpio/d'Alva delegation (in May), and with inducing the various Ovambo groups to accept a central tribal authority. So important were his tasks that Bruwer had private discussions with South African Prime Minister Verwoerd, who arranged for special leave for a year and for special research funding for Bruwer to be channeled through the University. Bruwer wrote a letter to the newly appointed Adjunct Minister for South West African Affairs in which he elaborated his plan of action. Officially, he said, he was going to do research on land tenure systems in Kaokoveld, Ovamboland and the Kavango; "this will properly cover my presence and mobility in all these areas and if necessary officials can be informed so that I can have at all times the necessary freedom of movement." And it was also important that he keep his University affiliation as a cover:

For practical purposes then I remain in the employ of the University and maintain thus my objectivity as researcher to the outside world. ... Apart for my striving for trust and goodwill and the other matters that have been given to me, the research itself will also have practical utility. Further I might be able in various regards be able to give confidential advice about affairs of the day... There is only one valid consideration here---love for the case of SWA-- for me it can only bring sacrifice. I have nothing to gain, possibly even much to lose (Letter to van der Wath, February 23, 1962, my translations).

By the time Bruwer reached Kuanyama he realized that SWAPO had heard of the impending United Nations visit, and were organizing a 50,000 person mass protest demonstration. Through his "contacts," he learned that SWAPO was now in league with traditional authorities, and that each ward had its own organizer. Desperate, he met with Toivo ya Toivo, the local SWAPO leader, as well as the various ward organizers, supposedly surprising them by knowing of their role. Expending over R3,000 (the equivalent to about US\$3,000 in those days) of his own funds, he claimed to have managed to persuade the demonstration organizers to accept a compromise to stage only a local demonstration. Eventually, only seventy demonstrators turned up to meet the UN team. During this episode, local white officials were unaware of what was going on.⁶ Whenever possible, Bruwer provided advice informally. Thus, he managed to dissuade Bantu Administration from introducing 43 Apartheid-style "tribal authorities" in Ovamboland in 1963 (on the expert advice of a Pretoria University *volkekundige*), arguing that his research had shown that the traditional authorities wanted a centralized system.

Bruwer was a busy scholar. While doing fieldwork, he was also helping to prepare the South African defense at the ICJ. In this effort, his involvement dated no later than early April, 1961. Originally it was decided that the (South African) Chief Government Ethnologist, van Warmelo, would provide the basic ethnological background, while Bruwer would prepare the section of the government's brief devoted to history, as well as provide the ethnological justification for *Apartheid*. However, van Warmelo's work proved to be unsatisfactory, and it was decided that Bruwer's research should provide the basis for the South African rejoinder (McGregor letter 26th March 1962). It is easy to understand why van Warmelo's 48 page Memorandum on the "Inhabitants of South West Africa from an ethnological point of view" was unacceptable to the team preparing for the World Court hearings. It described the eleven "racial groups," and concluded with a section on "Differences between Europeans as a group, and non-Europeans". After mentioning physical distinctions and *odor*, van Warmelo discussed language, dress and finally manners. His concluding two paragraphs *in extenso*:

(Native) practices in connection with micturition and defecation are to Europeans nauseously filthy, and though non-Europeans often wonder why Europeans don't like to shake hands with them, there are very good reasons. There is no guarantee that a well-dressed Native is not nevertheless still most primitive and loathsome in his habits. Europeans, seeing these people daily cannot but note how Native gentlemen put a finger to a nostril to blow the other.... So they draw their own conclusions. The sight of a Native latrine, or a visit to a Native homestead where Nature all around serves as latrine just like with the animals, should make it clear why Europeans insist on living apart from Natives...The differences here cannot be gone into without describing the institutions themselves, which has been done elsewhere. But such fundamental concepts as the role and duties of the sexes (man as gentleman, woman as worker), the relative unimportance of the marriage tie and illegitimacy, the importance of status and of seeming important against the relative unimportance of really being respectable, the spendthrift attitude towards waste, leisure, time and opportunity, all these and many other characteristic attitudes are a cause of Europeans not being able to establish real communication, or to work together except where the one directs the activities of the other.⁷

By January 1963 Bruwer was completing his conclusions. As he informed the South African Agent: "I am busy rewriting the ethnic exposition to **emphasize differences. I am also going to examine the violent struggles among the indigenous groups which raged until the end of the previous century in order to indicate that the groups could not live together in peace as a unit**" (Letter to McGregor, 14th January 1963, my emphasis). Later, he described the structure of his memorandum; the purpose of Section 3 was to "show that the groups could not live in peace before the whites came." Section 5 would emphasize "only basic and fundamental differences" and Section 6 would analyze cultures to "show the basic differences" again (Letter to McGregor 31st January 1963). In February 1965 he was asked to make himself available as a possible "Expert Witness."

Bruwer is more important for understanding Namibian society than his paltry publication record⁸ or "Expert Witness" status would suggest. To be sure, his tragic death in 1967 curtailed a most fascinating career. Bruwer's significance for Namibian anthropology is to be found in a variety of achievements. He attracted and sponsored a number of students who undertook fieldwork in the densely populated northern areas, in the Kavango and

Ovambo regions. More important, one has to examine Bruwer's influence on Government policy, especially his role in the *Afrikaner Broederbond*, his part in the *Commission for South West African Affairs*, and his performance as inaugural Commissioner-General for the Indigenous Peoples of South West Africa. He evidently played a leading role in guiding the *Commission for South West African Affairs*, and tried to oversee the implementation of its recommendations in his capacity of Commissioner-General; significantly, the South African Government committed large sums to try to implement the commission's major recommendations. Arguably, the South African government used Namibia as the site of a pilot project, giving *Apartheid* a trial run there by creating twelve separate homelands. Indeed per capita more people were forcibly removed (including whites) in Namibia than in South Africa. In large part, the *Apartheid* fantasy was given ostensive credibility by anthropologists such as Bruwer. The interesting aspect of Bruwer's career is that he resigned his Commissioner-Generalship prematurely, holding the post for less than a year. Like a good secretive *Broeder*, he purged his papers of any suggestions as to why he resigned, but a contextual reading of them suggests that he had a major disagreement about the viability of *Apartheid* with Dr. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister and driving force behind *Apartheid*. Unfortunately, he did not explain his differences with Verwoerd before he died, so we will never know what they were.

Conclusion

This brief paper forms part of a larger ongoing project on the role of expert ineptitude in the making of Namibia. Its story of how good, intelligent people with high moral principles were so thoroughly wrong in their interpretations and interventions is a lesson in humility, which is what some of us would argue is what anthropology is about. Although the project is incomplete, several tentative conclusions can be drawn from its preliminary findings.

Among students of South African anthropology, there has been a vigorous re-assessment of the role of anthropology in elaborating the ideology and policy of *Apartheid*. After an initial critique suggesting anthropologists' culpability (West 1988; Sharp 1981; Gordon 1988), there has been a counter-attack, insisting that the critics were too sweeping in their critique (Coertze 1999; 2000). This short note has been intended to provide sufficient empirical evidence on this point. Coertze has certainly been the major writer on this topic, and what is striking about his whole corpus on the history of *volkekunde* is that he has focus inordinately on his father, P. J. Coertze, ignoring the anthropologists who belonged to a later generation, such as Bruwer. Indeed in Coertze's vision of the world, Bruwer barely registers. Even his pioneering Afrikaans textbook is ignored. Bruwer contributed a chapter to the second edition of P.J.Coertze's *Inleiding tot die Algemene Volkekunde*, but his chapter was not included in the third edition. Did this indicate stresses and strains between the Coertzes and Bruwer? Coertze (1991; 1998) grounds his history of Afrikaans anthropology on the Universities of Stellenbosch and Pretoria, but ignores the wider socio-economic impact the universities' anthropologists might have had. Even in his twenty year delayed response to the critics, Coertze (1999) still downplays the role of anthropology in the wider community, and its policy impact in particular. Adam Kuper (2001) has made a plea for a less polemical assessment, and has pointed to the diversity of approaches, many of which were hotly contested, even in South Africa. Clearly, however, anthropological diversity was not found in Namibia. There, only Bruwer's opinion counted. The only other anthropologists in the Territory were a few German-émigré Government anthropologists attached to the Department of Native Affairs from 1948 to 1972: Lehmann, Wagner, Kohler, and Budack. They were hired by van Warmelo, both because he had a high opinion of German

anthropology and because they were conservative. Moreover, as foreigners dependent upon the state for their jobs, they could be trusted to avoid any sort of controversy. At best they functioned as technicians, not policy advisors. Recently, the historian Hermann Giliomee (2002) has traced the roots of the *Apartheid* idea not so much to anthropologists as to missionaries, such as G.B.A Gerdener. Clearly, however, the case of Bruwer, a missionary turned anthropologist, suggests that the two disciplines or callings have not been entirely separate entities, but have joined in all sorts of creative configurations.

¹ The question of whether there are two anthropologies in South Africa--a British-oriented Social anthropology and a Germanic-inspired *Volkekunde*--is a contentious one (Kuper 1999:xii-xiii; Gordon 1989). Bruwer seems to have split the difference: in 1956, he listed himself as in a Department of *Volkekunde* but wrote about Social and Cultural Anthropology; in 1958, he listed his academic home as the Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology. It has been suggested that both he and Eiselen saw *Volkekunde* as synonymous with Social Anthropology, and that they were reacting to the culturological emphasis which the Coertzes were giving *Volkekunde* at the University of Pretoria (M.de Jongh, personal communication. See also Kuper 2002).

² Included in his papers at the Institute for Contemporary History at the University of the Orange Free State is an autobiographical essay entitled "My Life and Striving in the Interests of South West Africa. 1958-1964" (PV 123 2/11/1). That he should choose such a title is significant as one of the martyrs of Afrikaner nationalism, Jopie Fourie, also wrote a biography entitled "My Life and Striving." This section is derived largely from material found in this deposit.

³ "These committees work in total secrecy and consist of prominent Broeders who "see that Broeders get effective control of key areas, check that they perform their duties properly, and advise Cabinet Ministers on policy matters" (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:397).

⁴ Fellow World Court witnesses Eiselen and van Zyl were also members of this Committee at one time or another. Other anthropologists who served on it included Prof. E.F.Potgieter, later also a Commissioner-General and Dr Piet Koornhof who exceptionally did his doctorate at Oxford and famously placed an embargo on it. Prof P.J.Coertze the doyen of *volkekunde* was an associate member (Wilkins & Strydom 1978:398-399).

⁵ Commissioner-Generals were political appointments made in the various South African ethnic groups with the purpose of providing direct links between the population groups and the South African Prime Minister. The purpose of their appointments was to try to circumvent the cumbersome civil service. A surprisingly large number of these Commissioner-Generals consisted of *volkekundiges*.

⁶ For alternative accounts from a local perspective, see Ndadi (1974) and Shituwete(1990).

⁷ It is difficult to reconcile these paragraphs with Hammond-Tooke's recent conclusion, based in part on personal experience, that van Warmelo had "extensive, shrewd and essentially practical knowledge of indigenous life (and was) skeptical of grand theory and ideological preoccupations" (Hammond-Tooke 1997:114).

⁸ Indeed, his most significant works are probably a stencilled study entitled *The Kuanyama* and an unpublished manuscript entitled *Die Matrilinere Orde van Kavangoland* (The Matrilineal Order of the Kavango). He wrote a number of general articles (e.g. Bruwer 1965) and a popular book *South West Africa: The Disputed Land*, which is essentially a summary of the arguments he made to the World Court.

Bibliography

- Bruwer, Johannes Petrus. 1957 *Die Bantoe van Suid-Afrika*. Johannesburg: Afrikaanse Pers.
- 1961. *Ons Mandaat, Suidwes-Afrika*. Johannesburg: Suid-Afrikaanse Uitsaaikorporasie.
- 1966 *South West Africa: the Disputed Land*, Cape Town: Tafelberg
- Coertze, Roelf D. 1991 "Aanvang van Volkekunde aan Afrikaanstalige universiteite in Suid-Afrika". *South African Journal of Ethnology* 14: 25-34.
- 1998. "Antropoloige aan die Universiteit van Pretoria. Die grondleggers en hulle invloed tot 1972." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 21(1):1-31.
- 1999. "Kommentaar op geignoreerde kritiek." *South African Journal of Ethnology* 22(3):81-96.
- 2000. "Repliek op Sharp se 'One nation, two anthropologies?'" *South African Journal of Ethnology* 23(1):34-38.
- De Villiers, David .P. 1968 "The South West Africa Case." *UCLA African Studies Papers*
- Giliomee, Hermann. 2003 "The Making of the Apartheid Plan 1929-1948." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29:373-392.
- Gordon, Robert J. 1988. "Apartheid's anthropologists: the genealogy of Afrikaner Anthropology." *American Ethnologist*. 15(3):535-53.
- 2000. "The stat(u)s of Namibian anthropology: a review". In: *Cimbebasia*, Vol. 16, pp1-23.
- Hammond-Tooke, D. 1997. *Imperfect Interpreters*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) 1966. *Pleadings, Oral Arguments, Documents. South West Africa Cases*. The Hague: International Court of Justice.
- Kuper Adam. 1999. *Culture: The Anthropologist's Account*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 2001. "Afterword: the usual suspects." *Patterns of Prejudice*. 35(2):81-86.
- 2002. "Today we have naming of parts; the work of the Anthropologists in Southern Africa" *Anthropology Southern Africa* 25(1& 2):7-16.
- Ndadi, Vinnia. 1974. *Breaking Contract*. Vancouver: LSM Press.
- Sharp, John. 1981. "The Roots and Development of Volkekunde." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 8:16-36.
- Shituwete, Helao. 1990. *Never Follow the Wolf*. London: Kliptown Books, London.
- South Africa. 1964. *Report of the Commission of Enquiry into South West Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- van der Wath, Johannes G.H. 1983. *Johannes van der Wath van Suidwes-Afrika*. Windhoek: Auas.
- West, Martin. 1988. "Social anthropology in a divided society." Inaugural Lecture. University of Cape Town.
- Wilkins, Ivor and Hans Strydom. 1978. *The Super Afrikaners*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- Institute for Contemporary History, University of the Free State. Personal Papers of J.P. van S. Bruwer.