The state-sponsored and centralised institutionalisation of an academic discipline: sociology in South Africa, 1920 – 1970

Shireen Ally
Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, 8128 Social Science Building, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison WI 53706
sally@ssc.wisc.edu

Katie Mooney
History Workshop, University of the Witwatersand, Private Bag 3, Wits, 2050
kmooney@mweb.co.za

Paul Stewart
Department of Sociology, University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag 3 Wits 2050
stewartp@social.wits.ac.za

This paper is the first of a two-part article. It is an exploratory attempt to expand our understanding of the organization of sociological knowledge within both the university and extra-university sectors in South Africa and the state's key role in that process. It tracks the institutional development of the discipline within the state's universities, as well as the centralised bureaucratic mechanisms of state power through which social research was commissioned, funded, practised and monitored. It outlines the three major ethnically and racially separate streams of sociology in the university system and identifies the key academic groupings and individuals involved. Similarly, the establishment and the role of highly centralised, state-sponsored and organized insitutions is traced, thereby showing how state agencies have co-ordinated, shaped and directed the actual content of sociological research.

Introduction

There is a fairly extensive literature on the historical origins and development of sociology in South Africa[1]. Most of this literature tries to understand the discipline's development in relation to larger socio-political structures. It demonstrates how the character of the white capitalist colonial, segregationist, and apartheid regimes was implicated in the content of sociology, and the discipline's role in establishing and maintaining successive racially repressive regimes. In doing so, this literature retains a useful emphasis on questions of structure, power and the connections between the imperatives of the socio-political order and the content of sociological teaching and research in the university context[2]. However, in demonstrating the connections between sociological content and the state, this literature focuses exclusively on the production of ideas and content within the academy. It thereby sacrifices the equally important dimension of the organization of sociolog-

ical knowledge, in both the university and non-university sectors implicated in the discipline's development.

Recent contributions to the debate on knowledge and its relationship to power and society have consistently demonstrated the value of focusing on the level of organization. Broadly characterised as the "organizational turn"[3], Collins, Wuthnow, Lamont and Camic have taken concerns with knowledge into the realm of social organization and the institutional supports that make particular types of ideas and their development possible[4]. They turn their lenses toward the university and non-university micro-contexts within which ideas emerge, remaining particularly sensitive to inter- and intra-institutional arrangements and the ways in which these structure the social organization of knowledge. Drawing on the long tradition of theorising about knowledge, extending from Karl Mannheim[5], contemporary theory and research on disciplines and their development is skeptical of the type of focus we see in the existing literature on South African sociology: that is, the focus on the effect of the state and state-level processes on disciplinary practices exclusively in terms of content and the level of the *production*, rather than the *organization* of ideas in the university sector.

This paper moves beyond the over-rehearsed questions of content and production in the university sector to introduce a much-neglected concern with organization beyond the academy. What follows is therefore an exploratory attempt, based on both primary archival and critical secondary sources, to expand our understanding of the *organization* of sociological knowledge within both the university *and* extra-university sectors of sociological knowledge in South Africa, and the state's role in that process. The paper tracks, firstly, the institutional development of the discipline within the state's universities and secondly, the centralised bureaucratic mechanisms of state power through which social research was funded, commissioned, practised and monitored. In other words, at one level, the paper attempts to outline the three major ethnically and racially separate streams in the South African university system and identify the key academic groupings and individuals involved. At another, closely related inter-linked level, the establishment and role of highly centralised, state-sponsored and organized institutions are traced. The paper outlines the role of these state-sponsored non-academic research units in producing sociological research, the role of state agencies in *coordinating* research across the academic and non-academic sectors, and in a more limited way, the role of state agencies in shaping or directing the actual content of research[6].

The role of these state-level institutions in framing the trajectory of the discipline and its organization, institutionalisation and development is demonstrated as crucial throughout the history of the discipline. The administrative and institutional organization of South African sociological practice remained a consistent and institutionally fortified epistemic weapon in the considerable arsenal of the apartheid state, a period central to the survey under consideration. HF Verwoerd, the architect and first prime minister of apartheid – as well as South Africa's first professor of sociology – perfected a bureaucratic tradition of centralizing the work of the university-based social scientific community by appointing mainly sociologists to centrally organize and administer state-funded research structures. The establishment and coordination of sociology and the social sciences more generally

are, in the South African case, therefore evident at the level of state-controlled social research units and commissions of enquiry.

With the exception of Adam Ashforth's *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth Century South Africa*[7] and the papers very recently produced for the *TRC: Commissioning the Past* conference held in June 1999[8], government commissions of enquiry have been patchily researched in South African historiography. This is surprising since one of the most common and historically abiding practices of the South African state has been the establishment of commissions, the publication of reports written from official investigative inquiries and the setting up of departmental and interdepartmental committees to probe perceived social, economic and political 'problems'. Committee members, mostly, if not exclusively, drawn from university departments, have historically been appointed by government ministers as 'experts' in the field. The main function of these commissions has been to produce information and formulate strategic orientations that result in policies of social engineering and restructuring. Ashforth stresses that *"the ritualized proceedings of commissions are not just modes of scientific investigation but are also performances which serve to authorize a form of social discourse[s]"*[9]. Populations are thereby controlled: the popularisation of state-sponsored discourse embody conceptualisations through which the practice of civil society is shaped.

In particular, government commissions and research units were responsible for both producing sociological research and coordinating the organization of such research across both the university and extra-university sectors. These research institutes, replete with a bewildering array of acronyms, were principally designed to engage in the production of sociological knowledge, provide new understandings on a wide variety of themes and topics, and coordinate the practice of sociology across its various institutional locations. Yet very little is known about such units in South African historiography.

These government commissions and state-sponsored research units, crucial to the centralisation of the state's knowledge assets, provided official platforms for members of government departments to work alongside prominent academics and other so-called 'experts' in the formulation of policy. Issues investigated ranged from youth and the family to marriage and housing through to the problem of 'white' poverty. In directly engaging important policy questions that helped shape ethnic, racial and class identities, the nexus between the state, its sponsored agencies and the academy is suggested. The material presented *intimates* some of the ways in which some groups of sociologists participated in organizations attached to decision-making structures within the state and the ways in which some agencies of social research had the potential to provide the knowledge that government used to structure its policies and programmes.

In showing how the state consistently organized, re-organized and instituted powerfully centralised state-funded research units in order to direct and execute such work, the role of the state in directly informing the content of social research projects undertaken by universities is implied. The identification of state-sponsored research units and the attendant structures that connected these to universities and promoted disciplinary institutionalised centralisation and co-ordination, raises a number of important questions regarding content. These questions are more explicitly concerned with the relationship between the

content of the social research and its functions for the state and have been over-analysed in the existing literature. As a result, this paper does not treat these content questions with as much seriousness as it does the contributory and co-ordinating role of these agencies. Questions about the extent of the state's involvement in directing research, through its attached institutions, and the ideological or truth status of sociology as a result of this connection are, however, implicitly presumed by the material presented in this paper and therefore await a future researcher's determination to tackle them.

Therefore, based on gaps in previous research into these issues, as well as contemporary directions in the study of knowledge, this paper attempts a history of the institutional development of the discipline within the universities and other state structures through which social research was practised, organised, and funded. This history of the discipline is divided into three phases: *Origins and Early Years* from *1920 to 1950*, the achievement of *Independence and Consolidation* from *1950 to 1970*, and the *Current period, New debates and Challenges* from *1970 to the present*. The first two periods are dealt with here as the first of a two-part article.

The origins and early years of academic sociology, 1920-1950

Sociology in South Africa can be traced back to 1918, when a resolution passed by the South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS)[10] called for a systematic anthropological and sociological study of South Africa's 'native' populations[11]. Even before this early beginning, in 1911, MS Evans (a segregationist ideologue) published *Black and White in South East Africa: A Study in Sociology*[12]. But it was the SAAAS that brought sociology to the academy. By 1919 there were various university courses with sociological content[13] before the establishment of sociology as a discrete discipline. The first full course in sociology was taught at the University of South Africa (Unisa), followed in 1926 by the University of Cape Town (UCT). UCT's first course was aptly titled 'Primitive Sociology' and focused on the 'primitive' social organisation of 'natives'[14]. Thereafter a second course, 'Sociological Analysis of Bantu Culture' was introduced, which prepared students to work in 'native administration'[15], thereby reflecting the definite relationship between sociology and the socio-political order during this period and which may well be shown to characterise the discipline into the present.

The late-19th century discovery of gold and diamonds on the Witwatersrand had already established a system of racial capitalism in South Africa. Mining capital had engineered a system of ensuring a constant supply of cheap black labour to the mines, premised on the dispossession and disenfranchisement of the majority African population[16]. 'Native administration' and 'planning' were essential for maintaining this system and sociology was initially expressly introduced to assist in the task[17]. While sociology achieved an institutional presence, it was in this early period very uneven and disjointed. At this point, the Universities of Cape Town, the Witwatersrand, and Stellenbosch were the only independent residential colleges within South Africa[18]. It took a private commission of enquiry to co-ordinate the definitive establishment of sociology across the university sector in South Africa.

In 1928, an American Philanthropic society – the Carnegie Corporation[19] – appointed

a Commission of Inquiry to investigate a significant effect of the cheap labour system – massive white unemployment[20], or what became known as the 'poor white problem' in South Africa. Louw's discussion of the origins of institutionalised social science in South Africa argues that the 'poor white problem' resulting from dependence of mining capital on cheap black labour, weakened the capacity of racist ideology to rally support from the white electorate, making the alleviation of that problem imperative for anyone with a stake in the racially and economically exploitative system[21]. The South African academic tradition that welcomed the officials of the Carnegie Corporation in the 1920s was comfortable with the American idea of applying social science to social policy[22]. Frederick Keppel – president of the Carnegie Corporation – along with other members of the corporation made visits to South Africa where the 'poor white' problem emerged as an issue in need of serious attention. They were concerned firstly at the scarcity of social research facilities (and research in general) and secondly at the lack of trained sociologists in the country. As a result, the corporation sent two American sociologists of which Prof. Charles W. Coulter was one.

Coulter made a considerable impact in developing sociology as a discipline in the country[23]. He was a positivist who believed that sociology was a scientific discipline that should be applied in conjunction with social welfare activities. According to Miller[24], it was the work of Coulter that provided the catalyst for the expansion of sociology and in particular the development of HF Verwoerd's welfare or reformist sociology in South Africa. Perhaps the most significant impact of the Carnegie Corporation came from its recommendation that a Department of Social Studies be created in a South African university to train social workers and to conduct scientific research. By 1931, the University of Pretoria had established a department of sociology[25], followed by the University of Stellenbosch in 1932[26], the University of Cape Town in 1934[27] and the University of the Witwatersrand in 1937[28]. The establishment and development of the discipline of sociology has therefore been inextricably linked to external agencies of control from its very beginning. Due to the increasing focus on sociology, social welfare, and social research, the State Department of Social Welfare was established in October 1937.

The socio-political imperatives for the establishment and institutionalisation of sociology in South Africa were reflected in its content and orientation. Sociology was a service discipline, offered only as part of the training programme for social workers. The discipline remained appended and secondary to social work. Its task was to provide social workers with the training and knowledge needed to address the problem of white poverty: this both initiated the discipline and constituted the focus through which it was initially spread[29].

During the 1930s, and through the 1940s and 1950s, sociology departments remained departments of 'Sociology and Social Work'. Courses across the various universities centred on the 'problems' of alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, divorce, and prostitution while directing the training of students towards 'native administration' and 'social planning'[30]. Researchers and academics throughout this period focused on documenting and ameliorating the various social effects of the government's policies, and on providing *"instruction in native life and languages for those intending to work for or among natives"*[31]. It was a con-

ceptualisation of the discipline, moreover, founded on sound empirical and quantitative research methodologies[32], encouraged by state-funded research projects and commissions of enquiry. Cilliers, commenting on the period, argues that *"it would probably not be an overstatement to characterize the main thrust of the first decade of academic sociology* (i.e. the decade of the thirties) *as an overriding concern with the professionalization of social work and with the institution of an infrastructure for social services in the country"*[33].

By the 1930s, this version of sociology had firmly established an institutional presence in the Afrikaans and English-medium universities of South Africa. By the end of the 1930s, three of the University Colleges affiliated to the University of South Africa established departments of sociology – the Universities of Potchefstroom and Natal in 1937, and the University of the Orange Free State in 1939 – all focused on social work and service training[34]. The only sections of the university system not reached by this extension of the discipline was, not surprisingly, the University of Fort Hare, a constituent college of the University of South Africa, established to meet the higher education needs of the African population.

The firm establishment of an institutional presence for the discipline, with this focus, during the 1930s was not coincidental. The 1932 Report of the Native Economic Commission showed that the reserves were in a state of collapse[35]. This resulted in massive urbanisation, and with it intense social dislocation, upheaval, and 'urban problems'[36]. Social institutions such as the family and religion seemed to be suffering under the weight of strained social relations and the lack of close social networks. Compounded by the effects of the Great Depression, it was a time of intense social upheaval for most South African communities. The whole social system was on the verge of change. Ideologically, there was a phasing out of English-inspired ideology and its replacement with Afrikaner Nationalist ideology. Politically, there was a unification of ruling classes in the Joint Select Committee, and economically, there was a dominance of national over imperial capital. Along with the massive social changes that accompanied the collapse of the reserves and unregulated urbanisation[37], the segregationist social order was in a state of decline[38]. With the need for a new social order, came a pressing demand for understanding social organisation and social relief. The institutionalisation of sociology in the 1930s therefore came at exactly the moment that theories of how to create social order and provide social relief were most needed.

Despite the social welfare orientation of early sociology across the various universities that such conditions created, the trifurcation of the university system in South Africa – between English-medium, Afrikaans-medium and the Black universities – did not allow the discipline to develop a coherent identity during the 1920s and 1930s. In particular, four distinct approaches to sociology were evident in the 1930s: Batson's social economics at UCT, Gray's comparative sociology at Wits, Cronjé's historical, cultural or *volk* sociology at Pretoria, and Verwoerd's welfare or reform sociology at Stellenbosch[39]. However, according to Miller, the types of sociologies espoused by Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd and Geoffrey Cronjé were the two dominant models of sociology in the 1930s[40]. The former adopted American and British conceptions of sociology and the latter type of sociology was based on Dutch and Continental conceptions rooted in questions around *Volkskarak-*

ter – national character. Verwoerd believed that sociology was an applied science used to understand and solve 'social problems'. In contrast, Cronjé emphasised theoretical issues in the discipline and focused on the development of a cultural or national *volk*. Cronjé's cultural approach spread beyond the University of Pretoria to include Afrikaans medium universities such as, Potchefstroom University and the University of the Orange Free State. Together, Verwoerd and Cronjé dominated Afrikaans sociology from 1920 to 1950.

Afrikaans sociology, 1920-1950

At Afrikaans universities, sociology produced and supported the intellectuals that were to spawn and legitimate the Apartheid idea. Even two prominent Afrikaner sociologists, Nic Rhoodie and HJ Venter, argue that a *"large number of Afrikaner intellectuals played a leading part in the study of the native question during the 1930s and 1940s"*[41]. Their role was so central and important that they go on to stress that *"...apart from the National Party and the Afrikaans churches, these were the most important interpreters and exponents of the Afrikaner's views of racial differentiation"*[42]. Throughout the 1930s, in a variety of social sciences, Afrikaner intellectuals shaped and re-shaped the thinking that informed and legitimated the Apartheid political project[43].

Apartheid's architect, HF Verwoerd, professor of sociology at the University of Stellenbosch in 1932, used his training to initiate an American-inspired brand of sociology. Despite the obvious intellectual influences of studying extensively in Germany[44], Verwoerd preferred the American empirical tradition of problem solving and social welfare politics to the European model[45]. American sociology in the twentieth century, *"was marked by a pragmatic positivism, and an impulse towards the amelioration of social problems rather than structural social change, and a methodological reliance on empirical data"*[46]. As a sociologist Verwoerd was "descriptive, empirical, and applied"[47]. The major goal of sociology, according to him, should be to solve the country's social problems as opposed to understanding social phenomena. He believed that sociology was an

> *...applied science with practical utility for dealing with the country's social problems ... Although he made frequent references to sociology as a 'science', he had little interest in scientific social theory. Instead he linked sociology to social work and the practical problems of social welfare in South Africa. He believed that sociology's strengths were in describing and diagnosing specific social problems and in providing scientific training for social workers to deal with them.*[48]

In addition, he emphasised the need to focus on the individual in seeking a solution to various social problems. Identifying these 'problems' formed the basis of his courses which covered topics such as poverty, crime, and juvenile delinquency. Verwoerd therefore implemented a sociology at Stellenbosch concerned with a highly practical sociological investigation of social problems, supplemented by the extension of expertise in collecting copious amounts of data to support social reform initiatives.

Geoffrey Cronjé, the "mind of apartheid"[49] was appointed as senior lecturer in 1934 and in 1936 became professor of sociology at the University of Pretoria (a position he retained until 1967 when he was replaced by Prof. JE Pieterse). At this stage, Cronjé was the only person to hold a doctorate in sociology obtained from the University of

Amsterdam[50]. He pursued a more "cultural sociology"[51] concerned much more with theorising the *volk* (nation) and the *rassevraagstuk* (racial question) than with Verwoerd's version of applying sociology to find solutions for perceived social problems[52]. During his 'reign' at Pretoria, Cronjé was not only responsible for establishing the first Department of Criminology in the country[53] but he elaborated a set of ideas that effectively theorised the apartheid concept. Through a series of close intellectual connections to mainly Afrikaans ethnologists located at Pretoria and Stellenbosch, including PS Groenewald[54] and PJ Coertze[55], Cronjé tried to decide the "kern van die rassevraagstuk" (the kernel of the racial question) and concluded that the central issue was "*...rassevermenging en rassebotsing – dit is die kern van Suid-Afrika se rassevraagstukke en dit sal die kern van dié vraagstukke bly solank die kontak en die verhouding tussen die blankes en die nie-blankes voortduur soos dit tans is*"[56] (racial mixing and racial clashing – this is the kernel of South Africa's racial question and this shall remain the kernel of this racial question as long as the contact and relationship between the whites and non-whites remains as it currently is). Interrupting the long-standing debate within Afrikanerdom about the extent to which racial purity should be compromised by the economic necessity of allowing non-whites into the urban areas they were so long banished from, Cronjé argued that the only solution would be racial separation. Such separateness or 'apartheid' was absolutely necessary argued Cronjé, amongst other things, because of the tremendous "rasseverskille" (racial differences) between whites and non-whites[57]. Citing "liggaamlike" (physical) differences of "velkleur" (skin colour), "sweet vermoë" (sweat glands) and "asemhalingstelsel" (mechanisms for breathing), and "geestelike" (spiritual) differences, Cronjé concludes: "*Wat in elk geval nie betwyfel kan word nie, is dat in Suid-Afrika sowel as elders, bewys is dat die Europeër tot hoër intellektuele prestasies as die neger in staat is*" (In any event, what cannot be doubted, in South Africa as elsewhere, the evidence is that the European is capable of higher intellectual achievement than the negro) making separateness or "apartheid" the white man's "verantwoordelikheid" (responsibility)[58]. In 1944, at the F.A.K. Volkskongres on Afrikaner racial policy, Cronjé produced 'scientific' evidence that "miscegenation led to racial decline"[59]. His publication a year later, *'n Tuiste vir die Nageslag* (A Home for Posterity), dedicated to his wife "*and all other Afrikaner mothers, because they are the protectors of the purity of blood of the Boer nation*", is therefore regarded as "*the first comprehensive fundamental exposition of the apartheid idea*"[60].

English sociology, 1920-1950

At the same time, during the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, sociology at English-medium universities shared the same overall social administration, welfare, and empirical focus of South African sociology in general. English-speaking sociologists, distanced from dominant power structures, combined with their own primarily British political tradition and commitments, adopted a more 'liberal', socially ameliorative, definition of sociology and its practice. At the Universities of Cape Town, Natal, and the Witwatersrand, teaching and research was concerned more explicitly with social welfare and alleviating, particularly amongst white communities, the 'problems' associated with the government's racial and economic policies and programmes[61]. At the forefront was John Gray, the first professor of sociology at

the University of the Witwatersrand. From the time of his arrival at the university in 1936, he established a reputation as a strong liberal, and shaped sociology at English-medium universities into his image of the discipline: *"an objective or scientific approach to contemporary social problems ... (with) an emphasis ... on work and research in the field of social administration"*[62]. The syllabus, while seemingly simply a derivative of Verwoerdian sociology, was actually more directly inspired by a strong tradition of British liberalism. Despite Gray's liberalism and anti-racism[63] which was influenced by this tradition, however, Wits sociology remained committed to a racially-paternalistic practice that remained consistent with the prevailing socio-political ideas of racial segregation and apartheid.

In these early days, the Wits Department of sociology was severely criticised, most notably by Dr Felix Brummer – a research officer at the Department of Social Welfare. Brummer felt that the sociology course at the University of the Witwatersrand paid inadequate attention to social work theory, social fieldwork and South African conditions. As a result, in 1939 a meeting was held between the officials of the Department of Social Welfare and Social Studies committee. The committee accepted the sociology course on condition that an experienced Afrikaans-speaking social worker was appointed. Consequently, Miss E Malherbe, a graduate in social work from the University of Stellenbosch, was employed[64]. Similarly at UCT and Natal University, sociology was almost wholly concerned with social 'problems' and 'welfare', addressing two 'problems' in particular: white poverty, and the 'native question'[65].

The attendant sociological conception that drove a response to these questions was heavily inspired by British theorists and texts, promoting a strongly empiricist and scientific sociology. Theory and method were used to promote liberal welfarism. John Gray at Wits founded the Fordsburg Community Health Centre in 1943 and which offered five types of service, namely; medical, nutritional, social work, recreational and educational,[66] and defined sociology as " . . . *the use of accredited scientific procedures . . . in the service of humanism*"[67] – a definition that described the orientation of most sociology departments in English-medium universities, especially at Cape Town.

Professor E Batson, Professor in the Department of Sociology and Administration at the University of Cape Town from 1935, was one of the foremost practitioners and promoters of this version of sociology. He separated professional training in Social work from the more general study of contemporary social issues by creating a diploma in Social Science alongside the Bachelor of Arts degree. He viewed the discipline of social science *as "the application of scientific methods to the investigation of social phenomena."*[68] Batson also took the lead in founding a Joint Universities Committee on Social Studies to co-ordinate training and employment of social workers across the Union. He was, according to Phillips, one of "the molders of the profession" and his graduates – in 1948 there were 151 of them (149 were women) – were favoured by the country's welfare bodies[69]. More concerned with social work, he fed the cause of sociology by establishing a 'laboratory' to collate data 'scientifically' and 'objectively', in order to identify areas most ravaged by poverty and 'urban problems'[70]. Batson became well known in a whole host of local and national welfare bodies, and even assisted government's social welfare programme by helping in the compilation of case registers. His vision of sociological method was consummated

when he released the first comprehensive Social Survey of Cape Town. With its pioneering use of sampling theory and the Poverty Datum Line, it was at that time one of the first and most sophisticated surveys of an African city[71]. It not only brought prestige to Batson, but highlighted sociology's role as the discipline that would provide the tools to identify areas needing social relief, and to provide such welfare.

This liberalism in sociology was supported and paralleled by a broader liberal strand within social science in general, in English-medium universities: RFA Hoernlé in Philosophy[72], ID McCrone in psychology[73], SH Frankel in Economics[74], and Macmillan and Ballinger in History. The liberalism of this strand of South African sociology was decidedly opposed to racialism, but the paternalism, which underpinned their attitude, is clearly evident in their writings and research postures.

Black-African sociology, 1920–1950

In the third institutional setting during this early period, African Colleges and Universities, sociology did not establish itself with any force. The educational and general social policies of the colonial and then white governments of South Africa (from Hertzog to Malan) severely stunted the growth of an African intelligentsia. Up until the establishment of the Native College of Fort Hare in 1916, under the tutelage of the University of South Africa, the most respected black intellectuals were those who had accepted white rule, remained only moderately critical, and had established themselves as 'civilised' and "of European culture"[75]. DDT Jabavu, Selope Thema, S Moreno, and Sol Plaatje were the most 'accepted' black social commentators in the early pre-1920s period. They usually took their inspiration from Booker Washington, and had either studied abroad or established themselves through apprenticeships with local government officials. Professor DDT Jabavu was one of the most respected of this group, having earned a BA in London and then appointed as the Professor of Bantu Languages at the SA Native College in Fort Hare. He established his reputation in South Africa due to his "European manner"[76] and his self-admitted extensive relationship with CT Loram, the Chief Inspector of Native Education in Natal[77].

Solomon Tshekisho Plaatje was another example of this group. He never attended school past the "fourth standard", but studied typewriting, Dutch and native languages enough to earn him an appointment as the Dutch interpreter to the Court of Summary Jurisdiction, presided over by Lord Edward Cecil[78]. It was an important enough position to establish his respect amongst the white administrators and an editorial position on the weekly English and Setswana paper, *Koranta ea Becoana*. Plaatje's articles on native affairs, writes the Editor of the *Pretoria News* in 1910, *"has been marked by the robust common sense and moderation so characteristic of Booker Washington. He realizes the great debt which the Natives owe to the men who brought civilization to Africa. He is no agitator or firebrand, no stirrer-up of bad feeling between black and white. He accepts the position which the Natives occupy today in the body politic as the natural result of their lack of education and civilization"*. Black intellectuals were therefore only accepted when they were uncritical of the status quo, seriously stifling the development of an independent black tradition of academic social science. The African National Congress, the first national liberation move-

ment to be established in Africa, was only to be formed two years later in 1912.

An independent black intelligentsia did develop however in the 1930s and 40s. Despite the politics of the establishment of the University College of Fort Hare, it was instrumental in producing a new class of black intellectuals. Until the passing of the Extensions of Universities Act (no 45 of 1949) that established the University Colleges of Durban (Indian), the North (Sotho), Zululand (Zulu), and Western Cape (Coloured), Fort Hare in Alice was the only recognised institution of higher education that produced and trained black intellectuals. It trained a new generation of African students and intellectuals who would eventually become the freedom fighters and leaders of the various national liberation movements. But, since the first courses in sociology were only established at Fort Hare in 1962[79], there was no African or black sociological tradition until that time.

Political alliances and state-controlled research units

The institutional differentiation of the universities, created by the colonial and segregationist regimes, however, still forced different emphases on the general conception of the discipline. In English-medium and Afrikaans-medium universities, the differential relationships between intellectuals and the structures of power forged two different and opposed sociological traditions which came together momentarily within the space of state controlled research entities such as the National Bureau for Educational and Social Research (NBESR). However, more often than not, English and Afrikaans speaking academics were in opposition, aligning themselves to different competing research units such as the *South African Institute of Race Relations* (SAIRR) and the *Rasserverhoudingsbond.* Nevertheless, this intimate relationship between the government and academics not only initiated social research – which ultimately fostered the cause of sociology – but suggests interesting relationships in the nexus of the state, its sponsored agencies, and the academy.

The first step towards improving the efficiency of social research was the creation by the Union government, in 1928, of the Bureau of Statistics and Information. A year later, in July 1929, the NBESR was instituted under the Union Education Department[80] with EG Malherbe as director and state bureaucrat Felix Brummer as second research officer. The Bureau itself was financed by the South African government at a cost of 5 000 pounds per annum[81]. However, in the 1930s, the Bureau was suffering from severe financial shortages due to the impact of the great depression and the lack of government subsidies to further research on a national scale. In November 1933, Malherbe therefore visited the United States to meet the President of the Carnegie Corporation – Dr. FP Keppel and managed to persuade him to make a five-year grant for a co-operative research project under the NBESR. Here it was proposed that a Council of Educational Research – as existed in Australia and New Zealand – be set up in South Africa to combat the lack of research into South African society. As a result, a body was established to maintain co-operation between the Union government and the Carnegie Corporation[82]. A sum of $62 500 (payable in five annual installments) was appropriated from the British Dominions and Colonies Fund,[83] on condition that a social research officer be appointed to supervise the *sociological* side of the Bureau's research.

The major function of the NBESR was the collection and interpretation of statistical

data pertaining to education and social work. The bureau also served as a liaison office between the different bodies that administered education and social work. It acted as a representative for the international conferences convened by the Committee on Intellectual Co-operation of the League of Nations and the *Bureau International deduction* at Geneva[84]. The major role of the bureau was to act as a research unit in which investigations of an educational and social nature were carried out. The bureau also acted as secretariat and executive office to the *South African Council for Educational and Social Research* (SACESR), which administered research funds.

The SACESR was constituted under the Minister of Education in 1934 under JH Hofmeyr[85] to administer a further grant of 12 500 pounds made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to further research in South Africa[86]. Its history is very closely linked to that of the NBESR. It commenced its duties in 1935. The National council convened every six months in order to establish and elaborate on current research projects, which covered a diversity of subjects. For example, the subcommittee on minimum standards of living headed by Dr PJ Olckers was established on the ninth of October 1947. The task of this committee was to *"collect information on the social trends, population needs, the structure of families and the problem of family economics within the Union."*[87] However the primary function of the Council was to provide grants and subsidies for research projects conducted by individuals at South African universities. Between 1953-4 the Council gave 20 707 pounds for research projects and overseas travel expenses[88].

In order to improve the efficiency and co-ordination of research the SACESR was divided into five divisions: the Educational Research Division (ERD), Social Research Division (SRD), Psychological Research and Service Division (PRSD), The National Library on Educational and Social Research and the Film Division. The ERD was responsible for the collection and interpretation of educational statistics for use in South Africa and internationally. The SRD was responsible for social work in relation to the collection and systematisation of data[89]. This division made important contributions to state departments. For example, it acted as secretariat for the committees on juvenile delinquency during the formulation of the Children's Act of 1937.

The council was linked to state departments, through the Bureau; therefore its research was constrained by the state's mandates. In order to ensure not only co-operation but also co-ordination in matters of research, a University Advisory Board (UAB) to the SACESR was established in 1938 to advise the Council and supervise research projects. It consisted of representatives of the universities, Provincial Education Departments, the Institute of Race Relations and other social and educational institutions. The Advisory Board was headed by Mr JH Hofmeyr. Some of its other members included Prof. MC Botha, Mr JD Rheinallt-Jones, Prof. RFA Hoernle` and Dr. EG Malherbe. The UAB's central duty was to ascertain the needs of research, thereafter the SACESR would advise the bureau of proposed research projects. The council met twice every year and the advisory board met once a year.

The first task of the advisory board was to send out questionnaires to various universities and university-colleges to obtain opinions about the conduct of research in South Africa. The general opinion was that insufficient research work was being done in the edu-

cational and social field in South Africa[90]. Therefore the Advisory Board recommended that the following factors be implemented; sabbatical leave to staff with full pay, regular grants to be given under the auspices of the bureau, shorter teaching hours, the establishment of a quarterly magazine to publish the results of research projects and the nomination of *ad hoc* commissions to undertake research projects focussing on specific 'problems'[91]. The elaborate structure of the SACESR and the NBESR ensured that academics from different – and at times opposing – intellectual settings and traditions came together to conduct social research on a national basis. However, in most instances Afrikaans and English academics in particular were divided in parochial institutions.

In this early period, Afrikaner academic's joint involvement in the *Institute of Race Relations*, which had been established in 1929, was one of the prime institutional settings that coordinated their interchanges with each other and separated them from English social scientists. These intellectuals all used social science to theorise and activate the racial, cultural, and economic ideas that gave birth to the project of Apartheid. But, it was the Afrikaner sociologists who were at the forefront of the intellectual project of Apartheid and the sociological enterprise in South Africa. In particular, it was Cronjé and Verwoerd in the sociology departments at Pretoria and Stellenbosch who were at the center of both the Afrikaner intellectual scene and sociology. Together, Pretoria and Stellenbosch crafted, legitimated, and maintained the cultural and racial ideas of Afrikaner nationalism, on the one hand, and the economic, social and political ideas of Apartheid, on the other.

The influence of this Afrikaner sociology quickly spread beyond the academy, and the discipline and its intellectuals became very influential in deciding the direction of government policy, and eventually establishing and maintaining apartheid. This influence was promoted by the unification of Afrikaner intellectuals, who were not only well-organised as a group, but more importantly, were connected in important ways to dominant political structures. Afrikaner social scientists first gained a political voice through their participation in the *Institute of Race Relations*. From 1935, a small group of prominent Afrikaner intellectuals made the decision to break away from the Institute due to its 'liberal' leanings. They established the *Suid-Afrikaanse Bond vir Rassestudies* instead, which was to become a key think-tank for apartheid ideas. Another example of this type of intellectual parochialism was the formation of a militant Afrikaans speaking body the *Rasserverhoudingsbond van Afrikaners*, established in 1934 to study racial issues[92]. This body was largely funded by the Dutch Reformed Church. The *Rasserverhoudingsbond* was a further movement towards the racial separation that had been developing in the DR Churches since early in the century. Later, in 1942, the DRC established the *Federale Sendingraad* (Federal Missions Council) that united church leadership and Afrikaner academics in search of a solution to the racial question. This council became the force behind the establishment of the *Suid Afrikaanse Buro vir Rasseaangeleenthede* (SABRA). Verwoerd, Cronjé and other prominent sociologists and social scientists were active members of the *Bond* and were soon sharing ideas and rubbing shoulders with such prominent Afrikaners and policy-makers as MDC de Wet Nel, P van Biljon, and WP de Villiers[93]. The *Bond* quickly became the key institution within which ideas were transformed into policy, and it was here that the Afrikaner's racial policy was honed and 'nationalised' as the concept of apartheid. MDC de Wet Nel,

the Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, admitted that the *Bond* adopted and popularised the concept "apartheid" by adopting it as their slogan and policy objective[94]. Rhoodie and Venter therefore conclude, "*...despite its short-lived existence the Bond may be regarded as the father of the concept of apartheid*"[95].

Although English speaking intellectuals were organised around the *South African Institute of Race Relations* (SAIRR) and Afrikaans intellectuals conglomerated around the *Rasserverhoudingsbond*, concerted efforts were made by certain scholars to bring English and Afrikaans scholars together. Surprisingly, one such pioneer was Verwoerd who, in the words of Miller, was a "linguistic nationalist"[96].

In his career as an academic Verwoerd's principles were radically different from those he embraced in his political career with the National Party. Miller notes,

> *Verwoerd was neither a strident Afrikaner nationalist nor a doctrinaire white supremacist ... But if Verwoerd had a political vision during the period before 1937, it was not expressed in ethnic separatism but in his attempt to bring the English and the Afrikaners together in local and national social welfare activities. He gave no indication of wanting to alter the political system to advance the cause of Afrikaner nationalism. Instead, he encouraged co-operative welfare activities during a period when others were increasingly stressing the differences between the English and the Afrikaners rather than the similarities.*[97]

As a sociologist, he made attempts to forge an alliance between English and Afrikaner social welfare activities. His primary goal was to ensure that *'the Afrikaner became part of the country's welfare system rather than to eliminate English participation in welfare.'*[98] At a time when English was the dominant language in academia Verwoerd insisted that all publications and minutes of meetings of the Continuation Committee be available in both English and Afrikaans[99], thereby ensuring linguistic equality. Verwoerd though was an exception, with ethnic separatism being espoused by the majority of scholars. He drafted plans for a social welfare research journal titled the *South African Journal for Social Science* (the choice of title reflects his South African approach to social welfare). However when the journal was launched after Verwoerd's resignation, it was published exclusively in Afrikaans and was entitled *Volkswelstand*[100].

Another political structure that cemented the bonds between Afrikaner intellectuals and policy-makers and gave sociologists a key inlet to power, was the *Broederbond*, a secret society established in 1918 that became Afrikanerdom's key political organization. The secret society of the *Broederbond* comprised members of the clergy, academics, farmers, professionals, and politicians. By 1950 it had a membership of 3 662 of which nearly 2 500 were teachers or members of the clergy and the other 500 were farmers[101]. In addition, half of the first cabinet of the Nationalist government were members, including Malan, Swart, Strijdom, Dönges and Jansen[102]. The *Broederbond* and the Cape nationalists created the economic movement that was given direction by the *Ekonomiese volkskongres* (Economic Congress of the Nation) of 1939. Their goal was to unite Afrikaner classes to work for the upliftment of all Afrikaners. The various bodies that were established to achieve these aims included the *Ekonomiese Instituut* (Economic Institute), of the *Federasie van Afrikaans Kultuurbewegings* (FAK). The *Reddingsdaadbond* (Rescue Action Society RDB), and the *Afrikaanse Handelsinstituut* (Afrikaans Commercial Institute, AHI). The *Suid-Afri-*

kaanse Lewensassuransie Maatskappy (South African National Life Insurance Company, SANLAM), assisted the financial operation of these organizations. Support for these organizations was widespread. For example, according to Moodie (1975), by 1946 support for the RDB was in excess of 65 000.

The FAK focused on cultural politics (*kultuurpolitiek)* rather than on issues of *partypolitiek* (party politics). They were involved in projects that would foster a national identity. It was the FAK that organized the great trek centenary celebrations in 1938. Most of the sociologists and social scientists operating in Afrikaans-medium institutions were members of this secret brotherhood, and were at the heart of political decision-making[103]. The claims that sociologists and Afrikaner intellectuals in general had established themselves as an intelligentsia and new class with privileged access to state power were never more evident than during this period and in relation to this group. This was extended with the outbreak of World War Two.

The war disrupted South African society[104] and social research was halted. The social dislocation following the Second World War put social 'problems' like unemployment[105], suicide, divorce, prostitution and alcoholism on the academic agenda nationally and internationally[106]. In essence, World War Two spawned a new *"role for planning [that] surfaced much more widely than the tinkering with the location of commercial activities within neighbourhoods and other mainly technical concerns which had emerged in the inter-war years."*[107] The result was a number of changes in state controlled research units, which in turn redirected the development of the discipline of sociology in particular.

This new direction was propelled by Smuts' broader goal of post war 'reconstruction' encouraged further by overarching bodies such as the *Social and Economic Planning Commission* (SEPC)[108] formed in 1943, the Industrial Development Corporation established in 1943, and the Post War Works and the Planning and Reconstruction Committee. Emerging out of a proposal by the Industrial and Agricultural Requirements Commission[109], the SEPC was formed in 1942 as a non-statutory advisory body[110]. The SEPC's major function was to:

> *review policies and programmes of the various Departments and Boards which have an economic or social bearing, with a view to advising the Government as to steps which should be taken to secure their better co-ordination.*[111]

They were granted the power to: nominate investigative committees; collect data relating to aspects of the social and economic system and to offer advice to the government, via the Prime Minister, on social and economic policies[112]. They played a prominent role in organising regional surveys carried out by universities[113] and in funding projects undertaken by the newly established Council for Research in the Social Sciences (CRSS).

The CRSS functioned as a co-ordinating unit which integrated the activities of the Council, universities and other relevant bodies. It was financed by the state but retained a measure of autonomy in policy matters. The major functions of the CRSS were the formulation of research projects covering aspects of *national* life, securing financial assistance for research projects and publishing and subsidising research of a high quality. In addition, and more importantly it advised the government and other authorities in matters pertaining to research, how to apply research to national planning as well as maintaining a central

bureau to co-ordinate 'social science' research in particular[114]. Its most important goal was to act as a co-ordinating body that would function in conjunction with universities.

The committee was composed of a chairperson and university specialists in each particular field. The CRSS laid the foundations for the development of *sociological* research on a national basis. Its aim was to integrate university research into the activities of the Council and the Institute. The CRSS stressed the need for universities to produce co-ordinated research that would benefit a broad national research programme. The central approach adopted was from the perspective of sociology and social work in which "reference to other fields [was] incidental."[115] The council called for the development of sociology beyond a teaching capacity.

However, the major problem facing the CRSS was a severe shortage of adequate funds. Certain research bodies, for example, the Social and Economic Planning Council and the Bureau for Social and Educational Research, only provided financing for specific projects. Therefore the choice of research was not only curtailed, but also directed by financial considerations. Another problem it encountered was the inability of sociologists to devote adequate time for the collection of fresh material because, at a time when universities were expanding,[116] teaching increasingly became a top priority for most academics[117]. The type of research project that the CRSS envisaged was both 'practical' and 'theoretical' (methodological). In particular, it called for research that would analyse social change with a view to 'the prediction of trends'[118]. The central topics that were researched ranged from the school, family and the press to delinquency, social pathology and race relations; themes that would prove to be increasingly popular amongst sociology postgraduates in the 1950s and the second phase of the history of South African sociology.

Independence and consolidation of an academic discipline, 1950-1970

By the 1950s, a new phase of sociology began in South Africa. The liberal tradition of English-medium universities continued into this second phase by the key figure of sociology in the 1950s, SP Cilliers. Cilliers was appointed professor of sociology at the University of Stellenbosch in 1958, and single-handedly overthrew Verwoerd's 'social engineering' sociology there by bringing Parsonian theory to South Africa[119]. After having studied under Parsons at Harvard, Cilliers was determined to revive theory in South African sociology[120]. The establishment of a theoretical framework that marked the distinctiveness of sociology was one major impetus towards the separation of sociology from social work.

During the 1960s, all the major departments of sociology that had previously been conjoined to social work broke away and established the independence of the discipline[121]. Sociology finally came into its own during the 1950s and 1960s, departments expanded, and developed the institutional capacity to produce PhDs (the first PhD in sociology in South Africa was awarded in Natal in 1965)[122]. The growth and expansion of sociology was not surprising in light of the general expansion of higher education. An economic boom, partly promoted by the stifling of black trade unions and political organizations such as the African National Congress (ANC), established new universities and expanded existing ones.

At the same time, the restructuring and intensification of the racial project in the 1960s made social amelioration a far less pressing issue. The implementation of 'grand' or 'high' apartheid in the 1960s involved a tightening and bureaucratisation of the state machinery in service of the apartheid idea and population counting, surveillance and urban planning assumed a new importance[123]. Cilliers' efforts were therefore well-timed and Parsonian structural-functionalism spread throughout the South African sociological community, transposed into different sociological traditions within the various institutional spheres.

English sociology, 1950–1970

At the English-medium universities, the American sociological imagination took firm root and informed a predominant preoccupation with prejudice and social 'pathology'. The gloss of scientific value-neutrality turned these foci into a concerted focus on attitudes, demography and criminology[124]. Many English-medium universities, including Cape Town and Wits, had formal links with or even joint programs with 'Demography and Criminology', and research during the time was overwhelmingly concerned with these issues[125]. This was not surprising, given that the state extended its apparatus and instruments of 'surveillance' during this time. With the simultaneous benefit of tracking the labouring population for purposes of labour supply control, the Population Registration Act and its attendant institutions, also satisfied the modernising state's insatiable need to count, register, and document the population[126]. Demographic techniques and research became increasingly sought after in this context. LT Badenhorst, a senior lecturer at Wits University, for example, established a reputation as an expert demographer, and published quite prolifically on population trends in South Africa[127]. OJM Wagner[128] (who succeeded Gray after his death in 1947) at Wits remained committed to structural-functionalism[129] and pushed for establishing two full courses in *Criminology and Penology* at Wits. This focus reflected a functionalist concern with the 'pathologies' created by the two dominant social processes at the time: urbanisation and industrialisation.

But, the University of Natal and the department at Wits, as well as other social scientists at English-medium universities, devoted most of their academic attention to attitudes. Shifting from a concern with social amelioration to an analysis of the conditions that created the need for social relief, sociology departments at English-medium universities turned to the subjective and ideological dimensions of apartheid[130]. Reflecting an American psychological concern with prejudice, attitude surveys became the staple output of various universities. Studies of group perceptions were pursued by Van der Berghe, Kuper, Dickie-Clark and several other distinguished sociologists[131]. Electoral attitudes were particularly pursued by people like Henry Lever, chair of the Department of Sociology at Wits, and a good friend of one of the key liberals of the time – Ellen Koch or Hellman. An important political figure, Ellen Hellman wrote extensively on racial attitudes and the importance of establishing a truly non-racial liberal political platform[132]. Her involvement in the *South African Institute of Race Relations* (SAIRR) was important for establishing contact with important new thinking within liberal historiography. Muriel Horrell, a researcher at the SAIRR, and CW De Kiewiet began theorising the basis of apartheid in racial attitudes,

and therefore the incompatibility between apartheid and capitalism. The critique of the apartheid regime amongst sociologists and historians at the time was therefore based on their belief that the system was motivated by retrogressive racial attitudes that would succumb to the progressive forces of economic growth and development. The liberalism of English-speaking sociologists, while it had matured from its earlier paternalistic and patronising forms, was therefore still largely unconcerned with the larger structural issues of the socio-political order. This was to change in the period that followed as these, by then matured, analyses were confronted by a new generation of initially British historians, followed by local historians and sociologists, at least partly inspired by the resurgence of Marxist thought in the wake of Europe's Paris 1968 student and worker revolt.

Afrikaans & Black-African sociology, 1950–1970

The character of sociology shifted, although not as markedly, at Afrikaans-medium universities during this time as well. Curricula and publications became more theoretical, but still concerned themselves with subjects like poverty, family structures[133] and religion[134]. These were all approached from a structural-functionalist perspective, as Afrikaans sociology departments began severing its formal ties to social work. The Universities of Potchefstroom and the Orange Free State joined Pretoria as the key Afrikaans sociology departments, and together they dominated sociology with their continued commitments to the *volk*, with renewed thinking and justifications of the apartheid idea[135]. Sociology became the arena in which more sophisticated theoretical justifications for apartheid and various debates regarding the optimum functioning of apartheid were played out. And their role in directing policy and the thinking of Afrikanerdom remained as strong as ever.

During the 1950s and 1960s these universities accounted for 68.6% of all the sociology graduates in the country, 40% of whom were recycled back into intellectual circles and another 15% of whom went directly into government service, planning and administering the socio-economic project of Apartheid[136]. The influence of the Afrikaner brand of sociology therefore remained wide. They were also able to extend their resources and influence by exploiting the institutional consequences of the apartheid regime – by using the African and Black universities established through the apartheid policy of 'separate development' as 'teaching universities'. Located in remote and poverty-stricken homelands, and lacking resources and facilities, they were prevented from developing independent intellectual and research traditions. Instead, the homeland universities were meant to produce the civil servants and administrators of the Apartheid regime[137]. As a result, they became the training grounds where young Afrikaner academics could start their academic careers or where Afrikaner civil servants were promoted to teaching positions[138], ensuring that the sociology taught at these universities was the same functionalist sociology that had informed their training. In a form of "academic colonialism"[139], sociology at these institutions, argues Balintulo, was *"to supplement the racist pedagogy that instils a sense of God-given mission of domination to the Afrikaner youth, with a more domesticating tribal-oriented pedagogy for the oppressed groups"*[140].

Afrikaner sociology therefore expanded considerably during this period with Afrikaner sociologists consequently remaining incredibly influential in shaping policy. At the forefront

of this continuity, supported and encouraged by the apartheid state, were the University of Pretoria and its chair of sociology, NJ Rhoodie, whose self-professed interest in "inter-group conflict in plural societies"[141] led him to theorise the racial question in ways that provided the Nationalists a more sophisticated justification for Apartheid. He argued, together with Venter, that the earlier apartheid idea premised on "guardianship" where *"the civilised, more highly developed white man took the uncivilised, undeveloped Black man under his protection, and began to educate and uplift him"* was a necessary and "important milestone" in the process of separation[142]. The process needed to enter the next phase, they argued, because the "uplifting of the Bantu" had ensured they had been placed *"intellectually, mentally, socially, and economically in such a position"* that they could now develop separately, on their own[143]. 'Separate development' had found an intellectual, sociological expression. It was supplemented by the extension of 'scientific' fields required to manage the project. Adam shows that *"[i]n the Afrikaner universities, mainstream sociology is [composed of]: criminology ('Black deviance'), demography ('Black overpopulation, migration, and development'), concern with modern management techniques ('poverty datum lines') and productivity dominate an essentially socially engineering approach"*[144]. Groenewald therefore concludes: *"There was little tension between Afrikaner society and Afrikaner sociologists in the 1960s. A mutually beneficial historical understanding had developed that enabled sociology to flourish institutionally in exchange for its analytical and technical contributions to the needs of the 'volk'"*[145].

State-controlled research units

This group of Afrikaner intellectuals, as their predecessors, established the influence of sociology through their institutional affiliations. In this generation's case, however, the 'scientific' administration of government policy made the early Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), the government's statutory funding and research agency, the central institutional link between sociologists and policy[146]. Nic Rhoodie was a senior researcher and Head of the Division for Group Interaction at the HSRC, and many other Afrikaner sociologists had worked, or were affiliated, to the HSRC at the time.

Furthermore, the NBESR continued to remain important. From its inception, the NBESR formulated its policies and set up a range of commissions to investigate various social problems. In 1954 it underwent a series of changes. The first was a change in name to the National Council of Social Research (NCSR). Specifically, radical alterations were made to its research policy. Support for research projects was divided over three departments: The South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (SACSIR), The National Council for Social Research (NCSR) and the University Advisory Committee (UAC), each of which had different functions to perform. The SACSIR was responsible for co-ordination and subsidisation in the field of the natural sciences while the NCSR evaluated recommendations regarding the co-ordination and subsidisation of fields in the social sciences and humanities. The UAC was responsible for recommendations concerning the material provisions for research at universities for example, buildings and equipment[147]. Much of the research produced by the NCSR was directly focused on community studies. For example, An Enquiry into Family Life by *Die Kommissie Van Ondersoek insake die Gesin-*

siewe van die Federale Armsorgraad van die Nederduits-Gereformeerde Kerke was anticipated. Child destitution, juvenile delinquency, single mothers, excessive drinking, female labour, divorce and housing conditions were some of the topics explored. In addition, a sociographical survey of Germiston and Pretoria was undertaken. Another example was a survey of the religious life, leisure activities and social welfare condition of the Population of Cape Town. Interrelated to this the NBESR (which functioned alongside the NCSR) launched its own journal entitled *Journal of Social Research*. The publications would be on a quarterly basis or whenever material became available[148]. Despite major epistemological, methodological and political differences, Afrikaans and English academics supported the NCSR and the NBESR alike because they were the central state bodies to provide finance for research projects. The huge rift between Afrikaans and English academics (and in this particular case sociologists) is more visible in their support of units that stood in opposition to one another.

The most extreme example of this rift between English and Afrikaans sociology, and its institutional expression, came in the 1960s. Throughout this period, in both English-medium and Afrikaans-medium universities, there was an expansion of sociology and its establishment as a distinct, influential – if divided – discipline. In 1967, that expansion and division culminated in the definitive institutionalisation and professionalisation of sociology in South Africa, with the formation of South African sociology's first professional association, the *Suid-Afrikaanse Sociologiese Vereniging* (SASOV), and the establishment of its official journal, *the South African Journal of Sociology* (SAJS). The history of SASOV is both indicative of the divisions within South African sociology, promoted the deepening of those distinctions and is therefore important for understanding the subsequent third phase of South African sociology.

In 1967, Professors Batson from Cape Town, Wagner from Wits, and Cilliers from Stellenbosch drafted a proposed constitution for SASOV, which was discussed at a meeting in Stellenbosch in 1967[149]. At the meeting, a proposal was made from the floor for a restrictive membership clause that would limit membership to whites only. When the motion was adopted, Batson, Cilliers and Wagner withdrew from the organization, as did many other English-speaking sociologists in the liberal tradition[150]. CD Roode of the University of the Orange Free State believes the decision to form a closed organization was simply pragmatic, because a multi-racial organization by apartheid law would only have been allowed to exist as a 'correspondence association', defeating the purposes of a professional organization[151]. But the established political orientation of Afrikaner sociologists, their aversion to any Anglicising influences, and their relationship to government does not preclude a racial motivation for their decision to exclude non-whites from the organization.

The 'whites only' clause remained continuously controversial, and in 1971, a parallel open sociological association was formed. The *Association for Sociology in Southern Africa* (ASSA) was formed in a meeting in Mozambique and its distinctiveness was based not only on its non-racialism, but more importantly, its regionalism[152]. Its regional focus is what drew people like Nic Rhoodie to ASSA. In Rhoodie's correspondence to SP Cilliers, he wrote: *"We now have the opportunity – as sociologists – to give substance and meaning to the*

outward policy"[153]. This outward policy, South Africa's *détente*, was Vorster's attempt to establish greater legitimacy in the region. Rhoodie's brother was the spokesperson for *détente*, and Rhoodie himself, along with other Afrikaner sociologists who joined ASSA, saw it as part of this programme and not as an alternative to SASOV. Many radical sociologists did see ASSA as the non-racial and critical alternative to SASOV. As a response to this or the Vorster regime's pragmatic defence of 'racial mixing', a handful of SASOV members raised the issue of restrictive membership again in 1976, arguing that it was originally intended to be for the 'initial' period only. A motion was forwarded to scrap the racial clause in January 1976, but was dismissed[154]. The side-by-side presence of SASOV and ASSA, with their respective and opposed memberships, academic foci, and political commitments, could very well be seen to have inaugurated the third phase of South African sociology. With the existence of ASSA, the differences between South Africa's opposed sociologies, *"the subjects studied by these two groups, the theoretical frameworks within which the discipline was taught, and the methodological approaches employed" were all accentuated. After all, "...the separation extended as far as two separate sociological associations, separate sociological congresses, separate languages, and even different academic journals in which sociologists could publish their research"*[155]. The mid-1970s therefore marked the shift towards a qualitatively different period in South African sociology.

Conclusion

As if to confirm the existence of the historical divisions within sociology, a report issued by the recently restructured National Research Foundation concludes that the practice of sociology in particular – and by implication the historical and social sciences in general – need to find a common collective purpose.[156] Yet emerging from and practised within a racially fractured capitalist society, the current struggle of sociology to establish an integrated identity is ironically manifest in its highly centralised state-sponsored history. It is as yet unclear how this identity in its practice can and should be forged, or whether it is in fact even desirable. The second part of this article will provide an account of the rupture that occurred in the discipline in the 1970's and begin to trace developments after the first democratic elections in 1994.

Given the unsurprisingly late establishment of the African sociological tradition, the question arises as how most adequately to explain the relationship between the English and Afrikaner traditions of sociology and the society in which they were embedded. The explicit racial orientation of the Afrikaner tradition and the masked racialism of the English liberal tradition could be viewed as different emphases on how an uncritically accepted Western economic system could best be developed and maintained in an African context. This question arises with new force in the phase of the sociological tradition that follows this period. In anticipation of the article to follow, within the English tradition conflicting analyses between roughly 'liberal' and 'Marxist' interpretations as to the relationship between apartheid and capitalism prominently occupied the academic intellectual scene. Merle Lipton traces this 'debate[157]. It is clear from her account that in the first half of the century there was certainly no sustained opposition by capital to racial segregation or apartheid style policies even by those in the manufacturing sector of the economy who in

the 1970's only began to voice strong opposition to apartheid as a result of requiring more developed skills from the black labour force. At least until 1970, the economic interests of the dominant mining and agricultural sectors were faithfully served in different ways in the intellectual and political practice of academic sociology. Neither entrenched Afrikaner notions of racial exclusivity, nor English liberal analyses designed to soften its legislative effects, penetrated to the social impact the trajectory of South African racial capitalism was defining in the historical moment. A cursory glance at the tumultuous path of South African labour history over this period[158], only to see the light of day in the 1970's, starkly raises the question as to why this was completely ignored by these sociological traditions. The epistemic frameworks of radical and oppositional political analyses that consciously cut across racial and class divides, current within the South African fabric as early as 1915 and forcefully expressed at critical junctures throughout the period, nevertheless remained absent as a focus from the academies. The racially jaundiced and class-blind perspectives of intellectual and academic life of the period suggest the thoroughly socio-political construction of knowledge, in its emergent and coalesced forms. While these intellectual and epistemic perspectives change over time, marking thereby the development of sociology and social scientific and historical practice in general, this pattern will, conversant with the history of the discipline, be seen to recur.

Abbreviations

CESR	Council for Educational and Social Research
CRSS	Council for Research in Social Sciences
CRSSH	Council for Research in Social Sciences and the Humanities
ERD	Educational Research Division
JUCSS	Joint Universities Committee on Social Studies
NBESR	National Bureau of Educational and Social Research
NCSR	National Council for Social Research
NRF	National Research Foundation
SAAAS	South African Association for the Advancement of Science
SAC	South African College
SACESR	South African Council for Educational and Social Research
SACSIR	South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
SACSR	South African Council for Social Research
SAIRR	South African Institute of Race Relations
SRD	Social Research Division
UAC	University Advisory Board
UCT	University of Cape Town

Notes

1. Adam (1981), Bozzoli (1990), Cilliers (1984), Evans (1989), Groenewald (1984, 1991), Jansen 91991), Jubber (1983), Miller (1995), Peterson (1966), Rex (1981), Rich (1993), Savage (1981), Webster (1981, 1985, 1991), Welsh (1981)
2. See, in particular, Rex (1991) and Jansen (1991)

3. This is based on a categorisation by Camic (2001), and is a blanket category that includes theorists as diverse as Collins (1983) and Whitley (1984). While some of the theorists, like Collins, would definitely not consider themselves 'organizational', they share the same set of fundamental assumptions that drive the 'organizational' approaches: a concern with the features of social organization of knowledge in micro-settings, and an appreciation for the ways in which those aspects of organization shape the local, contingent construction of knowledge – a set of assumptions that warrant the label 'organizational'
4. Collins (1983), Wuthnow (1989), Lamont (1987), Camic (1983, 1995).
5. See Mannheim (1936)
6. This limited focus on the third capacity within which state-sponsored research units were implicated in the development and institutionalisation of sociology in South Africa issues in part from the theoretical goal of moving beyond questions concerning content.
7. Ashforth (1990)
8. The *TRC: Commissioning the Past* conference co-hosted by the History Workshop, University of the Witwatersrand and the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation (11th – 14th of June 1999) was the first conference that placed government commissions at the centre of investigations.
9. Ashforth (1990:9)
10. The South African Association for the Advancement of Science (SAAAS) was established in 1903. It was responsible for setting up a series of research commissions in which the foundations were laid for the development and expansion of social research in the country, in Miller (1995:2)
11. Jubber (1983)
12. Dubow (1995:169)
13. The Sociology of Africans was taught in the department of Social Anthropology at UCT; courses in "social science" were taught in the Philosophy department at Stellenbosch and at Potchefstroom in the Theology department, see Miller (1995:3-4).
14. *Ibid*.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Wolpe (1972).
17. University of the Witwatersrand. *Calendar.* Department of Sociology 1937-1950, Groenewald (1984), Cilliers (1984)
18. The history of higher education in South Africa is only a century old. From the Dutch East India Company's rule at the Cape in 1652 to the first British occupation of 1795 higher education extended no further than the creation of a handful of private or 'Latin' schools. For a brief outline of the establishment of tertiary institutions in South Africa see Boucher (1973:57) The first college – The South African College (later UCT) – was only set up in 1829 and in 1873 the University of the Cape of Good Hope was established. The College was, however, was an examining body only and it was up to the various colleges associated with it to provide tuition. It was only in 1900 that moves towards the establishment of a 'true university' were made through the displacement of matriculation classes at the South African College. Between 1902 and 1910 the University of the Cape of Good Hope (the present day University of South Africa – UNISA) was the only degree conferring institution in the country. From 1910 onwards the government expressed its concern at the development of (rather the lack of) higher education. Act No 12 of 1916 formalised the transformation of the University of the Cape of Good Hope into the federal University of South Africa along with the establishment of the University of Cape Town – UCT (earlier the South African College) and Stellenbosch

(originally the Victoria College). Initially a variety of institutions belonged to the University of South Africa. Most, however, severed their ties at a later stage. The University of the Witwatersrand was the fourth university to be established through the passing of Act 15 of 1921 detaching itself from the federal university the following March. Act No 13 of 1930 enabled the Transvaal University College (TUK) to undergo transformation into the University of Pretoria. At its inception, the university of Pretoria, declared to be representative of both official language groups. Two years later English as a medium of instruction was phased out. The University of Natal was established through Act No 4 of 1948. Act No 21 of 1949 established the University of the Orange Free State and from March 1951 Rhodes came into existence according to Act No 15 of 1949. Act No 19 of 1950 gave the University of Potchefstroom for Christian National Education (PU vir CHO) its institutional autonomy. With the independence of these institutions the federal university ceased to exist however the University of South Africa lived on. For more detail, see Boucher (1973:189).

19. The Carnegie Corporation worked through the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) and the Union government, see Miller (1993).
20. Nation-wide for example, approximately 81 042 white men were registered as unemployed in 1930 a figure which rose to 187 924 in 1933. The Carnegie Commission calculated that one-fifth of Afrikaners were unemployed 'poor whites' (Davenport 1992:289)
21. Louw (1986)
22. This tradition was well entrenched by the 1920s due to the work of the SAAAS.
23. While in South Africa, Coulter gave a series of lectures on the rise of Sociology at Stellenbosch University.
24. Miller (1993).
25. The University of Pretoria had initially provided instruction in Sociology in its *Kinderleidingkliniek* (Child Guidance Clinic) that was established in 1929. The *Kinderleidingkliniek* was controlled by the traditionally conservative *Suid-Afrikaanse Vrouevederasie* (South African Woman's Federation, SAVF) who provided financial support for its establishment and encouraged research with of a social welfare nature. This influence combined with that of the Carnegie Corporation enabled the University of Pretoria to set up a Department of Sociology and Social Work in 1934 (Miller 1993:646).
26. Pollak (1968).
27. *Ibid.*
28. Murray (1982).
29. University of the Witwatersrand, *Calendar*, 1937-1950, University Archives, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg; Jubber (1983) ,Groenewald (1984), Cilliers (1984).
30. University of the Witwatersrand, *Calendar, 1937-1950*, University Archives, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Groenewald (1984), Cilliers (1984).
31. University of Cape Town.1921. *Calendar description for the School of African Life and Languages*, cited by Jubber (1983).
32. *Ibid.*, University of the Witwatersrand, Calendar, 1937-1950, University Archives, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, Groenewald (1984), Cilliers (1984).
33. Cilliers (1984).
34. Pollak (1968), Jubber (1983).
35. Lacey (1981).
36. *Ibid.*
37. Between 1921 and 1936 the population of the Witwatersrand increased from 230 657 to 402 233 E. Brink, "The Afrikaner Women of the Garment Workers Union, 1918-1939", S. Parnell,

"Johannesburg Slums and Racial Segregation in the Cities, 1910-1937", p.20. In Johannesburg alone between 1936 and 1946, the black population grew by 59% and the white population by 29% (Frescura and Radford (1982)

38. See Hyslop (1995), for example, who points out that the increasing rates of urbanisation and industrialisation in the 1930s were, 'eroding the paternalistic form of racial domination which had earlier been predominant in an agriculturally based social order'.
39. Miller (1995).
40. Miller (1995).
41. Rhoodie and Venter (1960:169).
42. *Ibid*.
43. Among others, there were RW Wilcocks and EG Malherbe in Psychology; CT Loram in Education; AW Roberts and NJ Olivier in Law; PJ Coertze, FJ Language, and PJ Schoeman in Ethnology; and EG Jansen, J Reyneke, WP de Villiers, and the famous Totius (JD du Toit) in Theology.
44. Apartheid: Psychiatry and South Africa', document prepared for the *Citizens Commission on Human Rights*, 1996, P.A.S.A 1
45. Cilliers (1984), Adam (1981)
46. Miller (1995:647).
47. Miller (1995:644).
48. Miller (1995:10).
49. Coetzee (1991).
50. Miller (1995:647).
51. Groenewald (1984).
52. Cronjé (1947), Cronjé (1968).
53. Cronjé was very influential in the expansion of the University of Pretoria, in part because of his role as Dean of Arts between 1941 and 1951. In 1948 Cronjé wrote a memorandum requesting the teaching of criminology, and in addition he asked that it become part of the Department of Sociology. The latter request was fulfilled on 26 June 1948. Pretoria University was the first in the university in the country to take this step. H.J. Venter (an ex-student of Cronje's) was appointed as the first lecturer, and by 1960 it became an independent department (dut Spies p. 123) with 37 undergraduates and 15 postgraduates (dut Spies, p. 51).
54. In Cronjé (1968).
55. *Ibid*.
56. Cronjé (1947:70).
57. Cronjé (1947:111).
58. Cronjé (1947:111-2).
59. The notion of the 'preservation of the white race' and racial separation have an enduring history. Giliomee and Schlemmer (1989:44) trace this notion back to the impact that German romanticism (the work of Herder and Fichte) made on a group of Afrikaners who had studied in Europe during the 1920s and 1930s. In particular it was Herder and Fichte's metaphysical beliefs on nationhood that made an impact. Both Fichte and Herder emphasise the centrality of nations in God's creation and a nations autonomy. This was clearly adopted in ideas on the *volk*. Most prominent among them were Nico Diederichs (later Minister of Finance), H.F. Verwoerd (later Prime Minister), Piet Meyer (later head of the secret Afrikaner B*roederbond – Brotherhood*) and Geoff Cronjé. It was through these scholars that neo-Calvinisim and ethnic particularism were introduced into the mainstream of Afrikaner intellectual life.
60. Rhoodie & Venter (1960), *op cit.* , p. 174.

61. Adam (1981), Cilliers (1984)., Groenewald (1984)., Jubber (1983)., Webster (1991)
62. Gray (1937:269).
63. See Dubow (1995:195).
64. Hare, I.R & Hoffman, W, *Social Work Education at Wits, 1937-1987*, School of Social Work, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 1987.
65. Gray (1943), Gray (1953), Sonnabend (1942)
66. Hare & Hoffman (1987:22).
67. Gray (1937).
68. Phillips (----:278).
69. Phillips (----:280).
70. *Obituary*, published in Monday Paper: Weekly Newspaper of the University of Cape Town, Aug 9-16 1999, Vol 18, No 22.
71. *Ibid*.
72. R.F.A. Hoernlé played a huge role in the advancement of the social sciences in this period. Hoernlé was a leading figure in the construction of South African Liberalism. His ideas, according to Rich, defined the goals of the group of South African liberals who were predominant in South African Politics during the inter-war years and his impact was far reaching. He made a huge impact on intellectual thought for two reasons; firstly, he undermined liberalism inherited from Britain by stressing 'group over individual identity' and the initiation of a dialogue with a segregationist state' which led to extreme criticisms liberal principles (Rich 1995:40-1). He based his ideas on those developed by the SAAAS. His role as advancer of social research was furthered when he accepted a position at the newly established University of the Witwatersrand in 1923 as chair of Philosophy. From 1934 to 1943, he was president of the South African Institute for Race Relations (SAIRR) which was established in 1929. He was eager for the development of empirical research in the social sciences and in 1933 he submitted a memorandum to the University of the Witwatersrand stressing the need for scientific social research. As a result of his efforts a Board of Social Sciences was established which would develop social science research up to World War Two.
73. Initially psychology was taught under the Department of Philosophy, MacCrone (1937, 1949)
74. Frankel (1940, 1949).
75. Foreword by John of Merriman, in Jabavu (1920)
76. *Ibid.*
77. Jabavu (1920).
78. Plaatje (1916).
79. Pollak (1968).
80. It was originally called the National Bureau of Education. The change in name only occurred in 1934 when a division of social work was created. CAD, VWN, 529, SW81/8, paper on the "Functions of Educational and Social Research" no author or date features, pp.1-2.
81. *Ibid.*
82. This was in contrast to the Australian body where the Carnegie Corporation was responsible for all the financial burdens.
83. *Ibid.*, p.3.
84. CAD, (Central Archives Depot , Pretoria) VWN, (Department of Social Welfare)(529, SW81/12, "Functions of the National Bureau of Educational and Social Research", annexure to the constitution of the council, 1938, p.2.
85. Other members of the council included: Patrick Duncan (Carnegie Trustee), Prof. M.C. Bothma (Secretary for Education), Dr R.W. Wilcocks (Rector, University of Stellenbosch),

Prof. R.F. A. Hornle (Philosophy, Wits), Dr W. de Vos Malan (Superintendent-General of Education in Natal) and Dr E.G. Malherbe (Director NBESR) see SACESR report 1934-1938, UOD (Union Department of Education), 1773, E113/7/4

86. CAD, UOD, 1773 E113/5/2-E113/7/4, The South African Council for Educational and Social Research" Malherbe's report for the period 1934-38, p.1
87. CAD, SES, 47, A1/21, Minutes of the first meeting of the subcommittee held on 9/10/47, p2.
88. CAD, SES, 47, A1/28, Minutes of meeting, 6 Nov, p.16.
89. A list of the members of the various committees has been provided in order to indicate the extent to which university professionals, both English and Afrikaans, were involved in the research subcommittees. The *Committee for Sociology* (Dr. F Brummer chairperson, Dr J.R Albertyn, Prof. E.Batson, Prof. G. Cronjé, Prof. J de W Keyter, Prof. S.Pauw, Prof. O.J. M. Wagner and Dr P.J. Olkers); *Committee for Education and Psychology* (Dr. P.J. Olkers-chairperson, Prof. H. Blignault, Prof. J.F. Burger, Prof. J.A.J van Rensburg, Prof. I.D. MacCrone, Prof. H.J. Rousseau, Prof. A.J. la Grange,); *Committee for Economics, Commerce and Geography* (Prof. C.S., Richards chairperson, Prof. H.R. Burrows, Prof. Hobart Houghton, Dr. J.H. Moolman, Mr. J.I. Raats, , Prof. C.G.W Schumann, Dr. P.J. Olckers); *Committee for African Studies* (Prof. J.D. Krige chairperson, Prof. P.J. Coertzee, Prof. G.P Lestrade, Mr. J. Lewin, Prof. B.I.C van Eeden, Prof. Monica Wilson, and Dr. P.J. Olckers); *Committee for Languages, History, Law* (Prof. M.C. Botha – chairperson, Dr. S.P. E Boshoff, , Prof. G.H. Durrant, Prof. F.E.J. Malherbe, Prof. D.Pont, Mr M.C. Roode, Prof. S.J.H. Steven, Prof. A.J.H. van der Walt and Dr. P.J. Olckers); *General Purposes Committee* (Dr. W. de Vos Malan – chairperson, Dr. F.C.L. Bosman, Prof. T.B. Davie, Rev. P. du Toit, Mr. G.A.C Kuschke and Dr. P.J Olkers); and finally the *Editorial Board of the Journal of Social Research* (Dr. F. Brummer – chairperson, Prof. A. J. la Grange, Prof. R.E. Lighton, Prof. O.J.M. Wagner and Dr. P.J. Olkers), it must be noted that the Committee of Education and Psychology was only inaugurated in 1946. In 1954 the specialist committees expired and new committees were constituted. in CAD, SES, 47, A1/28, Minutes, 29 May 1952, pp.11-13. While these names can be seen to include both English and Afrikaner academics, note that no black-African names appear.
90. The reasons for the latter were due to financial shortages, lack of equipment, lack of time, the comparative youth of universities where the major focus was on teaching and examining, inadequate publishing facilities, the scarcity of trained researchers, inefficiency in official statistics, lack of co-operation between state departments and universities.
91. CAD, SES, 47, A1/28, Minutes of meeting, 29 May 1952, pp. 1–5.
92. Rich (1995:50).
93. *Ibid.*
94. In Rhoodie & Venter (1960).
95. Rhoodie & Venter (1960:170).
96. Miller (1993).
97. Miller (1993:637-8).
98. Miller (1993:652-5).
99. Cited in Miller (1993:655).
100. *Ibid.*; JSAS p.655.
101. Lazar (1987:54-6).
102. All cabinet members were Afrikaans and only two – Eric Louw and Klasie Havenga – were not members of the Broederbond (Peberdy 1999:215)
103. Rhoodie & Venter (1960).
104. South Africa had a substantial amount of enlistments. There was for example, a total of 350

000 recruitments to the army, including 225 000 whites (of which there were 200 000 men and 25 000 women), 80 000 from the Native Military Corps and 45 000 from the Cape Corps. P. Alexander, Workers, War and the Origins of Apartheid, David Phillip, Cape Town, 2000, p. 17.

105. Unemployment would continue to soar after the war because preferential treatment was accorded to ex-servicemen – 106 000 returned at the end of the war – in terms of apprenticeship and training. P.L. Bonner, "The Shaping of Apartheid" in *Apartheid's Genesis*, p.20. As early as 1943 the Social and Economic Planning Commission (SEPC) voiced their concern estimating that 70 000 white males and 5 500 white females would have no employment to return to after demobilisation. UG '9-1943, Social and Economic Planning Council, Report No 1, 'Re-employment, Reconstruction and the Council's status', October 1942, p. 1. Taking into account returning soldiers and displaced workers theses figures increased to approximately 80 000 white men, 30 000 white women and not less than 120 000 Africans. UG '9-1943, Social and Economic Planning Council, Report No 1, 'Re-employment, Reconstruction and the Council's status', October 1942, p. 2
106. Jubber (1983)
107. Mabin & Smit, p. 203.
108. Very little has been written on this council with P. Wilkinson's article, 'A Discourse of Modernity: The Social and Economic Planning Council's fifth report on Regional and Town Planning, 1944, presented at the Symposium on South African Planning History, Pietermaritzburg, September 1993 being the only exception. Mr. Hendrik Johannes van Eck chaired the Social and Economic Planning Council. It was responsible for producing reports on a variety of issues. For example, Re-employment, Reconstruction and the Council's Status, Report no 1,1942 (UG 9-1943), Social Security, Social Services and the National Income, Report No. 2, (UG 14-1944), Aspects of Public Service Organisation and Employment 1944, Report No 3, (UG 15-'44); The Future of Farming in South Africa Report No.4 (UG 10-1945), Regional and Town Planning, Report No 5, 1944 (UG 34-1944), Social and Economic Statistics in the Union, Report No. 6 (UG 35-1944), Local Government Functions and Finances , report no 8, 1945 (UG 40-1945), The Native Reserves and their Place in the Economy of the Union of South Africa, Report No 9, 1946 (UG 32-1946), Public Works Programme and Policy , Report no 10, 1946 (UG 37-1946), Central and Commercial Banking in South Africa, Report no 12, 1948 (UG 52-'48), Economic Aspects of the Gold Mining Industry, Report No 11 (UG32-1948), The Economic and Social Conditions of the Racial Groups in South Africa, 1948, Report No. 13 (UG 53-'48).
109. The Industrial and Agricultural Requirements Commission was set up in January 1940. Social and Economic Planning Council, First Annual Report, October 1945, UG 38-1945, p.1.
110. SEPC had twelve part-time members under the directorship of Dr. H.J. van Eck.Dr. H.J. van Eck was also the Managing Director and Vice Chairperson of the Industrial Development Corporation, see P. Wilkinson, 'A Discourse of Modernity: The Social and Economic Planning Council's fifth report on Regional and Town Planning, 1944, presented at the Symposium on South African Planning History, Pietermaritzburg, September 1993, p. 249.
111. Social and Economic Planning Council, First Annual Report, October 1945, UG 38-1945, p.2.
112. Social and Economic Planning Council, Report No. 1, 'Re-employment, Reconstruction and the Council's Status, Annexure 1, UG 9-1943, p.8.
113. The first survey that they organised was launched in 1943 n a survey of the Western Cape carried out by the Universities of Cape Town and Stellenbosch, Social and Economic Planning Council, First Annual Report, October 1945, UG 38-1945, p. 4.

114. *Ibid.*, p. 11.
115. CAD, VWN, 551, SW81/12/1, O.J. M. Wagner & N.J. de W. Pansegrouw, "Sociological Research in South Africa", p2.
116. For example, between 1929 and 1948 the student body at UCT increased by 120 per cent and by 1948 a tenth faculty of Social Science was formed. Furthermore, the teaching staff increased by 152 per cent. UCT was second to Wits in terms of the size of the teaching and student body. Phillips, p. 219 and p. 25. In addition, in 1959 the department of sociology at the University of Pretoria had 701 undergraduates and 27 postgraduates. The university grew over this period as well, and in 1959 the Department of Sociology and Applied Sociology was the biggest department in the faculty of Arts. dut Spies F.J. & Heydenrych, D.H, *Ad Destinatum II, 1960-2, 'n Gedenkboek van die Universiteit van Pretoria*, pp.123-4.
117. In addition, various departments lack the machinery – punching and counting machines for example – to produce research. Official and other statistics were not reliable and widely available. It was recommended that work at the Department of Census and Statistics needed to be improved. The shortage of reliable data created prolonged delays in research outputs.
118. *Ibid.*, p. 20.
119. Groenewald (1984), Groenewald (1991).
120. Cilliers & Joubert (1966), Cilliers (1971).
121. Cilliers (1984), Groenewald (1984), Jubber (1983).
122. Pollak (1968).
123. Posel (1996).
124. University of the Witwatersrand, Calendar, 1950-1975, University Archives, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
125. *Ibid.*
126. Posel (1996).
127. Murray (1982).
128. Wagner was initially affiliated to the Department of Sociology and Social Work at the University of Stellenbosch.
129. Rex (1975).
130. Adam (1981), Webster (1991), Lever (1978).
131. Van den Berghe (1969), Dickie-Clark (1966), Kuper (1970), Kuper (1977).
132. Ellen Hellman file, #9, A1419, Box 1, Historical Papers Collections, University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg
133. In fact, in 1951 there was a Commission of Enquiry into Family Life with Prof. G. Cronjé as chair. Other members included Ds H.J. Piek and Dr. J.A. Grobler. CAD, VWN, 558, SW81/16, meeting 17th May, 1951. The commission was appointed by the Dutch Reformed Church to 'begin the widest sociological survey into European family Life undertaken in the Union.' Cape Argus, 20/10/1959
134. Sekgobela (1990).
135. Savage (1981)
136. Pollak (1968).
137. Balintulo (1981)
138. Moodley (1979).
139. Meer (1974).
140. Balintulo (1981).
141. Rhoodie (1966).
142. Rhoodie & Venter (1960), Preface.

143. *Ibid.*
144. Adam (1981).
145. Groenewald (1984:250).
146. Cloete N & Muller J (1991) Human Sciences Research Council Incorporated (Pty) Ltd: Social Science Research, Markets, and Accountability in South Africa, in J Jansen (ed) *op cit.*, pp. 141-160.
147. CAD, UG28/1956, Fifth Report of the National Council for Social Researchfor the Calender Years 1953 and 1954, p. 4, in NTS, 9727, 837/400 (VOL.I).
148. CAD, VWN, 551, SW81/12/1, Circular titled "Journal of Social Research – Proposed Policy", p.1.
149. Association for Sociology in Southern Africa Papers, Sanlam Library Archives, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
150. *Ibid.*
151. Grundlingh (1994).
152. ASSA Papers, Sanlam Library Archives, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
153. ASSA Papers, 3/1, Rhoodie to Cilliers, 21/4/1970, translated.
154. Grundlingh (1994) *op cit.*
155. Van der Merwe (1983:100-106).
156. Sociology: The State of the Discipline, Webster *et al.*, March 2000.
157. Lipton (1992).
158. For an initial overview of a currently rich historical tradition in which sociologists have played no small part, see Simons & Simons (1969), and Webster (1978).

References

Adam, H 1981. The vocation of a sociologist in South Africa, in J Rex (ed) *Apartheid and Social Research*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 115-127.

Ashforth, A 1990. *The Politics of Official Discourse in Twentieth-Century* South Africa, Clarendon Press, Oxford

Balintulo, MM 1991. The Black Universities in South Africa, in John Rex [ed] *Apartheid and Social Research*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 141-160.

Bonner, PL, Delius, P & Posel, D (eds) 1993. *Apartheid's Genesis 1935-1962*, Ravan Press-Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg

Boucher, M 1973. *Spes in Arduis, A History of the University of South Africa,*University of South Africa, Pretoria

Bozzoli, B 1990. From Social Engineering to bureaucratic sociology: state, authority, and the alienation of the intelligentsia in South African social science. *South African Sociological Review*, 3(1):69-76.

Camic, C 1983. *Experience and Enlightenment.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago

Camic, C 1995. Three Departments in Search of a Discipline: Localism and Interdisciplinary Interaction in American Sociology, 1890-1940. *Social Research*, Winter.

Camic, C 2001. The Sociology of Knowledge, in P Balter and N Smelser [eds] *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Elsevier. New York

Cilliers, SP 1984. *The origins of sociology in South Africa.* Paper delivered at the XV Congress of the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Cilliers, SP 1966. *Sosiologie: 'n Sistematiese inleiding*, Kosmo- & Joubert DD Uitgewery, Stellenbosch.

Cloete, N & Muller, J 1991. Human Sciences Research Council Incorporated (Pty) Ltd.: Social

Science Research, Markets and Accountability in South Africa, in J Jansen (1991) [ed] *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines.* Skotaville, Johannesburg, pp. 141-161.

Coetzee, JM 1991. The mind of apartheid: Geoffrey Cronjé. *Social Dynamics*,17(1), pp. 1-35.

Collins, R 1998. *The sociology of philosophies : a global theory of intellectual change.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cronjé, G 1968. *Kultuurbeïnvloeding tussen blankes en Bantoe in Suid-Afrika.* Openbare fakulteitslesing van die Fakulteit Lettere en Wysbegeerte van die Universiteit van Pretoria.

Cronjé, G 1947. *Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid.* Stellenbosch : Christen Studentevereniging-maatskappy van Suid-Afrika.

Davenport, TRH 1992. *South Africa: A Modern History*, Fourth Edition, Macmillan Press, London

Dickie-Clark, HF 1966. *The Marginal Situation: a sociological study of a coloured group*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Dubow, S 1989. *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919-1936*, St Martin's Press, New York.

Evans, I 1989. Intellectual Production and the Production of Intellectuals in South African *Racial Order*, Paper delivered at the Conference on Economic Change, Social Conflict and Education in Contemporary South Africa, 29-31 March, Essex University.

Frankel, SH 1949. *Concept of Civilization.* Clarendon, Oxford

Frankel, SH 1940. *Whither South Africa? An Economic Approach.* Blackwell, Oxford

Frescura, F and Radford, D 1982. *The Physical Growth of Johannesburg: a Brief Survey of its development from 1886 to date*, Conference on Urbanisation, South African Institute of Race Relations, October 1982, p.39

Giliomee, H & Schlemmer, L 1989. *From Apartheid to Nation Building*, Oxford University Press, Cape Town

Gray, JL 1953. Application of Social Security Principles to the Union of South Africa. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 40, pp. 342-4.

Gray, JL 1943: First step to genuine social security in South Africa. *Outspan*, 32(11).

Gray, JL 1937. The Comparative Sociology of South Africa. *The South African Journal of Economics*, Vol 5, No 3, September, pp. 269-284.

Groenewald, CJ 1984. *Die institutionalisering van die sosiologie in Suid-Afrika.* D.Phil.-proefskrif, Universiteit van Stellenbosch.

Groenewald, CJ 1991. The context of the development of sociology in South Africa: a response to Visser and Van Staden. *South African Journal of Sociology*, Vol 22, Iss 2, pp. 46-49.

Grundlingh, A 1994. Structures for Sociologists: A Historical Perspective on Associations for Sociologists in South Africa (1967-1991), in N Romm & M Sarakinsky (eds) *Social Theory.* Lexicon, Johannesburg.

Hare, IR and Hoffman, W 1987) *Social Work Education at Wits, 1937-1987*, School of Social Work, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

Horrell, M 1973. *Survey of Race Relations in South Africa.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Hyslop, J 1995. White Working Class Women and the Invention of Apartheid: 'Purified' Afrikaner Nationalist Agitation for Legislation Against 'Mixed Marriages', 1934-9, *Journal of African History*, vol. 36

Jabavu, DDT 1920. *The black problem: papers and addresses on various native problems.* Book Department, Lovedale Institution Press, Lovedale

Jansen, J 1991. *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines.* [ed],

Skotaville, Johannesburg.
Jubber, K 1983. Sociology and its Social Context: The case of the rise of Marxist Sociology in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, Vol 9, Iss 2, pp. 50-63.
Kuper L 1977. *Pity of it all: polarisation of racial and ethnic relations*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis
Kuper L 1970. Class and Colour, *Race*, 11(2), pp. 1-35
Lacey, M 1981. *Working for Boroko*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg
Lamont, M 1987. How to Become a Dominant French Philosopher. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93:584-622
Lazar, J 1987. *Conformity and Conflict, Afrikaner Nationalist Politics in South Africa*, 1948-1960, PhD, Oxford
Lipton, M 1992. *Capitalism in Apartheid: South Africa 1910-1986*, Wildwood House
Louw J 1986. *The Carnegie Commission and the origins of institutionalised social science in South Africa*. Unpublished paper presented to the University of Natal Social Science Seminar Series, Durban
Louw J 1987. From separation to division: the origins of two psychological associations in South Africa. *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences*, 2341-352.
Mabin, A & Smit,D 1992. "Reconstructing South Africa's Cities 1900 – 2000: A prospectus (Or, A cautionary tale)" Programme for Planning Research, Occassional Paper Series, No 3
MacCrone ID 1949. Race Attitudes: An Analysis and Interpretation, in Hellman E (ed) *Handbook on Race Relations in South Africa*. Cape Town
MacCrone ID 1937. *Race Attitudes in South Africa*, London.
Mannheim, K 1936. Ideology and Utopia, in Mannheim K *Ideology and Utopia*. Harcourt Brace Javanovich, New York
Meer, F Presidential 1974. *The sociologist: myth maker or realist*. address delivered at the V Congress of the Association for Sociology in Southern Africa, University of Natal, Durban
Meyer, LE 1974. A report on South Africa's black universities. *Issue*, Vol 4, pp. 12-18.
Miller, RB 1993. Science, and Society in the Early Career of H.F. Verwoerd, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 4, December
Miller, RB 1995. *Science, Sociology and Social Engineering: South Africa in the 1930s*, (unpublished paper), 17 April
Moodie, TD 1975. *The rise of Afrikanerdom : power, apartheid, and the Afrikaner civil religion*. University of California Press, Berkeley
Moodley, K 1979. The Politicisation of Ethnic Universities: Experiences with South Africa's 'College Brews', in Pierre Van den Berghe (ed) *The Liberal Dilemma in South Africa*. London: Croom Helm, London
Murray, BK 1997. *Wits: The 'Open' Years: A History of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg: 1939-1959*, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
Murray, BK 1982. *Wits: The Early Years – A History of the University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg and its Precursors, 1896-1939*, University of the Witwatersrand Press, Johannesburg
Peberdy, SA 1999. *Selecting Immigrants: Nationalism and National Identity in South Africa's immigration policies, 1910-1998*, Queens University, Canada
Peterson, RA 1966. Sociology and Society: the case of South Africa. *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol 36, pp. 31-38.
Plaatje, ST 1916. *Native Life in South Africa*. Negro Universities Press, New York
Pollak, PH 1968. *Sociology post-graduates of South African universities*. Durban: Joint Universities

Committee on Sociology and Social Work
Posel, D 1996. *Modernity and Measurement: Further Thoughts on the Apartheid State.* Seminar Paper No 407, Institute for Advanced Social Studies, Johannesburg
Rex, J 1981. *Apartheid and Social Research*, [ed], UNESCO, Paris
Rex, J 1975. The Sociology of South Africa: a review article. *Journal of South African Studies*, Vol 1, pp. 247-252.
Rhoodie NJ & Venter HJ 1960. *Apartheid, a socio-historical exposition of the origin and development of the apartheid idea.* HAUM, Cape Town.
Rhoodie NJ 1966. *Apartheid en partnership: 'n Rasse-sosiologiese ontleding van afsonderlike volksontwikkeling en vennootskap, met besondere verwysing na die motiewe vir hierdie beleidsisteme*, Academica, Pretoria
Rich, PB 1993. *Hope and Despair, English-speaking Intellectuals and South African Politics, 1960-1976*, British Academic Press, London
Rich, PB 1989. *Liberals, radicals, and the politics of black consciousness.*Paper delivered at the African Studies Institute, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
Savage, M 1981. Constraints on, and functions of, research in sociology and psychology in contemporary South Africa, in John Rex [ed] *Apartheid and Social Research*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 45-66.
Simons, HJ & Simons, RE 1969. Class and Colour in South Africa 1850 – 1950, Penguin African Library, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, England
Sonnabend, DH 1942. Dissertation on the sociological aspects of the theme of the Congress of the SA Health Officials' Association. *Public Health*, 6(3), pp. 4-7
Van den Berghe PL 1969. Pluralism and the Polity, in Kuper L and Smith MG [eds] *Pluralism in Africa*, University of California Press, Berkeley
Van der Merwe, HW 1983. Ideological and academic polarization: the challenge to sociologists in Southern Africa. *South African Journal of Sociology*, 14(3):100-106
Verwoerd, HF 1972a. *Verwoerd die Republikein; hoofartikels uit Die Transvaler 1937-1948*, saamgestel deur O. Geyser Du Toit JB. Tafelberg, Kaapstad.
Verwoerd, HF 1972b. *Toe witmense arm was: uit die Carnegie-verslag 1932*, saamgestel deur Dian Joubert, Tafelberg, Kaapstad.
Vilakazi, H & Tema, B 1991. Universities and the Black Revolution in South Africa, in J Jansen (1991) [ed] *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines*, Skotaville, Johannesburg, pp. 127-140.
Webster, E *et al* 2000. *Sociology: The State of the Discipline.* Report prepared for the National Research Foundation, Johannesburg
Webster, E 1981. Servants of apartheid? – A survey of social research into industry in South Africa, in John Rex [ed] *Apartheid and Social Research*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 85-114.
Webster, E 1991. The Historical Search for a Critical Sociology in South Africa, in J Jansen (1991) [ed] *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical Perspectives Across the Disciplines*, Skotaville, Johannesburg, pp. 69-78
Webster, E 1985. Competing Paradigms – Towards a Critical Sociology in Southern Africa, *Social Dynamics*, Vol 11, No 1, pp. 44-48
Webster, E, Ally, S, Crothers, C, Hendricks, F & Jordan, N 2000. Sociology: The state of the Discipline. National Research Foundation, 21 March 2001.
Welsh, D 1981. Social Research in a Divided Society, in John Rex [ed] *Apartheid and Social Research*, UNESCO, Paris, pp. 11-26
Whitley, R 1984. *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences.* Oxford University Press,

Oxford
Wuthnow, R 1989. *Communities of Discourse.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge