FEELING THEIR WAY

Emotions and Structural Logics of Difference in the South African English-Speaking Community at the Height of Apartheid

by:
Jagger Andersen Kirkby,
MA in History

▲

ABSTRACT: In a bid to step away from a history of apartheid centred on African and Afrikaner nationalisms, the article redirects attention towards the white South African English-speaking community. An analysis of the emotional practices employed in the South African English-language press on Rhodesian unilateral independence in 1965 define the emotion work these practices carry out. The article concludes that this emotion work creates certain emotional narratives, which nuance a conventional view of the English-speaker as "unknown" and his attitudes towards the racial dilemma in South Africa as aloof, thus revealing a hitherto unprecedented proactivity in the English-speaker.

Keywords: apartheid, emotions, English-speaking South Africans, Rhodesia

▲

Introduction: Revisiting an Epic Struggle

Recent years have seen the emergence of several historical studies (Thörn 2009; Adhikari 2005; Mendelsohn and Shain 2008) that contest the conventional narrative of the broader apartheid epic. These studies have been bids to step away from a tale of racial oppression and segregation that predominantly highlights the deeds of the oppressor (e.g. Giliomee 2011) and/or the oppressor's main antagonist's struggle for freedom (e.g. Welsh 2009). These latter studies are crucial to our understanding of how

and why the differential nature of South African society came to be, and arguably, has been broken down, since South Africa's transition to a democracy in 1994. Whilst admirable in their endeavour to explain the emergence of the apartheid system as well as its fissures, and ultimately its failure, these studies contribute to a narrative that is centred on Afrikaner and African nationalisms (Lambert 2009b: 599). This leaves the historian with a sense of nonfulfillment as to the role played by those individuals and groups within the South African societal conglomerate who do not identify as Afrikaners or Black Africans.

Indeed, the "apartness" that apartheid prescribed was not only a question of the subordination of black individuals to white. Rather, it encouraged the separate development of not only the racial groups established with the introduction of the Population Registration Act, but also of those clusters that differed from each other within them, thus enforcing a wide-ranging logic of difference. The redirection of attention away from Afrikaner and African nationalisms and towards other ethnic groupings or subdivisions complicate the larger apartheid picture in a beneficial way, and can only contribute to a greater understanding of a harrowing past with which South Africans of all affiliations are still grappling. The study to follow centres on one of these groups, namely white, English-speaking South Africans, of British descent, the goal being to challenge the notion of their group identity as being fundamentally conglomerate.

In the following, I argue that the predominant view in the scarce research on English-speaking South Africans, which portrays them as an "unknown people" and their identity as thoroughly composite (Lambert 2009: 600), can be contested by including emotions as a historical variable. In my previous work (Kirkby 2016) I have argued that specific political and societal events that took place in South Africa in the period from 1960 to 1966 were of particular importance vis-à-vis the emergence of a less composite English-speaking identity. Indeed, these six years would see South Africa transitioning into a republic, cutting its formal ties to the United Kingdom, leaving the Commonwealth of Nations, and Rhodesia, ruled by a white minority also of British descent, unilaterally assume independence (UDI). My assumption is that these events are crucial in shaping a re-evaluation amongst English-speakers of their identity and

sense of self. In this article, I highlight the issue of Rhodesian independence as a case example.

Concretely, I analyse the emotional practices that emerge from debates in the South African English-language press on Rhodesia's UDI in 1965. I then discuss how these emotions nuance conventional views on the English-speaking community.

Preceding this, I first elaborate further on the content of the introduction through a discussion of existing research relating to the above research question, as well as present my theoretical and methodological framings, and briefly elaborate on my source material.

"An Unknown People"

Descriptions of South African English-speakers are often put in quite unflattering or, at least, colourless terms, adding to an attributing of cultural anonymity to the community, and their identity is often perceived as being thoroughly composite (Sparks 1990; Schlemmer 1976; Worrall 1976; Lambert 2009a).

Scholarship on the English-speaking community throughout the apartheid era is scarce. Some scholars, however, have attempted to nuance and challenge this fact in various ways, especially in recent years (e.g. Conway and Leonard 2014; de Villiers (ed.) 1976; Dubow 2009; Lambert 2000; 2005; 2009a; 2009b; Saunders 2006). Here, I touch upon and synthesise these scholars' main approaches and findings, as well as further clarify my own approach to this contested field.

Some have placed English-speaking South Africa in the broader imperial narrative of the British Empire (Garson 1976: 21). This article, however, seeks to explore the English-speaking community in its own right, albeit acknowledging the potential importance of "Britishness" to its sense of self and identity. As such, I am interested in the English-speaker in ethnic terms rather than, say, other groups' reactions to him and his "Britishness" (e.g. Dubow 2006; Saunders 2009). Garson's study of the "British connection" ends abruptly in 1961, implying that this connection no longer played any role after South Africa became a republic. By doing so, Garson seemingly renders the

English-speaking community's experiences thereafter irrelevant. Yet, it is exactly his omission of an English-speaking history after 1961; the insinuation that the community throughout this period of time underwent a transition from having a history to having none that implies a dynamic throughout this period of time. It is this dynamic that this article seeks to uncover by highlighting English-speaking attitudes towards Rhodesian UDI in 1965 as a case example.

Others have instead highlighted the societal marginalisation of English-speakers that accompanied the rise of Afrikaner nationalism throughout the first half of the twentieth century. After the Afrikaner Nationalist Party (NP) came to power in 1948, it carried out an implementation of strongly nationalist measures, for example job reservation for Afrikaners, as well as its promised policy of enforced systematic racial segregation that would become known to the world as apartheid. This nationalist struggle, with its ultimate goal of afrikanerdom (Maylam 2001: 210f.), would be the dominant political and cultural and in turn, historiographical, focal point for much of the twentieth century. As such, there seemed to be no room for the role of or identity inhabited by the English-speaker in a politically and culturally Afrikaner-dominated country (Lever 1978: 17).

The joint contribution of the papers in English-Speaking South Africa Today (de Villiers (ed.) 1976) presents an assessment of this at the time marginalised and rigid political and cultural position of the English-speaking community, which can be summed up as "... a sense of political 'suffocation' or 'dismemberment' ..." (Schlemmer 1976: 96). It fails, though, to actually address the issue at hand. Rather, the quality of the studies presented appears to be their expression of disillusionment with the fact that English-speakers have been ostracised (Temple 1977: 67), which in itself can be seen as a call for re-conferring on them a historical value.

English-speakers were in effect "caught in the middle" in two regards: between loyalties to South Africa and to Britain, and between the Afrikaner and the African (Macmillan 1963), especially after the introduction of apartheid. The compositeness of their identity, I believe, can be attributed to their "in-betweenness" throughout South African history. Unlike the monolithic Afrikaner nationalist and African struggles, English-speakers

have not in the same way had to fight for survival or for their right to exist. A lack of cohesiveness in an English-speaking identity is in this way understandable, as nothing has forced them to come together in a "sense of mission" (Sparks 1990: 47). At the same time, English-speakers have throughout comprised a minority of a minority, resulting in a different relationship with the "mother country" and a lack of a national identity, which by contrast did flourish in other similar settlements where descendants from Britain comprised a majority and held a foundational role in society, for example Australia, Canada and New Zealand (Ward 2001; Buckner 2005; Darian-Smith, Macintyre and Grimshaw 2007).

Thus, English-speakers in South Africa have been more dependent on their relationship with Britain, at least until 1961, as they have never had the need nor been bestowed with the opportunity to identify fully with their country of settlement. Yet, the particular demographics and political situation in South Africa have served as a reminder that they were indeed not mainland Britons either, which the events of 1960-1966, and especially Rhodesian independence, highlight. These events generated highly emotional debates on allegiance, power, identity and race, issues at the forefront of the English-speaker's mind when revising his triangular relationship with the Afrikaner and the African.

Within this complex ménage-à-trois, Anglo-Afrikaner relations during the apartheid era are readily traceable and ripe for analysis, as are Afrikaner-African, both due to the monopoly of power held by Afrikaners. Anglo-African relations, however, appear to be the single strand within the tripartite melee of apartheid South Africa that remains to a degree obscure.

English-speakers' attitudes towards apartheid and the "racial question" in general are not only a sensitive issue, but also a question to which there is no clear answer. The main synthesis among those who have touched upon it, however (Conway and Leonard 2014: esp. 154-156; Stone 1973), is one of the English-speaker as aloof, indifferent to, or accepting of, apartheid. Tellingly, this complex standpoint in which the English-speaker is aware of and informed by the racial situation, yet acquiescent through his own passivity all but confirms his position as the "Third Man" (Sparks 1990: 45) of South Africa and adds to the image of him as difficult to entangle.

The ethical dimension of racism means that an untangling of the role of the English-speaker, whether he stands out as an anti-apartheid activist, as mitigating or supporting apartheid, naturally and importantly informs the larger picture of the apartheid struggle. Yet, the English-speaker's role and identity seem somewhat obscure and divergent. In the next section, I suggest that the inclusion of emotions to a historical study may offer us clearer methods with which to untangle this complexity.

Common Repertoires of Feeling

Considering the emotional character of South Africa's traumatic past, it seems remarkable that the subject of emotions has yet to arise from it as an area worthy of serious historical scrutiny. The historiographical "cultural turn" of the 1980's took place predominantly in Europe and the United States. At this time, South Africa was preoccupied with a racial and ideological "war" that was played out in all spheres of society, including the academic world. The white nationalist project was reflected in many researchers' work on one side, whilst the opposing side became increasingly engaged with attempting to give the oppressed majority a voice. At a time of war, there seemed to be no space or time for sentiment. Thus, when dealing with the history of apartheid South Africa, emotions appear to be a topic ripe for investigation. Emotions have lingered in full visibility under the surface, but have yet to be dealt with in a comprehensive manner (van Zyl-Hermann 2012).

I suggest that scrutinising emotions may not only result in arriving at a greater understanding of South Africa's emotionally charged past, but also that operating with emotions as a historical variable may offer a way in which to comprehend the experiences of and role played by English-speakers during apartheid. This means scrutinising their relations within the triangular relationship consisting of Briton, Bantu and Boer. An analysis of their emotional character may moreover be a key to accessing a more uniform component of their identity.

I uphold the view that emotions contain a historicity worthy of analysis when regarded as to a degree intertwined with culture and social life (Rosaldo 1984). This involves rebutting the view of emotions as being irrational, universal and inaccessible (as

championed to a greater or lesser degree by for example Febvre 1941; Stearns and Stearns 1985; Reddy 1997). Instead, I introduce a dynamic that can be investigated historically by regarding emotions as something that is practised instead of something we possess or inhabit and consequently may or may not be able to scrutinise in depth.

Emotions should then be seen as products of social and cultural life. Discourse may be an optimal way of accessing them (Lutz and Abu-Lughod 1990). The source material, that is, newspaper articles, chosen for the following analysis, thereby prescribes an approach resembling a discourse analysis. The theoretical ideas behind the relationship between discourse and society and, in turn, emotions, in a critical discourse analysis frame my readings of the newspaper extracts I have singled out. Discourse is then both constitutive and constituted, and a social practice that contributes to the shaping of social relations, identities and systems of knowledge and vice versa (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 61ff.). In this relationship, emotions exert influence on discourse as well as the opposite, suggesting that structures exist outside of the discursive realm. I therefore employ Monique Scheer's notion of emotional practices, which locates emotions ontologically as in-between discourse and practice. With that, bodily emotional experiences can also be "read". Instead of concentrating on what emotions are, Scheer suggests reading emotions as "a practical engagement with the world." (Scheer 2012: 193). Scheer introduces emotions as expressions from a mindful, conscious body, which neutralises those historians' insistence that we can only identify their expression, as opposed to experience, and then only through norms or discourse. Concretely, emotions-as-practice functions not only as a means of identifying otherwise "veiled" emotions in the debates on Rhodesia's UDI but also allows the historian to trace changes in the emotional practices English-speakers employ. To understand these changes, Scheer's concept works even more to an advantage when linked with the question of not just how emotions are practised, but what emotions do (Vallgårda 2013: 104).

To further inform the concept of emotional practices, I introduce two additional approaches to theorising emotions, namely historian Barbara Rosenwein's emotional communities (Rosenwein 2002; 2010) and culture theorist Sara Ahmed's emotion work (Ahmed 2004a; 2004b). Ahmed, similarly to Scheer, views emotions as a form of

cultural practice. Through an analysis of public texts, a source material similar to my own, she argues that these texts "perform" emotion. Here, she argues that emotions establish collectives that are demarcated by the way the collectives in question feel about other "bodies," these often being other people. In this way, emotions generate and maintain a constant alignment of some subjects with others against other "others" (Ahmed 2004a: 25ff.).

Barbara Rosenwein makes a related path of argument to Ahmed's with her concept of emotional communities, which she likens to other social communities. Her concept is particularly useful, as it advises the historian to

"... uncover systems of feeling; what these communities (and the individuals within them) define and assess as valuable or harmful to them; the evaluations [and] the nature of the affective bonds between people that they recognize ..." (Rosenwein 2010: 11)

Thus, it is my hypothesis that a more uniform component of identity may be attributed to the English-speaking community if the role of emotions is taken into account. In the case example to follow, I analyse debates on Rhodesia's UDI in 1965. The critical discourse analysis prescribes that discourse and the social are mutually constituent, which inspires my reading of the debates. Emotions, however, are not necessarily exclusively discursive, as Scheer argues. By making use of Scheer's emotional practices and Rosenwein's emotional communities, the goal is to evoke a common repertoire of feeling, in effect conjuring up what I call an emotional narrative of the English-speaker that arises from the debates. To explain why and how these emotional narratives emerge, I turn to Ahmed's concept of emotion work. Emotions expressed in the debates are presumed to have an affect on and shape those who read them, in this case English-speakers themselves. The key challenge thereupon lies in identifying those subjects that align themselves with each other and alienate themselves from others by virtue of the emotions that are conveyed. I do, however, make the reservation that some emotions may remain more or less embedded in the individual. That is, some "basic" emotions may be universal, yet the way they are felt and expressed depends on cultural standards as well as on individual circumstances (Vallgårda 2013: 103; Scheer 2012: 205; 211; Rosenwein 2002: 836f.). They do, though, create an opportunity for attachment or

change, regardless (Bønnelycke 2015). In order to evoke a more transparent English-speaking identity, then, the challenge is, as Ahmed prescribes, to identify those subjects that do emotionally align and the processes through which they do so.

Before turning to my analysis, I briefly reflect on my source material, the South African English-language press.

The South African English-Language Press

The almost complete lack of contact between different racial groups during apartheid meant that South Africans were dependent on the media to obtain news and information about other groups (Potter 1975: 164). The South African English-language press is generally considered to share the same values as its counterpart in the Anglo-American world, such as an adherence to the concept of free press (Hachten and Giffard 1984: 95). This liberal outlook prescribed the recognition of the existence of all groups in apartheid South African society, on whom it did not fail to publish reports. Yet, this recognition was not necessarily equal to the conveyance of an acceptable picture of these groups, nor was the quantity of information about different groups balanced. Its primary concern was the white English-speaking group whose interests it duly represented (Potter 1975: 165; Lambert 2006: 39; Mervis 1989: 453). Compared to its Afrikaner counterpart, however, the English press did publish unbiased reports on the horrors of apartheid (Potter 1975). To the historian seeking access to the English-speaking community, then, the English press offers an independent, assorted and unrestrained bulk of information on South African current affairs, whilst its opinions mostly reflected those of its main readership, English-speakers.

English-Speakers and Rhodesia's Unilateral Declaration of Independence

After longstanding negotiations between the British and white minority Rhodesian governments, the Cabinet of Rhodesia unilaterally declared Rhodesia independent on 11 November 1965. No country recognised Rhodesian de jure sovereignty and international

sanctions ensued with support from the United Nations. Whilst South Africa had officially recommended against independence before UDI, it did not support sanctions and indeed circumvented them by supporting Rhodesia economically after UDI. It has been argued that for the South African English-speaking community, the United Kingdom's stance against Rhodesian independence (to which many English-speakers were sympathetic due to the cultural similarity between the white English-speaking communities in both countries), caused a change in their mutual relationship that "… caused a bewilderment that amounted almost to trauma, and this in turn bred a resentment towards Britain." (Heard 1974: 152). This case example explores this emotional perplexity.

For Love of Country

Views in the South African English-language press on then impending UDI were sympathetic to the situation of the English-speaking community's Rhodesian kin, yet advised strongly against independence. The editorial in the Cape Times on October 14, 1965, for example, noted the following on rumours that South African Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd privately desired independence for Rhodesia:

"We trust that this is not so. We hope that it is only the runaway enthusiasm of certain of Dr. Verwoerd's propaganda henchmen that gives this unfortunate appearance of wanting to make something like a political catspaw of the White South Africans' sorely tried White cousins beyond the Limpopo. For our own part we are not eager to have reckless policies of action tested at other people's expense, nor to see the White Rhodesians take a step which may truly destroy all that they and their forbears have built up …" (Cape Times, 11 October 1965).

In the above, the emotional practice of communicating sympathy, or love of their "White cousins beyond the Limpopo" is prevalent and functions as a stimulus to advise against the "recklessness" of declaring independence and destroying the "progress" of white Rhodesians.

The same attitude is found in a letter to the editor on November 11, 1965, which links sympathy with Rhodesians to the question of colour:

"Although fully sympathizing with Mr. Ian Smith [the Rhodesian Prime Minister, ed.] in his efforts to avert premature "Black rule" in Rhodesia, there comes a stage where reason should prevail over sentiment ... He might serve Rhodesia better if, recognizing the inevitable, he played for time during which the future Black rulers might possibly be trained to be more reasonable ..." (Cape Times, 11 November 1965)

Here we are presented with an "other," in Ahmed's words, namely "the Black". Whilst debates on the republic referendum and Commonwealth membership are linked to the question of Afrikaner nationalist dominance (Kirkby 2016), the Rhodesian question seems to open up a new flank for interpretation within the South African tripartite relationship, namely that between English-speakers and black Africans. The above quotation offers a paternalistic view of the native insofar as the "Black rulers must be trained". Before this, majority rule would be "premature".

Exploring how feelings of love "work," Ahmed highlights their ambiguity by connecting them to feelings of hate (Ahmed 2004b: 42ff.; 122ff.). Whilst her primary focus is right wing hate groups, I argue that her argument is applicable to the racial dimension of the debates on Rhodesian UDI, albeit the structures in this case may appear blurred.

By sympathising with the white Rhodesian minority, in effect considering them members of their own emotional community, English-speakers restructure themselves as a group that emotionally identify actively with Rhodesia as a nation. Indeed, we find other stances in the debates that verify this. An observer at a United Party rally remarks that the party leader's support for Rhodesia after UDI was declared, provoked a rapturous applause that "... shows where the *hearts* of the greater part of the electorate lie" (Cape Times, 12 November 1965, my italicisation), implying a bond of love and fraternity between English-speakers in South Africa and their namesakes in Rhodesia.

Yet, if we turn to Ahmed's analysis of love, we understand that this narrative works to conceal its own point. English-speakers' tentative attitude towards the native is now renamed as "support of equality before the law" and sympathy for "sorely tried" Rhodesians. In this way, as Ahmed argues, "[The group comes] to be defined as positive

... we love rather than hate." (Ahmed 2004b: 123). To juxtapose, English-speakers' sympathy for the white Rhodesian minority works to conceal their animosity towards a majority rule alternative. At the same time, what Ahmed describes as a "pull of love" (Ahmed 2004b: 124) towards Rhodesia is transferred towards the collective minority as a whole, expressed as a desire for an ideal (Ahmed 2004b: 124) of togetherness between English-speaking whites, Rhodesians included, with no place for the African.

Whilst we find no dissenting voices in the debates advocating for UDI, it is clear that the United Kingdom and English-speaking South Africans advocate against UDI for different reasons. The United Kingdom refuses granting independence to Rhodesia before majority rule has been established. English-speakers, however, advise against UDI out of fear that it will cause majority rule since the United Kingdom at this time has already withdrawn from other "... former possessions in Central Africa and handed over White settlers to African control without either facilitating their exodus or adequately safeguarding their future." (Cape Times, 9 November 1965).

Here the English-speaking community attributes the notion of "otherness" to another figure, namely the United Kingdom. The above suggests that the only two options English-speakers consider viable in relation to the decolonization process are either an exodus, or local protection from the African. This both illustrates clearly that the English-speaker considers the African a figure with which he either cannot co-exist or only co-exist with precautions in place, marking an irreconcilable position between the two. The British government is accused of not recognising this fact and its apparent ignorance of the White settlers' position in Africa means that they too are becoming increasingly estranged, that is, "unloved":

"The methods which the British Government employed in an attempt to coerce White Rhodesians to hand over their country to African rule fills [English-speakers] with bitterness because it proves to them that ... they too are "written off" ..." (Cape Times, 9 November 1965).

This frustration with the "mother country" is also foreboded in editorials on the then on going negotiations between Smith and UK Prime Minister Wilson. The Cape Times

implies that the United Kingdom's position on the Rhodesian question is too aggressive and an assertion of unwarranted imperial power (Cape Times, 26 October 1965), again indicating a growing disunity between the "mother country" and its "subjects," not only in Rhodesia, but in South Africa as well. After UDI, the Cape Times moreover publishes an editorial analysing ways in which the South African Republic may help Rhodesia circumvent impending economic sanctions from especially the United Kingdom (see also Cape Times, 15 November 1965; 16 November 1965). Whilst the Cape Times refutes a reader's allegation of supporting "treason," by declaring the word "... meaningless in the Rhodesian context," (Cape Times, 19 November 1965) it nevertheless draws attention to the press's apparent double standards on the Rhodesian question.

The few dissenting opinions appear to be voiced by either the small Progressive Party (Cape Times, 23 November 1965) or a small number of its readers (see e.g. Cape Times, 16 November 1965). An emotional narrative here emerges of the English-speaking community opposing UDI in fear of its consequences for its own status as a privileged minority in South Africa, and of Britain's disregard or "non-love" of White Rhodesians as causing "trauma" to it.

When Love is Lacking

English-speaking South Africa's disillusionment with Britain's position on UDI has already been clarified in the above section and is concisely explained by political scientist Ken Heard:

"... the punitive measures [sanctions, ed.] which she [Britain, ed.] did adopt were seen by the whites of South Africa as proof that Britain had gone over into the camp of the 'enemy'." (Heard 1974: 152).

I would here like to return to how love or, rather, the lack of it, "works," in order to clarify how the above is sufficient to provoke a vocal disenchantment.

Using "the nation" as an example of the object of love, Ahmed reasons that love is crucial to the formation of group identities (Ahmed 2004b: 130ff.). This argument bears similarities to that of Rosenwein, who, as we recall, would argue that emotional communities exist by virtue of "the nature of the affective bonds between people that they recognize ..." (Rosenwein 2010: 11). In the case of UDI, it is exactly the white minority settler nation that is under threat. English-speakers, in turn, feel an affinity with their kin in Rhodesia, juxtaposing that nation with their own community in South Africa. Indeed, Sparks argues that the counterfactual image of an Anglicised South Africa without the Afrikaner did in fact already exist: Rhodesia (Sparks 1990: 49). Britain's "punishment" of Rhodesia, then, was regarded as an attack on English-speaking South Africa as well, as proof that the "mother country" no longer regarded their nation as compatible with her own.

Ahmed suggests that love comes into being as a form of reciprocity and as surviving the absence of reciprocity. Love is a demand for reciprocity; we want to be loved in return, yet if we are not, we may intensify our own love. In the case of the nation, she argues:

"We can see how love then may work to stick together in the absence of the loved object, even when that object is 'the nation'. Love may be especially crucial in the event of the failure of the nation to deliver its promise for the good life. So the failure of the nation to 'give back' the subject's love works to increase the investment in the nation." (Ahmed 2004b: 130f.)

In the context of Rhodesian independence, I suggest that "the nation" consists of Rhodesia, the United Kingdom and the English-speaking community in South Africa. Rhodesia's love for the United Kingdom, who has not delivered its "promise for the good life," is not returned. Rhodesia indeed came to exist through British colonisation and was founded on some liberal values, yet also on the domination of one racial group over another. In a decolonising world, this is no longer compatible with "the nation". Thus, the subject, the Rhodesian, increases his investment in the nation by attempting to force

it to come to exist through independence. The same is then the case with English-speaking South Africa, as it sees Rhodesia as the model society that it could not achieve with the Afrikaner present (see e.g. Kirkby 2016: 25-34). Recognising that this model society is irrevocably untenable; that the love of it is not reciprocated, the English-speaker then increases his investment in it. In this case this happens quite literally by supporting aid to Rhodesia to circumvent sanctions. In this way, the subject "stays with" the nation and loves it "more," "... out of hope and with nostalgia for how it could have been." (Ahmed 2004b: 131)

Ahmed claims that this hope and nostalgia requires an explanation for the failure of return of love. Because one has invested work and time in the nation, one invents these explanations to defend the subject against the injury that would be caused if one simply "gave up" the object of love (Ahmed 2004b: 131), here the ideal of an unperturbed white settler society and the nation from which this ideal was born. As is clear both in South Africa and Rhodesia, the African is seen as the explanation. With the African present, the English-speaking South African and the white Rhodesian construct the fantasy that without the African, the love of the nation would finally be returned. Ahmed puts it thus:

"The failure of return is 'explained' by the presence of others, whose presence is required for the investment to be sustained. (Ahmed 2004b: 131)

With this, the nation itself also becomes a construct in that it only exists so long as it is invested in, that is as long as the African remains "the other" that gives the English-speaker a reason to invest in the nation and hope for his love of it to be returned.

To conclude in short on the above analysis, then, we find that the emotional practices employed in debates on Rhodesia's UDI in the South African English-language press uncover an English-speaking sympathy for the situation of white Rhodesians. I decipher this as articulations of love. An interpretation of the emotion work that love induces reveals an emotional narrative of the English-speaker aligning himself with the Rhodesian, in effect creating a common emotional community. The United Kingdom is excluded from this community due to a relationship of increasingly unrequited love between the mother country and its subjects. Furthermore, we learn that the bond of

love between English-speakers and their Rhodesian namesakes works to conceal an underlying common animosity towards the African, an "other" from whom the English-speaker requires safeguarding.

Next, in conclusion, I briefly discuss how this narrative nuances existing research on English-speakers and the broader apartheid narrative.

Conclusion: Informing Existing Interpretations

With the above, I argue that an "emotional" reading of the debates on Rhodesia's 1965 UDI imply that the English-speaker proactively inhabited a desire to uphold existing societal and racial structures in place in South Africa at that point in time, at the expense of the United Kingdom and the African. Consequently, this image of the English-speaker exists in opposition to that of the "aloof," or "benign" English-speaker who usually "does not want to know" about the racial dilemma, or is regarded as having done something "rather reprehensible" if he lets his true opinion on it be voiced (Sparks 1990: 47) or has been coerced by the Afrikaner into passive acquiescence (e.g. Giliomee 2012).

The apparent degree of emotional solidarity between English-speakers on the issue of UDI furthermore suggests that a less composite element of an English-speaking identity may be identifiable when including emotions as a historical variable, as well as contests the notion of the English-speaker as "unknown".

This affirms the relevance of exploring strands of apartheid history outside of Afrikaner and African nationalisms and interpretations. Furthermore, it shows how taking different conceptualisations of the theory and history of emotions seriously, may contribute to a nuancing of a historical narrative.

Bibliography:

- Adhikari, M. 2005: *Not White Enough, Not Black Enough: Racial Identity in the South African Coloured Community.* Ohio University Press, Athens, OH.
- Ahmed, S. 2004a: "Collective Feelings: Or, The Impressions Left by Others". *Theory, Culture & Society* 21:2, p. 25-47.
- Ahmed, S. 2004b: *The Cultural Politics of Emotion.* Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Buckner P. 2005: "The Long Goodbye: English Canadians and the British World". P. Buckner and R.D. Francis (ed.): *Rediscovering the British World.* Calgary University Press, Calgary, p. 181-208.
- Bønnelycke, C. 2015: "Storbyens allerlaveste kryb: Diskursive, affektive og rumlige praksisser i den københavnske dækning af Sædelighedsskandalen 1906-1907". Master's Thesis, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen.
- Darian-Smith K., S. Macintyre and P. Grimshaw (ed.) 2007: *Britishness Abroad: Transnational Movements and Imperial Cultures.* Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Conway D. and P. Leonard 2014: *Migration, Space and Transnational Identities: The British in South Africa.* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.
- de Villiers, A. (ed.) 1976: *English-Speaking South Africa Today: Proceedings of the National Conference July 1974.* Oxford University Press, Cape Town.
- Dubow, S. 2009: "How British Was the British World? The Case of South Africa". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 37:1, p. 1-27.
- Febvre, L. 1941: "La sensibilité et l'histoire: Comment reconstituer la vie affective d'autrefois?" *Annales d'histoire sociale* 3:1/2, p. 5-20.
- Giliomee, H. 2011: The *Afrikaners: Biography of a People.* Hurst, London.
- Giliomee, H. 2012: *The Last Afrikaner Leaders: A Supreme Test of Power.* University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville, VA. Kindle Edition.
- Hachten, W.A. and C.A. Giffard 1984: *The Press and Apartheid: Repression and Propaganda in South Africa.* Macmillan, London and Basingstoke, UK.
- Heard, K.A. 1974: *General Elections in South Africa 1943-1970.* Oxford University Press, London.
- Jørgensen, M. and L.J. Phillips 2002: *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* Sage, London.
- Kirkby, J.A. 2016: "Feeling Their Way. Emotions and Structural Logics of Difference: The English-Speaking Community in South Africa at the Height of Apartheid, c. 1960-1966". University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen
- Lambert, J. 2005: "An Identity Threatened: White English-Speaking South Africans, Britishness and Dominion South Africanism, 1934-1939". *Kleio* 37:1, p. 50-70.
- Lambert, J. 2009a: "'An Unknown People': Reconstructing British South African Identity". *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 37:4, p. 599-617.
- Lambert, J. 2009b: "Maintaining a British Way of Life: English-Speaking South Africa's Patriotic, Cultural and Charitable Associations". *Historia* 54:2, p. 55-76.

- Lambert, J. 2000: "South African British? Or Dominion South Africans? The Evolution of an Identity in the 1910s and 1920s". *South African Historical Journal* 43:1, p. 197-222.
- Lambert, J. 2006: "'The Thinking Is Done in London': South Africa's English Language Press and Imperialism". C. Kaul (ed.) *Media and the British Empire*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.
- Lever, H. 1978: South African Society. Jonathan Ball, Johannesburg.
- Lutz, C.A. and L. Abu-Lughod 1990: "Introduction: Emotion, Discourse and the Politics of Everyday Life". *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 1-24.
- Macmillan W.M. 1963: *Bantu, Boer and Briton: The Making of the South African Native Problem*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Maylam, P. 2001: *South Africa's Racial Past: The History and Historiography of Racism, Segregation and Apartheid*. Ashgate, Aldershot, UK.
- Mendelsohn, R. and M. Shain 2008: *The Jews in South Africa: An Illustrated History*. Jonathan Ball, Johannesburg.
- Mervis, J. 1989: *The Fourth Estate: A Newspaper Story*. Jonathan Ball, Johannesburg.
- Potter, E. 1975: *The Press as Opposition: The Political Role of South African Newspapers*. Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.
- Reddy, W. 1997: "Against Constructionism: The Historical Ethnography of Emotions". *Current Anthropology* 38:3, p. 327-351.
- Rosaldo, M.Z. 1984: "Towards an Anthropology of Self and Feeling". R.A. Shweder and R.A. LeVine (ed.) *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self and Emotion*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rosenwein, B.H. 2010: "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions". *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1, p. 1-32.
- Rosenwein, B.H. 2002: "Worrying about Emotions in History". *American Historical Review* 107:3, p. 821-845.
- Saunders, C. 2006: "Britishness in South Africa. Some Reflections". *Humanities Research* 13:1, p. 61-69.
- Scheer, M. 2012: "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion." *History and Theory* 51, p. 193-220.
- Schlemmer, L. 1976: "English-Speaking South Africans Today: Identity and Integration into the Broader National Community". A. de Villiers (ed.): *English-Speaking South Africa Today: Proceedings of the National Conference July 1974*. Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 91-136.
- Sparks, A. 1990: *The Mind of South Africa*. Heinemann, London.
- Stearns, P.N. and C.Z. Stearns 1985: "Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards". *American Historical Review* 90:4, p. 813-836.
- Stone, J. 1973: *Colonist or Uitlander? A Study of the British Immigrant in South Africa*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Temple, P. 1977: "Review". *English in Africa* 4:1, p. 67-69.

- Thörn, H. 2009: *Anti-Apartheid and the Emergence of a Global Civil Society.* Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, UK.
- Vallgårda, K. 2013: "Følelseshistorie – Teoretiske brudflader og udfordringer". *Kulturstudier* 2, p. 87-113.
- van Zyl-Hermann 2012: "The Emotional Historian?" http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/discussion/the-emotional-historian. Accessed 21 August 2016.
- Ward, S. 2001: *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*. Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- Welsh, D. 2009: *The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*. Jonathan Ball, Cape Town.
- Worrall, D. 1976: "English South Africa and the Political System". A. de Villiers (ed.): *English-Speaking South Africa Today: Proceedings of the National Conference July 1974*. Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 193-215.

Sources:

- Cape Times, 11 October 1965.
- Cape Times, 26 October 1965.
- Cape Times, 9 November 1965.
- Cape Times, 11 November 1965.
- Cape Times, 12 November 1965.
- Cape Times, 15 November 1965.
- Cape Times, 16 November 1965.
- Cape Times, 23 November, 1965.