

Afrikaners Abroad: Demonstrating the Impact of International Education

DAVE JERVIS
Washburn University
Topeka, Kansas 66621
e-mail: zzisa@washburn.edu

UDK: 37.014
37.015.4
316.614(=680)
Izvorni znanstveni rad
Priljeno: 10. svibnja 1999.

International education professionals have argued that participants in overseas study programs return home as "different people." They know more about their own country as well as the country where they studied, evaluate their homeland more critically, and often become more tolerant and altruistic. This article illustrates the impact of foreign study upon five prominent South African Afrikaners. While a very small sample, the comments and actions of each upon his return to South Africa illustrates the types of learning traditionally associated with overseas educational experiences.

Key words: INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, SOUTH AFRICA, AFRIKANER

International education professionals have long argued that overseas study brings a number of personal and intellectual benefits to participants. These include not only more knowledge of other countries and cultures but a more critical perspective on one's own country. Overseas study has also been shown to impact participants' values. There is evidence, for instance, that students who study overseas return with more tolerance of others and a sense of altruism.¹ Government officials have also recognized these benefits. Senator J. William Fulbright, sponsor of the most famous American international education initiative, argued that the Fulbright program's purposes were "to erode the culturally rooted mistrust that sets nations against one another" and "to encourage people in all countries... to stop denying others the right to their own view of reality..."² Given such outcomes, the movement of students and scholars between divided societies and more tolerant ones might be a way to begin to heal the divisions in societies torn by ethnic and racial conflict.

This study illustrates the impact of overseas study upon five prominent South African Afrikaners. Two returned to South Africa and became leading dissidents. A third was forced to remain in exile and became very critical of the apartheid regime. The final two became prime ministers. One of those returned from overseas and implemented grand apartheid, while the other returned to dismantle that system. The sample is so small that generalization is impossible and no claim is made that overseas experience, alone, determined later actions. Still, the comments and actions of most of these people upon their return to South Africa does illustrate the types of learning traditionally associated with overseas educational experience.

Afrikaners are a particularly interesting group to study, because they have long been isolated from the world. Part of the reason for that, of course, is geography and, more recently, politics. Yet Afrikaners have often chosen to isolate themselves. Rian Malan has pointed out

¹ Jerry Carlson, et al, **Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates** (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1990); Norman Kauffmann, et al, **Students Abroad: Strangers at Home** (Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1992); D. L. Sampson and H. P. Smith, "A Scale to Measure Worldmindedness", **The Journal of Social Psychology** 45 (1957): 99-106. Empirical studies have mixed results regarding the impact of study abroad on values. See Kauffman, **Students Abroad**, p. 81.

² J. William Fulbright, **The Price of Empire** (New York: Pantheon, 1989), pp. 218-19.

that when the Afrikaner nation was formed in the late 1770s, its members called themselves "Doppers," the name of the metal caps they used to extinguish candles. The reason, Malan contends, is that "they were deliberately extinguishing the light of the Enlightenment, so that they could do what they had to do in darkness." Because of this "willful self-blinding," Afrikaners "have lived ever since in darkness."³ Afrikaners also had little contact with the other population groups in South Africa, itself, a tradition exacerbated by the apartheid system which had "effectively managed to isolate the white man" in his own country.⁴

Profiles of Dissidents

Two of the most significant Afrikaner critics of the apartheid state were Beyers Naude and Abraham (Bram) Fischer. Both had the family background and training to become establishment figures, yet each became an outspoken dissident after having spent time overseas.

Beyers Naude

Beyers Naude (1915-) is one of the most famous Afrikaner dissidents. He was born into a prominent family: his father had been a chaplain to Boer troops during the Boer War (Naude is named for Christian Frederick Beyers, a prominent Afrikaner general in that war) and was so opposed to the British that he refused to sign the Treaty of Vereeniging ending the war. At the center of the Afrikaner renaissance in the early twentieth century, Naude's father was the first to use Afrikaans (rather the Dutch) from the pulpit and was a founding member of the Afrikaner *Broederbond*. When the government forbade the teaching of Afrikaans in the schools, he organized Afrikaans-medium schools in Cape Province. Naude's mother held similar views. She was "strongly prejudiced against the British," so the family had almost no contact with English-speakers while Beyers was a child. One observer claims that Naude did not read any significant English-language books as a child.⁵

Given this upbringing, it is not surprising that Naude advanced on a path toward prominence in the Afrikaner community. In 1931 he entered Stellenbosch University, the emerging bastion of Afrikaner consciousness (where, ironically, one of his instructors was H. F. Verwoerd, later to be the architect of grand apartheid). He received a degree in theology in 1939 and began to move up the ministerial hierarchy, eventually becoming Acting Moderator of the Transvaal Synod in 1958 and Moderator in 1963. In other ways, too, Naude appeared to be an up-and-coming person in the Afrikaner community. He participated in the reenactment of the Great Trek in 1936, joined the *Broederbond* in 1939, opposed South Africa's entry into World War II, and voted for the National Party in the 1940s and early 1950s. Naude later remarked that he had never considered that blacks could be a part of South Africa in these years.⁶

Yet by the early 1960s Naude had changed. The first public manifestation of his dissent occurred following the Cottesloe Consultation of December 1960. Called by the Archbishop of Cape Town in the aftermath of the March 1960 Sharpeville incident, the Consultation brought together representatives from South African churches, including Naude, and representatives from the World Council of Churches. The Consultation passed a number of reso-

³ Rian Malan, *My Traitor's Heart* (London: Vintage, 1990), pp. 27-28.

⁴ Quoted in Allister Sparks, *The Mind of South Africa* (New York: Ballantine, 1990), p. 218.

⁵ G. McLeod Bryan, *Naude: Prophet to South Africa* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1978), pp. 10-12; Peter Randall, "Not Without Honour: The Life and Works of Beyers Naude", in Peter Randall, (ed), *Not Without Honour: Tribute to Beyers Naude* (Johannesburg: Raven, 1982), pp. 2, 5.

⁶ Robert Kinloch Massie, *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years* (New York: Talese, 1997), p. 182; Bryan, *Naude*, pp. 10-12; Randall, "Not Without Honor", pp. 6, 11.

lutions critical of government policy, e.g., that no one who believed in Jesus should be excluded from any church on the basis of race or color and that all had the right to own land and to participate in government. The furious reaction of the South African government and Afrikaans church establishment forced most Consultation delegates to recant. Naude was the only one who refused to do so, and he soon became an active opponent of the apartheid regime.⁷ He founded a critical journal, *Pro Veritate*. In 1963 he helped create the Christian Institute, which was dedicated to the unity of the church, ecumenical participation, and racial justice.⁸ The Christian Institute and Naude soon became a focal point of opposition to apartheid.

Bram Fischer

Bram Fischer (1908–75) has been described as “[p]erhaps the most prominent Afrikaner radical of all,”⁹ yet like Naude, he was born into a prominent Afrikaner family. His grandfather had been Prime Minister of the Orange River Colony and was supportive of Afrikaner republican aspirations. Later, as Minister of Lands, Fischer's grandfather was the primary architect of the 1913 Natives Land Act. Bram's father played a modest role in the Afrikaner rebellion against South Africa's entry into World War I, provided legal counsel for its leaders, and was later President of the Orange Free State Supreme Court. Given this lineage, it is not surprising that Fischer grew up as an Afrikaner nationalist and anti-imperialist. As a high school student, for instance, he led a protest against required attendance at a reception for the visiting Prince of Wales. There is also a story, perhaps apocryphal, that he went so far as to refuse to wear the required school uniform because it was in the British style. Later, at the University of Cape Town, Fischer advocated abolition of the King of England's veto over South African legislation.¹⁰

By the early 1940s, however, Fischer seemed to live in two very different worlds. He was not only a successful member of the legal community (the Johannesburg *Sunday Times* later argued that he was “regarded as a future Prime Minister or Chief Justice” at this time¹¹) but also an active member of the Communist Party of South Africa. Over the next twenty years he began to argue cases on behalf of the victims of apartheid including, African mine workers and the residents of Sophiatown. Fischer was also part of the legal team which defended those accused in the Treason Trial (1956–61).¹² By the 1960s, after the South African government increased its repression and eliminated all legal means for change, Fischer participated in and endorsed the African National Congress's decision to seek change through violence. It was ironic, then, that he was the one who in 1963-64 defended those same ANC leaders charged with trying to overthrow the state. Fischer, himself, was arrested in September, 1964. He soon went underground as an act of solidarity with African prisoners and others oppressed in South Africa. On the run for ten months, he was captured in November 1965 and sentenced to life in prison in 1966.¹³

⁷ Bryan, Naude, pp. 11–12; Randall, “Not Without Honor”, pp. 18–19.

⁸ John W. de Gruchy, “A Short History of the Christian Institute”, in Charles Villa-Vicencio and John W. de Gruchy, (ed), **Resistance and Hope: South African Essays in Honour of Beyers Naude** (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), pp. 14–15; Massie, **Loosing the Bonds**, pp. 183–85; Bryan, Naude, pp. 22–23.

⁹ Joshua N. Lazerson, **Against the Tide: Whites in the Struggle Against Apartheid** (Boulder: Westview, 1994), p. 99.

¹⁰ Mary Benson, “A True Afrikaner”, **Granta** 19 (1986), p. 198; Stephen Clingman, **Bram Fischer: Afrikaner Revolutionary** (Amherst, MA.: Massachusetts, 1998), pp. 29–30, 55–56; Lazerson, **Against the Tide**, pp. 99–100.

¹¹ Benson, “A True Afrikaner”, p. 202.

¹² Clingman, **Bram Fischer**, pp. 228–64.

¹³ Clingman, **Bram Fischer**, pp. 229–399.

Explaining the Change

Naude and Fischer led similar lives. Both had been born into prominent nationalistic Afrikaner families and both had later turned on their people in order to work with the oppressed in their society. That turnaround would be significant in any case, but for Fischer and Naude to do so is simply amazing. In addition to their prominence, they were members of an Afrikaner community characterized by its "herd mentality." Afrikaners, according to one of their own, possess "an absolutist streak" and are "suspicious of... healthy relativism and critical inquiry." They "feel secure as long as only one way, one truth and one life are presented to them as the ultimate answer..."¹⁴ Given this, it is not surprising that "opponents [of apartheid] from within Afrikaner ranks were few and far between..."¹⁵

Yet Naude and Fischer did criticize their government's policies. Willem Saaymen suggests two factors common to South African dissidents. One was "an encounter with the very real aspirations of black South Africans." In addition, almost all dissidents were "people with an ecumenical consciousness and experience of ecumenical contact both inside and outside of South Africa."¹⁶ Both factors are evident in Naude's and Fischer's transition from Afrikaner nationalist to dissident. One of Naude's biographers writes that there "seems little doubt that Beyers Naude's first visit outside South Africa was a very significant milestone in the process which led him to reject his church's teaching on the issues of race and nationalism."¹⁷ In Fischer's case, his overseas schooling was "apparently... a key formative political and philosophical time for him."¹⁸

Naude was first exposed to foreign opinions in 1953, when he spent six months investigating church youth groups in Europe and America. While overseas, people asked him about the Defiance Campaign and African leaders, but Naude had no idea who they were. Asked about his views on Alan Paton's *Cry the Beloved Country*, he had to admit that he had never read the book. Even on religious issues, Naude's questioners undermined his belief in the Biblical justification for separation of the races. Naude later noted that that trip had given him a new perspective on the world, and upon his return he began a study program on his country.¹⁹

Further changes in his thinking occurred after he returned from overseas, during his ministry in Potchefstroom. While there he came into contact with Afrikaners who were ministering to African, Coloured, and Indian congregations and through them to Africans, Coloureds, and Indians. These experiences "gradually enabled him to move beyond the limits of the white exclusivity within which he was ensconced."²⁰ Through participation in an ecumenical group, Naude came to understand that many churches outside South Africa opposed the theological justification of apartheid.

Bram Fischer also became more critical of Afrikaner thinking and practices after coming into contact with others. One of the most important experiences in his early adulthood was shaking hands with a black man in 1927. Reflecting on his initial sense of revulsion,

¹⁴ Willem de Klerk, *F. W. de Klerk: The Man in His Time* (Johannesburg: Jonathon Ball, 1991), pp. 118, 146.

¹⁵ Lazerson, *Against the Tide*, p. 99.

¹⁶ Willem Saaymen, "Rebels and Prophets: Afrikaners Against the System", pp. 56-57 in Villa-Vicencio and de Gruchy, (ed), *Resistance and Hope*, pp. 56-57

¹⁷ Randall, "Not Without Honour", pp. 12-14.

¹⁸ Lazerson, *Against the Tide*, p. 100.

¹⁹ Bryan, *Naude*, p. 12; Massie, *Loosing the Bonds*, pp. 181-82.

²⁰ Villa-Vicencio, "A Life of Resistance and Hope", in Villa-Vicencio and de Gruchy, (ed), *Resistance and Hope*, pp. 7-8.

Fischer wondered “[c]ould I really... as a white adult, touch the hand of a black man in friendship?” Further introspection led him to “understand that colour prejudice was a wholly irrational phenomenon, and that true human friendship could extend beyond the colour bar once the initial prejudice was overcome.”²¹

Later, in 1931, Fischer went overseas to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. He remained in Europe until 1934, also traveling to the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Germany, Switzerland, and Austria during these years. The many letters he wrote document how his attitudes were changing. The confirmed Afrikaner nationalist was critical of nationalism after visiting Hitler's Germany. The Nazis manifested a “cancerous nationalism,” he wrote, and the “whole movement is hateful.” Linking such sentiments to the formation of the Purified National Party in South Africa, Fischer lamented that it was “difficult to generate much enthusiasm for the birth...of exactly that spirit our own country.” He had come to believe, in contrast, that “the world's one hope of salvation lies in the suppression of... nationalism.”²² The trip to the Soviet Union was especially important for this soon-to-be communist. Although he developed a number of misconceptions about the USSR, Fischer came to believe that the Soviets had developed answers to several problems then being faced by South Africa, including relationships between different nationalities. Fischer saw in the USSR a model for South Africa.²³

Perhaps the best way to demonstrate that Fischer had also come to understand the perspective of others is to quote at length a speech he gave in London on December 16, 1933. The occasion was a celebration of the anniversary of the Battle of Blood River (or Dingaan's Day, after the name of the Zulu chief defeated by Afrikaner forces), one of the most important days in Afrikaner history. Fischer said:

Time out of number we have heard Blood River referred to as bringing the boom of civilization to Southern Africa. But one point of view I have never heard Dingaan's Day considered from is the point of view of Dingaan... The time has come, if it is not already too late, for an acute examination of this attitude... Many ideas as to race and nationality have to be destroyed or modified. This will require a new attitude of mind - of all human qualities perhaps the most difficult to attain.

He concluded by arguing that it was time to “draw together not only the two different European races, but to see to it that these two advance together with our vast black population.”²⁴

An Exile's Experience

Breyten Breytenbach

Breyten Breytenbach (1939–) is a third Afrikaner who developed into a prominent dissident after spending time overseas. His family background and childhood experiences were much more ordinary than those of Naude and Fischer. He describes his childhood years were “one long waste” and “extremely uneventful and perfectly ordinary on the whole.”²⁵ His life began to change when he went to Cape Town to study fine arts. Then, in 1959, he traveled to Europe, believing that all young painters should go to Paris. While there he married a Vietnamese woman. Since she was designated “non-white” by South African authorities, Brey-

²¹ Quoted in Clingman, **Bram Fischer**, pp. 51–52.

²² Quoted in *Ibid.*, pp. 89–90.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 85–86.

²⁴ Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 99.

²⁵ Breyten Breytenbach, **A Season in Paradise** (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1980), pp. 27, 33.

tenbach was unable to return to the country with her, so his temporary sojourn became a permanent exile. Only in 1973 was he allowed to return to South Africa for a three-month visit.

It is difficult to draw as close a connection between Breytenbach's overseas experience and subsequent dissidence as was possible with Naude and Fischer. Like them, he advocated a society "in which *each and every one of us* may have his rightful share" and pledged to combat "those institutions and edifices and myths and prejudices and untruths and idiocy and greed and self-destructive urges and common stupidity which render such a community impossible."²⁶ Yet his dissidence was certain to be different. Being in Paris essentially prevented Breytenbach from confronting the apartheid state directly, except for one curious incident in 1975. He returned to the South Africa using a false name and passport, apparently to establish contact with local dissidents. He was soon arrested and charged with treason. Faced with execution if he did not confess to his "crimes," Breytenbach confessed and was sentenced to nine years in prison.²⁷

Breytenbach's dissidence is better expressed in language than deeds, however. He became a prominent author and poet while in exile, and his writings demonstrate the critical perspective often resulting from extended overseas stays. During his 1973 trip to South Africa Breytenbach described white South Africans as "the scum of a civilization built upon injustices."²⁸ They were a "bastard people" who "made [their] otherness the norm, the standard – and the ideal" and maintained it "at the expense of our fellow South Africans..."²⁹ That system could not last. Within fifty years "the temporary domination of the white man will be remembered only as one of the obstacles in the struggle of the black man... for liberation and representative government."³⁰

These comments demonstrate that Breytenbach had also developed an understanding of and empathy for South Africa's black population. He was "convinced" that the country's future lay "almost exclusively in the hands of my black and brown fellow countrymen..."³¹ He was not surprised that black people wanted "to have less and less to do with us" and, in an analogy often raised by dissidents, Breytenbach compared the African experience under apartheid to the Afrikaner experience in the nineteenth century: "How long did we tolerate the yoke of British imperialism, and what did we do then?... Or have [Africans] less reason? Are they less human?"³²

Future Leaders

Not all Afrikaaners who went overseas returned as dissidents. Several future national leaders went overseas, too. Needless to say, the impact of their overseas experiences was different than those of Naude, Fischer, or Breytenbach.

F. W. de Klerk

Frederik Willem de Klerk (1936–) is the Afrikaner most responsible for the new South Africa. Unlike the dissidents, he returned from overseas with a desire to reform the apartheid system from within. De Klerk, too, was born into a prominent family. His paternal and

²⁶ Ibid., p. 153. Emphasis in original.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 9–12.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 203.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 156. Emphasis in original.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 217–18.

³¹ Ibid., p. 154.

³² Ibid., p. 158.

maternal grandfathers were involved in politics. His father was an active National Party politician for 31 years and served in the governments of Stijdom, Verwoerd, and Vorster. De Klerk was "raised to believe passionately that the British hegemony in South Africa should be rejected" and that "National Party principles were never questioned."³³

Yet this was the man who ended the apartheid system and navigated South Africa toward multiracial democracy. Overseas experiences, alone, can hardly explain the evolution of de Klerk's thinking, but that later thinking does reflect some of the benefits usually associated with overseas experiences. De Klerk appears to have begun to develop new attitudes after a 1976 trip to the United States. That trip "reportedly had a profound effect on his thinking about many matters, including race relations," as he was amazed at the ease with which Americans of different races interacted.³⁴ Later trips expanded de Klerk's substantive knowledge of other political systems. He went as a member of parliamentary groups to Germany, the UK, and Israel, and colleagues remember that he "virtually became the spokesman of the team in the intensive political discussions on these trips."³⁵ After becoming president in September 1989 de Klerk was especially interested in constitutional guarantees for minorities, but by that time increased substantive knowledge was linked with greater understanding of others: "by no means" did he believe that "minority rights should include the entrenchment of minority privileges or minority of minority domination over majorities."³⁶

H. F. Verwoerd

A second future prime minister who studied overseas was Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd (1901-66). His post-overseas behavior and attitudes were to be very different, however, because Verwoerd became "the man who more than any other was to embody the Afrikaner dream of apartheid."³⁷ Born in the Netherlands in 1901, Verwoerd's family emigrated to South Africa that same year. His father operated a food store, worked with the local Coloured population, qualified as a lay missionary, and was assigned to Bulawayo, Rhodesia, so Verwoerd had much contact with the region's various population groups. While Verwoerd attended English-language schools for most of his youth, he admired the rebelliousness of the Afrikaners during World War I and easily entered Afrikaner society when his family returned to South Africa in 1915. He entered Stellenbosch University in 1918 and received an MA in 1923. He could have gone on to Oxford but preferred to go to a university on the continent. He stayed at Stellenbosch until 1925, finished his Ph.D. – the first to be written in Afrikaans – and earned a scholarship for study in Germany.³⁸

Verwoerd studied at universities in Leipzig and Berlin from 1925-27, a time of political and intellectual ferment in Germany. He and other Afrikaners studied the works of the early 19th century German Romanticists, who emphasized the importance of language, national history and national identity, and warned against liberalism, materialism, and individualism.³⁹

It was ideas such as these which Verwoerd brought back to South Africa. He focused on the needs of his own community and manifested little tolerance of others. To deal with the

³³ De Klerk, **F. W. de Klerk**, pp. 139-42.

³⁴ Massie, **Loosing the Bonds**, pp. 651, 842.

³⁵ de Klerk, **F. W. de Klerk**, p. 152.

³⁶ Quoted in *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

³⁷ "The Afrikaner who was born in Holland", **Reader's Digest Illustrated History of South Africa** (Cape Town, 1994), p. 423.

³⁸ Alexander Hepple, **Verwoerd** (Baltimore: Penguin, 1967), pp. 12-23. Daniel Malan, Verwoerd's predecessor as Prime Minister had also studied overseas, in Holland at the turn of the century.

³⁹ Sparks, **The Mind of South Africa**, pp. 163-65.

“poor white,” i.e. Afrikaner, problem, for instance, he proposed that certain jobs be reserved for whites and that African movement to urban areas be restricted. As a newspaper editor in the 1930s he devoted much attention to Afrikaner unity and to the “Jewish question” in South Africa, writing editorials on this issue and successfully lobbying the government against further admissions of refugees from Germany. Later, in 1947, he organized an Afrikaner boycott of the British royal family's visit to South Africa.⁴⁰ Such exclusivist attitudes persisted throughout Verwoerd's subsequent political career. As Minister of Native Affairs and Prime Minister, he “had the ability and... the will to impose apartheid as a systemic policy...”⁴¹ Finally, unlike many who studied overseas, Verwoerd was so confident in his opinions that he did not consider different points of view. He once told a reporter that “I do not have the nagging doubt of ever wondering whether perhaps I am wrong.”⁴² His biographer argues that he was “so sure that his separate development plan provided a complete answer to all critics of apartheid that he refused to countenance other points of view.”⁴³

Conclusions and Implications

This study has illustrated the impact and importance of overseas study for prominent Afrikaners. While Fischer, Naude, Breytenbach, and de Klerk came from a variety of family backgrounds, chose different professions, and manifested different levels of support for the government in Pretoria, one element common to their experience was overseas study. Undoubtedly all returned to their homeland with greater substantive knowledge of world affairs. More important for the purposes of this study, however, is that they returned home with attitudes of greater tolerance and understanding of the position of South Africa's non-white population. Verwoerd, of course, is an exception to that pattern. His experience in Germany in the 1920s likely had an impact upon his later thinking. However, the political turmoil and growing prominence of Nazis and communists there seem to have strengthened any sense of intolerance he brought with him. Thus, it seems to be important not just that students go overseas but also where they study.

If the conclusion that overseas educational experience can have a positive impact upon participants' values is valid with respect to Afrikaners, then it should also be valid for students and scholars in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Cyprus, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, and elsewhere. Unfortunately for the concerns of this study, relatively few students from countries and regions troubled by ethnic and racial intolerance study in the United States. Thus, only 23,162 (4.8%) of 480,000 international students studying in the U.S. in 1997-98 were from Africa and only 30,962 (6.4%) were from the Middle East, (although many students from these regions are probably studying in France or the UK). American students, too, are studying overseas in increasing numbers, but the same generalization applies: the overwhelming majority of the nearly 100,000 American students who studied overseas in 1997-98 went to Europe. Fewer than 3% went to either Africa or the Middle East.⁴⁴

A significant barrier preventing more students from studying overseas is the cost. The Institute for International Education reports that foreign students in the United States rely on personal and family funds for nearly 68% of the costs of their study.⁴⁵ Fischer, Naude, and

⁴⁰ Hepple, **Verwoerd**, pp. 24-34, 77, 219-30; “The Afrikaner who was born in Holland”, p. 423.

⁴¹ Hermann Giliomee and Lawrence Schlemmer, **From Apartheid to Nation-Building** (Cape Town: Oxford, 1990), p. 64.

⁴² Quoted in Hepple, **Verwoerd**, p. 237.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁴⁴ Institute for International Education Press Release, “Open Doors 1997/98: IIE's Annual Report on International Educational Exchange”, (December 7, 1998) taken from the home page of the Institute for International Education <www.iie.org>.

⁴⁵ Institute for International Education home page, www.iie.org.

Verwoerd all had some sort of financial backing. It is incumbent upon governments and universities to facilitate the movement of students across international frontiers, especially to and from regions dealing with racial and ethnic divisions.

This sort of strategy has many advantages – for American national interests, the educational goals of American and foreign universities, and the cause of peace in divided societies. One is that it is less “imperialistic” than many other strategies as students volunteer to participate. It is also cost-effective. Funding the movement of students and scholars between divided societies and the United States costs far less in economic terms (to say nothing of human terms) than sending military missions or imposing sanctions upon societies torn apart by ethnic conflict. It is mutually beneficial, since American students can learn much from foreign students. There is, finally, a multiplier effect to international education. Fulbright once argued:

For every university professor whose outlook has been broadened by study in another country, many thousands of students will gain some measure of intercultural perspective... For every politician or diplomat who, through study abroad has gained some appreciation of the world as a human community, untold numbers of ordinary citizens, as well as their leaders, may be guided away from parochialism and narrow nationalism to broader, more fruitful perspectives.⁴⁶

Governments and universities need to recognize the validity and utility of such ideas and create opportunities in which students and scholars from tolerant and less tolerant societies can interact with each other.

REFERENCES

- Benson, Mary (1986) *A True Afrikaner*. *Granta* 19:198–223.
- Breytenbach, Breyten (1980) *A Season in Paradise*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Bryan, G. McLeod (1978) *Naude: Prophet to South Africa*. Atlanta: John, Knox Press.
- Carlson, Jerry, et al. (1990) *Study Abroad: The Experiences of American Undergraduates*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Clingman, Stephen (1998) *Bram Fischer: Afrikaner Revolutionary*. Amherst: Massachusetts.
- de Gruchy, John W. *A Short History of the Christian Institute*, in Villa-Vincencio and de Gruchy (ed).
- de Klerk, Willem (1991) *The Man in His Time*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.
- Fulbright, J. William (1989) *The Price of Empire*. New York, Pantheon.
- Giliomee, Hermann and Schlemmer, Lawrence (1990) *From Apartheid to Nation-Building*. Cape Town: Oxford.
- Hepple, Alexander (1967) *Verwoerd*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Institute for International Education. Various reports from the home page: www.iie.org
- Kauffmann, Norman, et al. (1992) *Students Abroad, Strangers at Home*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Lazerson, Joshua N. (1994) *Against the Tide: Whites in the Struggle Against Apartheid*. Boulder: Westview.
- Malan, Rian (1990) *My Traitor's Heart*. London: Vintage.
- Massie, Robert Kinloch (1997) *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years*. New York: Talese.
- Randall, Peter. *Not Without Honour: The Life of and Works of Beyers Naude*, in Randall (ed).
- Randall, Peter (ed) (1982) *Not Without Honour: Tribute to Beyers Naude*. Johannesburg: Raven.
- Reader's Digest Illustrated History of South Africa* (1994) Cape Town: Reader's Digest.

⁴⁶ Fulbright, *The Price of Empire*, p. 231.

- Saaymen, Willem. Rebels and Prophets: Afrikaners Against the System, in: Villa-Vicencio and de Gruchy (ed).
- Sampson, D. L. and Smith, H. P. (1957) A Scale to Measure World mindedness. **The Journal of Social Psychology** 45:99-106.
- Sparks, Allister (1990) **The Mind of South Africa**. New York: Ballantine.
- Villa-Vicencio, Charles. A Life of Resistance and Hope, in: Villa-Vicencio and de Gruchy (ed).
- Villa-Vicencio, Charles and de Gruchy, John W. (ed) (1985) **Resistance and Hope: South African Essays in Honour of Beyers Naude**. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

AFRIKANERI U INOZEMSTVU: DOKAZIVANJE UTJECAJA MEĐUNARODNOG OBRAZOVANJA

DAVE JERVIS

Washburn University

Stručnjaci u području međunarodnog obrazovanja tvrde da se sudionici u stranim obrazovnim programima vraćaju kući kao "drugi ljudi". Više znaju o svojoj zemlji kao i o zemlji u kojoj su studirali, kritički procjenjuju svoju domovinu, i često su tolerantniji i čovjekoljubivi. Članak govori o utjecaju studiranja u inozemstvu na pet prominentnih južnoafričkih Afrikanera. Iako je to vrlo mali uzorak, njihove izjave i aktivnosti po povratku u Južnu Afriku ilustriraju tip učenja koji se tradicionalno povezuje sa stranim obrazovnim iskustvom.