South Africa, Race and the Making of International Relations

Vineet Thakur and Peter Vale

South Africa, Race and the Making of International Relations

Kilombo: International Relations and Colonial Questions

Series Editors: Mustapha K. Pasha, Aberystwyth University, Meera Sabaratnam, SOAS University of London, Robbie Shilliam, Queen Mary University of London

This is the first series to mark out a dedicated space for advanced critical inquiry into colonial questions across International Relations. The ethos of this book series is reflected by the bricolage constituency of Kilombos – settlements of African slaves, rebels and indigenous peoples in South America who became self-determining political communities that retrieved and renovated the social practices of its diverse constituencies while being confronted by colonial forces. The series embraces a multitude of methods and approaches, theoretical and empirical scholarship, alongside historical and contemporary concerns. Publishing innovative and top-quality peer-reviewed scholarship, Kilombo enquires into the shifting principles of colonial rule that inform global governance and investigates the contestation of these principles by diverse peoples across the globe. It critically re-interprets popular concepts, narratives and approaches in the field of IR by reference to the "colonial question" and, in doing so, the book series opens up new vistas from which to address the key political questions of our time

Titles in the Series

South Africa, Race and the Making of International Relations

Vineet Thakur and Peter Vale

ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD
INTERNATIONAL

London • New York

This book is dedicated to those whose physical labour has made our intellectual effort possible. Those who have worked tirelessly, without much acknowledgement, at two institutions, one that this book writes about, the South African Institute of International Affairs, and another that this book was mostly written in, the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study.

Contents

Acknowledgements

On a late morning at work in 2015, both of us sat down with our friend, Estelle Prinsloo, to discuss the state of humanities in South Africa in light of the Rhodes Must Fall movement. As such dialogues go, especially when one in the group has crossed undisclosable decades, discussions turned into tale-telling. One in particular went on for slightly too long—it was about a framed cover in Peter Vale's office. The cover was from the journal *The State*, first published in 1909. It was intriguing, not least because the image on the cover depicts George Frederic Watts's statue, called *Physical Energy*, which stands at the bottom of the granite stairs at the Rhodes Memorial, located on Devil's Peak in Cape Town. The statue was a tribute to Cecil John Rhodes and so was the journal, *The State*.

Curious to know more about that cover has led us to writing this book, as will become apparent when these pages are turned. Over the next few years, as we discussed, dissected, whipped and condensed each other's arguments into these chapters, we have never forgotten how important it is to keep telling tales to each other.

Intellectual labour is always fulfilling, but the institutional machinery of the university system rarely accords the permanence to enjoy it. We have had to co-think and co-write it from across continents, and in the process both of us have accrued institutional debts, in particular, to the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study, where much of the research for this project was conducted. In addition, we must thank our current universities and colleagues in Leiden and Pretoria, respectively, for providing us academic homes in otherwise dark times for the life of the mind—to intentionally use Hannah Arendt's famous phrase.

Various sections of this book have been presented at gatherings held in Delhi, Cardiff, Johannesburg, Singapore, Leiden, Brighton and Ningbo,

Figure Int.1   The cover of the first issue of *De Staat* (*The State*).

so it will be impossible to thank each and every person who has given us
comments, but we appreciate the collegiality in which they were made.
We would also like to thank the University of Johannesburg, the School of
Oriental and African Studies London, the (South African) National Research
Foundation and the Institute for History, Leiden University, whose generous
research funding has allowed us to visit several archives. Accordingly, we
are also very grateful for the help and access we were given by the library
and staff at the National Archives of South Africa (Pretoria), Wits Historical
Archives (Johannesburg), Johannesburg City Library (Johannesburg), Cory
Library (Grahamstown), University of Cape Town Library (Cape Town),
Bodleian Libraries (Oxford), British Library (London), Chatham House
Archives (London) and National Archives of Scotland (Edinburgh).

Our understanding of International Relations disciplinary history has been
enriched through conversations with colleagues. Ian Patel, Alexander Davis,

Chapter 1

The Frontiers of IR

In the late Johannesburg winter of 1906, a thirty-four-year-old Englishman began writing a document that was to lay down the bones for the creation a new state in Africa. Issued as the Selborne Memorandum in mid-1907 in the name of the high commissioner to South Africa, Lord William Palmer, Second Earl of Selborne, the document proposed to initiate discussions on creating a single 'sovereign' unit across southern Africa. It served as a crucial precursor to the National Convention of 1908–1909, where the details of the Constitution of (the Union of) South Africa were finalised. The memorandum's author, unnamed in the document, was Lionel Curtis.[1]

Born in Coddington, Nottinghamshire, in 1872 to an Anglican clergyman and his wife, Curtis went to school at Haileybury, the very place where Rudyard Kipling (in an earlier iteration of the school) had been a pupil, and graduated from New College, Oxford, with a third in Classics. Spurred by a call to arms for the empire, Curtis arrived in South Africa during the South African War, or the Boer War, as it is sometimes called.[2] Along with his New College friends Max Balfour and Lionel Hitchens, he was recruited into the cyclists' section of the City Imperial Volunteers, which had been authorized by the Royal Warrant on Christmas Eve 1899. He was attached to Ian Hamilton's column, which marched from Bloemfontein to Pretoria and eventually captured the Boer capital.[3]

Assuming that the war was almost over, Curtis returned to England in June 1900 but was back by September when it became clear that the Boer guerrilla tactics would prolong the fighting. This time he served in the administration. Alfred Milner, the arch-imperialist and British high commissioner to South Africa, soon recruited him as a town clerk for Johannesburg. In this capacity, Curtis proposed the formation of a town council for

1

Johannesburg with a jurisdiction covering seventy-nine square miles. With this decision, the City of Gold turned from a loosely bound mining town into the second largest municipality in the world (after Tokyo) with its own local government.[4] Curtis's hard work was rewarded when in 1903 Milner made him the assistant colonial secretary of the Transvaal, one of the four British South African colonies, the other three being Orange River, Natal and the Cape.

These years as imperial servant in South Africa, as we shall see, were only a prelude to a remarkable career. The call of empire, which he had first answered in 1900, was to remain with him for the rest of his life. The British Empire, as his fellow enthusiast, colleague and collaborator Philip Kerr, was to say, was 'Lionel's God . . . [that] he worships and serves day and night'.[5] His ideas on political and administrative organisation were to organically move up from the city of Johannesburg to the South African state to the British Empire/Commonwealth and eventually to the then increasingly popular idea of 'the international'.

In the age of the decolonization of knowledge, when the demand for epistemological justice is aligned with the search for truth, it is not difficult to appreciate how it was that a set of policy proposals penned by a white, male foreigner could play such a formative role in the establishment of states in distant places. We must be clear that this book is located within the folds of the agitation around decolonization. But it must be equally clear that the sweep of its interest reaches beyond the establishment of South Africa itself towards the creation of the very idea of 'the international'. To sharpen a point that will run the course of these pages: the making of South Africa and the making of the idea of 'the international' are intrinsically linked one with the other.

While this book traces the unfolding of Curtis's project in its broadest terms, its purpose is to show that the effort and the energy of Curtis (and his cohort) in the making of South Africa form a vital precursor to the origins of the academic discipline of International Relations (IR). Usually IR's foundational narratives tether the discipline to a single narrative—namely, the calls for 'peace' at the end of World War I. However, in these pages, we argue that both 'the international' and its politics/relations came into sharp focus in the Anglo-Saxon world in an era preceding the war. The Edwardian empire was bookended by the war in South Africa and the formation of the Union of South Africa. The former was set in concerns about the decline of the empire, while the latter raised hopes for its transformation into a new global order that was increasingly called 'the international'. Between these interstices we find one—among many—of IR's origins stories, one that necessitates our first sketching South Africa's place in the imperial chain of being.

THE IMPERIAL CHAIN OF BEING

In Edwardian England, most discussions on the nature of state, as Jeanne Morefield's work has shown,[6] drew from the Greeks. This was partly as a counterweight to two intellectual currents that had dominated British thinking in mid- and late Victorian England. The first was laissez-faire individualism, insidiously championed by intellectuals such as Herbert Spencer and Alfred Marshall. But laissez-faire, both as a political and an economic doctrine, was possible only so long as the British state remained undemocratic.[7] A spate of reform measures during the later Victorian era, impelled by industrialisation that generated undercurrents of workers' revolution, made the British state more democratic[8]—a development that Spencer was to characterize as the 'rebarbarization' of Britain.[9]

The second dominant influence was the Hegelian state idea that had captivated British intellectuals in the same period. The French Revolution and the rise of Germany as a major power in the late nineteenth century undergirded the Hegelian-inspired liberalism in Britain, especially in the works of idealists at Oxford, such as T. H. Green, Bernard Bosanquet and Edward Caird.[10] While the pull of Bismarckian-type welfarism was irresistible to those who were inspired by its language of social rights,[11] the antidemocratic politics of the newly formed German state also created a general sense of discomfort for those scholars who came of age in the 1880s and 1890s.[12] The urge to 'reform' this liberalism and to present an alternative model gave rise to a whole new interest in Classicist scholarship. Furthermore, the works of scholars like Gilbert Murray and Alfred Zimmern reinforced the idea that the British Empire was the worthy progeny of the Greek commonwealth.[13]

Philosophical inspiration aside, the political roots of this British idealism, manifested in the form of creating a 'commonwealth', can be traced back to the Victorian-era efforts to create a Greater Britain or imperial federation.[14] The underlying idea was that the empire, spread across a wide geographical expanse, ought to be governed as a common political-cum-economic system rather than as separate, detached colonial sovereignties. The idea was framed either as a culturally centred aspiration (i.e., Greater Britain) or as a project for the defence of the empire—both these positions, however, received little encouragement until the late nineteenth century. In 1884, the Imperial Federation League was formed, only to collapse less than a decade later in the face of a strong resentment from self-governing colonies that were seeking not deeper integration but greater autonomy.[15] The idea of a closer form of unity gathered momentum in the first decade of the twentieth century, but only after arguments about the organic union of the empire were advanced from southern Africa rather than from Britain itself. Importantly, besides giving a sense of political ownership to the margins and so blunting their critique

of the idea, the closer union arguments were now holistically framed at the three levels of imperial community: empire, state and society.

An event that prompted the recalibration of this ideological framing was the war in South Africa. In a political etymology of 'imperialism', Richard Koebner and Helmut Dan Schmidt argue that throughout the nineteenth century, the word stood for 'the federation of Great Britain with her colonies for the purpose of spreading what was best in English civilisation, the application of justice and the message of freedom'.[16] But events in South Africa changed this understanding. Up until the outbreak of the Boer War, British imperialism was largely considered a noble force of peace and progress, even by the left-liberals such as the Fabians. Indeed, even at the start of the Boer War, when Fabians debated the war, both the war's critics, such as S. G. Hobson, and its supporters, such as George Bernard Shaw, saw imperialism as a positive force for creation of a higher kind of social organisation. Shaw had even claimed that, of necessity, a Fabian must be an imperialist.[17]

The conflict in South Africa was 'an essential turning point' in this particular understanding because it generated an unprecedented revulsion in Britain for both the war and the imperial project.[18] It divided the Liberal Party into the camps of 'Liberal Imperialists', who supported the policy, and the radicals who opposed the war. Liberal writers like Leonard Courtney (1832–1918), William Stead (editor of *The Times* and a friend of Cecil Rhodes) (1849–1912) and John Hobson (1858–1940) staunchly opposed it.[19] Hobson presented the war in South Africa as a capitalist—even a Jewish—conspiracy. In his book *Imperialism* (1902),[20] written after he returned from South Africa, he argued that the war had given the idea of imperialism 'the status of partial abuse'.[21] So it was that the progressive hopes represented by imperialism came to face a forceful moral challenge from within British intellectual circles.[22] This loss of faith was captured in biblical terms by the liberal journalist G. P. Gooch, who asked, 'What . . . does it profit a state if it gain[s] the whole world and lose[s] its own soul?'[23]

While the Boer War generated moral revulsion from liberals (Henry Campbell-Bannerman attacked the government for using the 'methods of barbarism',[24] and David Lloyd George called it 'an unnecessary, a damnable, even worse perhaps, a senseless war'[25]), it also fanned anxieties about the decline of the empire. Although Britain emerged victorious, it was weakened and felt increasingly insecure about its power and moral authority. Indeed, the Boer War was considered to have inaugurated the decline—if not quite the end—of *Pax Britannica*, that glorious Victorian phase in which Britain's empire had commanded the globe with its power and authority.

The evidence for the declinist position was plain: the most industrialized nation in the world had taken three long years to defeat a largely peasant population, despite pouring 450,000 troops—from the length and breadth

of its empire—into the war. Prior to the onset of hostilities, Joseph Chamberlain, the secretary of state for the colonies, had stated that the war would occasion a question of Britain's continued existence as a great power in the world.[26] It would be 'a long war, a bitter war and a costly war . . . leav[ing] behind it the embers of strife which . . . generations would hardly be long enough to extinguish'.[27] In the event, the war was the largest that Britain fought between the Napoleonic Wars and World War I. Britain endured 100,000 casualties, including 22,000 dead. It cost the treasury £217 million, more than three times the Crimean War, deepening the Edwardian financial crisis.[28] In short, the Boer War exhausted Britain militarily, financially and morally.

Deepening anxiety over military weakness and a resulting ideological vacuum generated fears about the decline of the British 'race'. The reverses in the war were attributed to a link between industrialisation and the emasculation of the British soldier. A notion grew that the slums and squalor of industrial Britain had produced 'a stunted, narrow-chested, easily wearied [dweller] . . . with little ballast, stamina or endurance'.[29] This had emerged, so the logic ran, during the same period as the best Britons had sailed to the 'other Englands'—as the Oxford historian and empire enthusiast J. A. Froude called the white settler colonies.

Such worries played into an increasing lack of confidence in Britain's view of itself as a global power. The country had already been warned off the Atlantic world by the United States in the 1895 Venezuelan Affair—the boundary dispute between Venezuela and the British colony of Guinea—and felt increasingly threatened by the rise of Germany and Japan in the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. The rise of America was generating rumblings around sovereign claims from other settler colonies. For these places, the United States provided a more desirable model of white supremacy. Under Theodore Roosevelt, America's imperial adventures and readiness to flex its military muscle seemed to reassure the settler colonies in the Pacific Rim of a security cover. They were increasingly terrified of the naval and military ascendency of Japan, especially as Britain had withdrawn its navy from the Pacific under the Anglo-Japanese Agreement of 1902. Consequently, when the so-called Great White Fleet, a US naval task force of sixteen battleships, toured the Pacific from 1907 to 1909 to show off a blue-water naval capacity, they were enthusiastically welcomed in both Australia and New Zealand.[30] Indeed, as Roosevelt had declared, the fleet was an 'effort to show to England—I cannot say a "renegade mother country"—that those colonies are white man's country'.[31] Pointily, too, he declined a British government invitation for the same fleet to visit a British port. As a result, there was a concern that an emerging white man's alliance might well exclude Britain altogether.[32]

Out of this sense of despair a new fantasy emerged: 'new imperialism'—an optic through which enthusiasts saw an opportunity to cast a Britain-centred empire into a more politically and militarily decentred white commonwealth. The drift towards this kind of thinking had begun during the war in South Africa when the so-called daughters of the empire—other settler colonies—had fought alongside the British against the Boers. Given this, an Indian commentator was unsurprisingly later to comment, the Australians, New Zealanders and Canadians had 'sealed' the empire connection 'in blood'.[33]

Amidst these anxieties about the physical, moral and intellectual sustenance of the empire, the political, social and economic formations within it were also in flux. There was, for instance, a growing conceptual tension between the idea of empire and the facts of statehood. The spread of capital had ignited a drive towards individual state authority—even at the furthest corners of the imperial project. The political economy of empire, especially in the field of resource extraction, had necessitated new technologies of rule—like railways, telegraph, photography, postage, secret services and so on—even in the margins of the empire.[34] This required increasing levels of bureaucratic control that prefigured political formations. This was especially true of southern Africa, where the discovery of gold and diamonds had catapulted the region into the middle of the imperial—indeed, the global—economy. As the Boer War had illustrated, the press for a South African statehood without or within the folds of empire was a politically charged issue. Further afield, the demands for autonomy in other white settler colonies had resulted in the granting of dominion status to Australia (1901), New Zealand (1907) and even to Newfoundland (1907).[35]

In the face of these unfoldings, it was not clear what the nature of the relationship between these somewhat mutually exclusive political ideas would be, should be, or indeed might become. At the level of both theory and practice, empire and state were operated along two different axes of control of fidelity and sovereignty. How these would (even could) interact with each other was not immediately clear. How was the British Empire to be distinguished from the British state, for instance? Consequently, how was the latter to be distinguished from the Dominions? Until this point, the practice of political rule within the empire was established more by happenstance than a clear-cut understanding of rights and responsibilities.[36] To succeed in a changing world necessitated coordination between the empire and individual states, a political narrative and a ruling ideology.

In order to fashion a theory to underpin these, the Edwardian era had offered more puzzles than solutions in the form of a peculiar social interaction between capital, civil rights and race. Within the empire, the issue of race operated in a contradictory fashion: it called for the instruments of social control, like those provided by sovereignty, while at the same time

encouraging and forcing the wide-scale migration of European, African and Asian populations. The long history of resistance and wars with local African populations had compelled white governments to source labour from neighbouring colonies and from both India and (to a lesser extent) China. Potentially creating a welfare state for whites and at the same time keeping up with the demands of mining capital for cheap labour were contradictory aims, raising questions about rights—political, economic and civic. White publics across the settler colonies, not just in South Africa, were actively resisting Asian immigration—indeed, as Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds have argued, W. E. B. Du Bois's 'global colour line' had emerged largely because there was an increasing transnational white solidarity against Asian immigration.[37] In response, the immigrant communities, particular those from India, had organised to demand civil and political rights as imperial subjects, hence generating a need to rethink the question of imperial citizenship and rights.[38] What form these rights would take and how citizenry would be extended to different 'categories' of immigrants—European, Asian and African—was the big question that confronted the liberal theorists of empire.

Nested alongside the claims on rights was an unresolved social category: race. Throughout the previous century, the racial issue had essentially been dealt with in two ways: extermination and social Darwinism. Initially, non-white races, seen as 'savage', were simply exterminated in settler colonial settings—Tasmania, of course, was the exemplar.[39] But Darwinian theorising promoted a more liberal approach to thinking about the issue: 'non-European races', accorded natural rights, were to be pulled up a civilisational ladder by Europeans.[40] The limitations of social Darwinism were all too plain in an empire in which there were more 'non-Europeans' than 'Europeans'—namely, what would happen when all the 'natives' were all finally civilised? This raised the spectre of a terrifying future in which there would be no need for colonialism. Worse, this implied that political power in many parts of the empire would fall in the hands of non-Europeans, leaving the future of European settlers uncertain. A more apocalyptic interpretation of the same outcome was that the Europeans would face extermination by indigenous people.

Discussions on race (and the idea of civil rights) were informed by the tide of world events: Japan's victory over Russia in 1904, for instance. In the words of African American scholar W. E. B. Du Bois, this victory broke the 'foolish magic of the word "white"'.[41] As a result new Asian powers—such as Japan, China and India—laid claims to civilisational parity with Europe and the United States. Immigrants from these countries, who were scattered across the empire, called for civil rights under the pretext of their civilisational equality with Europeans.[42]

The need to think all of these socio-political questions—within the ambit of the empire and its future—inspired the formation of the Fortnightly Club,

a development that stands as a foundation stone in the arguments that run through these pages. And sharpening the questions faced by this new formation was the fact that the immediate concerns of the British colonies in southern Africa were a reflection of what the empire faced elsewhere.

Take the issue of defence: as Britain was threatened by other powers, Germany especially, so were the colonies in southern Africa—for instance, the Cape Colony abutted German South-West Africa. German fantasies of creating a 'German India' in the southern corner of Africa, in collaboration with the Boers, had been a constant source of insecurity.[43] But there were other threats to defence too—several of which were more local. In 1905, each of South Africa's four colonies had dispatched troops to suppress the Bambatha Rebellion, an uprising in the colony of Natal against the imposition of a poll tax, after the fashion of the Boer War, when other white settler colonies—Australia, New Zealand and Canada—had sent their forces to fight the cause of empire. Such cases demonstrated that faced with a common threat, all the colonies were willing to pull their resources together. However, both these instances—the Boer War and the Bambatha Rebellion—had also demonstrated the immense challenges of creating a common defence position without a form of political unity.

For two further reasons the southern African colonies were the best example of the racial and immigrant quandaries faced elsewhere in the empire. For one thing, they encapsulated the empire's intra-civilisational European conflict around the Irish Question. In their own English-Afrikaner/British-Boer[44] relations as well as the inter-civilisational interface between the Europeans and the non-Europeans, the southern African colonies juxtaposed two civilizational extremes: the English and the Africans. For another, interlocking networks of race, capital and the idea of civilisation had created a liminal zone—a place of political uncertainty that immigrant Asians straddled. Their rights within South Africa—which were premised on their rights as subjects of the empire—was being stridently championed by Mohandas Gandhi. Quite inadvertently, Lionel Curtis himself had launched Gandhi's political career. Gandhi had decided to return to India after the South African War, when he noticed in a newspaper that the then town clerk of Johannesburg, Curtis, had issued an order for Indians to register their fingerprints within the jurisdiction of the city. Gandhi immediately accused Curtis of 'selling' his 'grand design' of reconciliation between South Africa's two white communities by making Indians a target of racial prejudice. Gandhi believed that the rights Indians received as subjects of the empire has been forfeited in order to achieve white unity in South Africa.[45] As the legend runs, Gandhi cancelled his return journey to Bombay and stayed in South Africa to launch *satyagraha*.

In no other part of the empire were these (and other) questions simultaneously and immediately so relevant as they were in South Africa. As a result,

the disjuncture between 'empire' and 'state' was pressing, even though the nature and form of local statehood was yet to be determined. It was also not very well understood theoretically. The social puzzles provided by the southern African question had wide-reaching ramifications not only for the region but for the empire as a whole, making the region an important laboratory for the future of political rule.

Finally, the calls for an organic union of the empire were also driven in part by the spectacular domestic success of the United States of America. F. S. Oliver's book on Alexander Hamilton, author of *The Federalist Papers*, had triggered the notion of creating a federal state in southern Africa.[46] But the American story was also important on another register: it was a reminder of fraternal loss. Had more accommodative policies been followed in the case of the thirteen American colonies, they would still be part of the British Empire. And if America had stayed with Britain, the empire would be immeasurably stronger and feel far less threatened. South and southern Africa offered a chance to not repeat a historical mistake as well as to create a more stable and unified political structure on the world stage.

This is why the challenge of statehood in southern Africa was both a precursor of and a model for the grander project of the organic union of the empire. Moreover, as we have suggested, it was interlaced with issues that touched on domestic politics and two emerging challenges that would shape the future: how to organise the emerging idea of the international and how to cope with the emerging issue of rights. These questions were taken up with curiosity and fervour by an epistemic formation that was to have a lasting impact on the imaginations of South Africa in 1900s, the empire in the 1910s and 1920s and the world in the 1920s and 1930s.

And it is to this epistemic formation that we now turn.

MILNER AND HIS KINDERGARTEN

The decades between 1885 and 1905 catapulted southern Africa into an imperial project of modern statehood. The area itself was situated at the political and conceptual margins of the empire and fractured into several forms of political rule. At its epicentre was the city of Johannesburg, which transformed from obscurity into the global centre of economic fortunes in the same decades. This prompted the Australian journalist Ambrose Pratt to call it 'the twentieth century prototype of Ancient Babylon and Nineveh'.[47]

For the representative of empire Alfred Milner, Johannesburg exhibited the clash between 'a medieval race oligarchy and a modern industrial state'.[48] Considering southern Africa 'the weakest link in the Imperial chain', Milner had arrived in South Africa to assert British superiority over the Boer

republics.[49] Beneath this intent lay a far grander agenda—namely, construct-ing a new state that would serve as a model for other parts of the empire. A microcosm of the empire in all its problems and prospects, southern Africa was to be the testing ground, from where Milner (and others like him) would work upwards towards a new, grand vision of the empire. Once the Boer republics were destroyed by the British victory, Milner's attention turned towards the ideal of a united South Africa as part of a network of sister states joined to England, the imperial centre. British Transvaal would for him be the stepping-stone to a British South Africa, which in turn would lead to a consolidated imperial federation.[50]

Milner's project of state building began with an overhaul of the bureau-cracy, the first institution of the state. The Transvaal bureaucracy was for him 'the Augean Stable' of incompetence and corruption.[51] In pursuit of the Weberian ideal of efficient bureaucracy, Milner looked no further than his own alma mater, Oxford.[52] In the few years following the Boer War, he recruited a group of young men from Oxford—mainly from New College and Balliol—who helped deliver the dream of a united country. The original scheme had been to recruit senior Oxford academics, but when the British government refused to sanction adequate salaries, Milner realized he would have to make do with younger graduates.[53]

Derisively called 'Milner's Kindergarten' (first by William Marriot), the group over the years came to include Robert Brand (1878–1963), Patrick Duncan (1870–1943), Geoffrey Robinson (later known as Dawson) (1874–1944), Richard Feetham (1874–1965), Dougal O. Malcolm (1877–1955), Hugh Wyndham (1877–1963), Lionel Hitchens (1874–1940), F. (Peter) Perry (1873–1935), Philip Kerr (1882–1940), John Dove (1872–1934) and Lionel Curtis (1872–1955).[54] Most of these men were to become influen-tial in various spheres of late imperial life. Brand, raised to the peerage in 1946, was a leading figure in London banking circles. Duncan finished his sterling political career as South Africa's governor general from 1937, dying in office in 1943. Robinson (Dawson) was editor of *The Times* (of London) for close to twenty-six years. Richard Feetham became a South African Supreme Court judge and served on several high-profile interna-tional commissions, including the Irish Boundary Commission in 1924 and 1925, of which he was the chairperson. Dougal Malcolm was the director and eventually president of the British South Africa Company, an avatar of the British East India Company in southern Africa. Hugh Wyndham, later Fourth Baron Leconfield, after a short political career in South Africa, left for England in 1923, wrote several books, and was active in Chatham House. Lionel Hitchens became the chairperson of the influential shipbuilding company Cammell Laird in 1910 and remained so until his death in 1940. John Dove served as the editor of the *Round Table*, the pioneering journal

in the field of International Relations,[55] from 1920 until 1934. Philip Kerr, later Marquess of Lothian, served as the first editor of the *Round Table* and subsequently occupied several important government positions, including private secretary to British prime minister David Lloyd George during World War I and ambassador to the United States in 1939 and 1940.[56] Some of the temporary or peripheral members of the group included the famous architect Herbert Baker (1862–1946)—jokingly called 'Grand-Pa' in the group—and the British journalist and influential politician Leo Amery (1873–1955). Although this group remained tethered to Milner through its moniker, its intellectual energy surpassed both Milner and his immediate vision. Its members went on to advance ideas that had far greater ramifications for not just South African or imperial issues but global politics too. The Round Table group, which emerged from the Kindergarten, was seen, during World War I and the interwar years, as 'a cabal of considerable power'.[57] Indeed, no less a person than Lloyd George had called them 'perhaps the most powerful [group] in the country'.[58] The intellectual guiding light of these groups—Kindergarten and the Round Table—however remained Lionel Curtis, who judiciously gained the moniker 'the Prophet'.[59] Of the many initiatives of Curtis, both intellectual and institutional, perhaps the most important for our claim about the origins of IR is that he was the founder of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, or Chatham House, as it is popularly known in IR circles and far beyond.

During South Africa's reconstruction period (1902–1905) under Milner's leadership, various existing but scattered practices, such as controlling the urban influx of Africans through pass laws, the creation of 'reserves' and the imposition of indirect rule, were consolidated in servicing an industrializing state.[60] Although Milner left South Africa in 1905, the members of his Kindergarten took upon themselves the task of promoting a federation of the South African colonies. From 1906 to 1909, the Kindergarten worked behind the scenes to bring the four colonies together in the form of an 'organic union' and visualised this as a model that could be replicated on a grander scale throughout the empire. British ambitions in southern Africa had long toyed with the idea of uniting the then embryonic states and colonies. By 1907, however, the context and content of its enunciation was different. With its victory in the Boer War, Britain controlled the two former Boer republics and the numerous African kingdoms as well as its own colonies, Natal and the Cape. While the mission of the Selborne Memorandum was to lay out a case for sovereign unity, there was little clarity about what shape (or form) it would take. This task was to fall to a members-only association, steered by the Kindergarten, called the Fortnightly Club.

Organised by Curtis and others, the first meeting of this club took place on 4 October 1906 in the house of a Kindergarten member, Richard Feetham,

called 'the Moot House'. As we will see in chapter 3, the name was to gain legendary fame in the Round Table Movement—an epistemic formation whose connection to the Fortnightly Club as well as early IR is fleshed out in these pages. Over two years, some forty young British devotees of the empire met more than two dozen times to discuss ideas around empire, race and statehood. Essentially, their focus was on southern Africa, but their comparative canvas was wide, and it drew from understandings of developments elsewhere, especially from across the Anglo-Saxon world, including the United States. Years later, when Curtis floated the idea for the establishment of an Institute of International Affairs, he insisted that its first task was to organise monthly meetings where a member would present a paper followed by non-minuted discussions—the latter was important because only this would ensure frank discussions.[61] This model—which was to take root across the world—was drawn from the experience of the Johannesburg-based Fortnightly Club.

Curtis's ideas, like the institutions that carried them, were able to travel from private spaces into the public domain through a calibrated strategy. In order to encourage political union in southern Africa, the Kindergarten established a body called the Association of Closer Union Societies in September 1908. Known as the Closer Union Societies, its sole purpose was to propagate the idea of common statehood across the southern African region. In addition, a bilingual journal, *The State/De Staat*, was launched in January 1909. Its purpose was to provide a platform for the Closer Union Societies to articulate a common statehood. These initiatives were central to the political strategy of the Kindergarten. The Kindergarten also produced two sets of books, each of which fostered the goal of a regional political formation—these were titled *The Government of South Africa* (which ran to two volumes) and *The Framework of the Union*.[62]

Published anonymously, the *Government of South Africa* volumes were written by Curtis.[63] In their writing, a mode of research that later became synonymous with the 'scientific method' in the study of IR, was to be perfected. Curtis would begin by conducting field researches, reading widely and conducting interviews with influential people. He would then prepare a draft that would be privately circulated to groups of sympathetic allies—a form of peer review. On the basis of this input, Curtis would rewrite the draft, and finally it would be published anonymously. Such documents had both public and policy appeal. They were meant to serve as public manifestoes but also to appear as if they were 'dropped in the path of . . . statesman' for the latter to consult while making policies.[64]

The *Framework of the Union*, also published anonymously (but written by another associate of the Kindergarten, B. K. Long) under the banner of

the Closer Union Societies, compiled federal constitutions from five different countries as a comparative template that southern Africa could follow. The *Government* volumes catered to the analytical side of research, while the *Framework* fulfilled the need for information and reference. By creating both an analytical and an information archive on practices of statehood, the Kindergarten and its associates hoped to guide Whitehall bureaucrats and local politicians towards a particular policy outcome; the task of shaping public opinion was left to the Closer Union Societies and the journal *The State*.

Statehood in southern Africa was thus not confined to practices of boundary ma(r)king. The ideas for statehood had to draw together various threads of thinking that encompassed all three levels of the imperial project that have already crossed our paths: empire, state and society. As we have hinted earlier, a political union in southern Africa was instrumental not only for its own purpose but also because it also reverberated with the major concerns that faced the British Empire. Milner's young disciples viewed southern Africa as a laboratory of the empire—a place where a new conception of the empire could be tried, tested and finally elevated to the international level.

And, indeed, that is what happened. As soon as South African statehood was achieved, the Kindergarten embarked on replicating the South African model across the empire. In the same fashion as in South Africa, societies were set up across the Dominions and a journal common to all these societies was established; it was called the *Round Table*. The new mission was the organic union of the empire, and Lionel Curtis once again assumed the role of imperial missionary, travelling across the empire to establish such societies and spread the gospel. The product of Curtis's efforts was the 1916 book *The Commonwealth of Nations*, which played an instrumental role in popularizing the idea of the 'British Commonwealth', effectively replacing the term 'empire'. A concise version of his argument had earlier circulated privately among the members of the Round Table Societies in a book titled *The Problem of the Commonwealth*.[65]

It would be an overstatement to claim that Milner's Kindergarten drove the project of South African statehood to its end. Rather, more deserving of that credit were local politicians like Jan Smuts, John X. Merriman and Louis Botha. However, the lore of the Kindergarten's success in South Africa, which spread across the Dominions, provided legitimacy to the later work of the Round Table. Much of this was based on the tales they told the world.[66] A belief took hold about how '30–40 men went and planted themselves in the different colonies in South Africa' and 'accomplished [the South African] union' through research and propaganda.[67] South Africa not only provided the ideological framework for their thinking on questions of race, empire, rights

and international affairs but also gave them a legitimacy that was often marshalled as their primary capital in asserting their influence.

Over the course of this book, we will focus on the construction of South Africa as an epistemic project in the writings and efforts of the Kindergarten. The imagination of South African statehood moves beyond its borders and frontiers and travels into the imperial metropole to evolve and emerge in multiple other projects: the British Commonwealth and the world state are two such. The narrative is carried through the work of members of the Kindergarten; our focus will invariably be on Lionel Curtis and also Philip Kerr. In academic literature, the imperial lives and ideas of Curtis and Kerr have been well covered. These and other tomes have also amply focussed on the projects of the British Commonwealth and the world federation.[68] Historians, however, have generally paid less attention to the lasting impact of the South African projects, in particular two very important initiatives of the Kindergarten: the Fortnightly Club and the journal *The State*. While keeping our eyes on the imperial project, we will closely read the arguments made in the Fortnightly Club and *The State* and suggest how these formations played a formative role in the thinking of the Kindergarten as well as their imagination not just of South Africa but also of the world. Although the Kindergarten built their legitimacy on the successful completion of the project of South African statehood, the Round Table Movement, which was built upon this success, remained, ironically, weakest in the country of its origins. Indeed, Curtis and Kerr, among others, left South Africa in 1909 to form Round Table Societies across the empire in a bid to replicate the South African model, but the movement gained very few followers within the country itself. The prodigals, however, sought to metaphorically return to South Africa in the late 1920s and early 1930s through an institutional formation—the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA). In the intervening years, the Round Table—the imperial version of the Kindergarten—was undoubtedly the most important thought collective, which influenced the formation of institutes and chairs of international relations across the Anglo-Saxon world. Curtis, whose contributions to the discipline often go unacknowledged, like the Selborne Memorandum, remained the invisible main author of many such initiatives.

Chapter 2 broadly positions Curtis and his role in the academic study of international relations and traces the presence of South Africa in his global imagination, which produced both institutions and ideas. Chapter 3 frames the debates within the Fortnightly Club in the Edwardian context and pays specific attention to how ideas of segregation emerged in the South Africa. The South Africa–specific version of segregation, we argue, later shaped the

notions of trusteeship in the League of Nations. Chapter 4 is an intellectual history of the journal *The State*, a short-lived journal that, albeit briefly, was the official journal of the Closer Union Societies. The journal was the template on which, arguably, one of the first journals—if not *the* first—in the field of International Relations, the *Round Table*, was based. Chapter 5 takes a twenty-year leap and focusses on discussions and debates preceding the foundation of the SAIIA. All these initiatives, much like the discipline that birthed them, were underpinned by specific understandings of race—something that IR as a discipline has only recently started to acknowledge.

As such, in this South Africa–focused narrative, we make three contributions. Our first original claim is towards the discipline of International Relations itself. IR's historiographical turn has allowed for new histories of the discipline. However, even the new critical histories remain squarely focussed on (and, mostly, in) the West. We attempt to dislodge the source of 'origins', whether Aberystwyth or America. To be clear, our assertion about Johannesburg's 'origins' is not for claim on a birth certificate. We remain attentive to the fact that our narrative is only one among several possible stories of disciplinary origins. A crack at the 'origins' in that sense is only aimed at throwing open a field of possibilities for more histories to be mined and written. There is a strong possibility—given the ubiquity of race, imperialism and patriarchy— that such stories intersect. In pitching our story as a provocative 'origin' story, we are making a case for alternative genealogies in order to dislocate 'Aberystwyth' as the discipline's fountainhead. Contrary to belief, the Aberystwyth claim is not just of 'institutional' origins—but tied to it is a strong assumption that IR's founding was driven by 'a global vision' and a pious hope for world peace.[69] But, as others have argued[70] and we will also show, this myth is misleading and fundamentally silences a past that is thoroughly implicated in, to use Friedrich Nietzsche's term, a *pudendo origo*, a dirty origin.

Our second claim in not entirely novel but decidedly pushes forward one made by Robert Vitalis and other disciplinary historians that race was central to early imaginings of IR. There is a caveat here, of course: this is not a story of the Global South—or a non-Western story. White men still dominate in this story, but that is to show precisely how IR as a discipline emerged as an imperial project. But what is important to acknowledge is that the non-West was present—as the subject to be acted upon. The proper context of the emergence of IR is imperialism, and in our story we show how South Africa serves as a laboratory for such ideas and their implementation.

Finally, we believe there are new historical insights in the material we have explored, especially with regard to the Fortnightly Club, *The State* and the SAIIA. Historians of South Africa and the British Commonwealth have not paid close attention to any of these initiatives, notwithstanding that much has been written on the Kindergarten and the Round Table Movement. Indeed,

these initiatives provide a holistic context to the thinking and working of these two closely connected epistemic formations. In particular, this work serves as an invitation to IR scholars and practitioners to engage further in navigating South African IR's own disciplinary history, a fuller account of which remains to be written.

NOTES

1. J. W. Shepardson, "Lionel Curtis: Commonwealth Builder," Round Table Papers, MS. Eng. Hist. c. 855, Bodleian Library, Oxford, 23, 1949.

2. On the contestations over the naming and labelling of the war, see Gred Cuthbertson and Alan Jeeves, "The Many-Sided Struggle for Southern Africa, 1899–1902," *South African Historical Journal* 41, no. 1 (1999): 2–21.

3. Also accompanying Hamilton was the soldier-turned-journalist Winston Churchill, who wrote a book about it. See Winston Churchill, *Ian Hamilton's March* (New York: Longmans Green, 1900).

4. G. A. Leyds, *A History of Johannesburg: The Early Years* (Cape Town: Nasionale Boekhandel, 1964), 269.

5. Deborah Lavin, *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1995), 128.

6. Jeanne Morefield, *Covenants without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005).

7. A. M. McBriar, *Fabian Socialism and English Politics, 1884–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 73. For opposing perspectives on the nature of the British state in the nineteenth century, see A. V. Dicey, *Lectures on the Relationship between Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century* (London: Macmillan, 1905); J. B. Brebner, "Laissez-Faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth-Century Britain," *Journal of Economic History*, supplement 8 (1948): 59–70; Oliver MacDonagh, "The Nineteenth-Century Revolution in Government: A Reappraisal," *Historical Journal* 1 (1958): 52–67.

8. Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation.* Foreword by Robert M. MacIver (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944).

9. Herbert Spencer, *The Man versus the State* (Caldwell, ID: Caxton Publishers, 1965).

10. On how these thinkers influenced Fabian circles, see McBriar, *Fabian Socialism*, 74.

11. Samuel Moyn, *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World* (London: Belknap Press, 2018), 30.

12. Morefield, *Covenants*, 55.

13. Daniel Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006), 14.

14. Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

15. See, for instance, John Merriman, "The Closer Union of the Empire," *Nineteenth Century* 21 (1887): 507–16.

16. Richard Koebner and Helmut Dan Schmidt, *Imperialism: The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 230.

17. McBriar, *Fabian Socialism,* 119–24.

18. Koebner and Schmidt, *Imperialism*, 230.

19. Koebner and Schmidt, *Imperialism*, 248; John G. Goddard, *Racial Supremacy, Being Studies in Imperialism* (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1905), 227.

20. J. A. Hobson, *Imperialism, a Study* (London: J. Nisbet, 1902).

21. Koebner and Schmidt, *Imperialism*, 221–49.

22. However, even the critics were not completely dismissive of British imperialism. Instead, what they asked for was more socially and ethically driven imperialism. While Hobson called for 'sane imperialism', the Fabian circle articulated in favour of socialist imperialism. See David Boucher and Andrew Vincent, *British Idealism: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Continuum, 2012), 141.

23. G. P. Gooch, "Imperialism," in *The Heart of Empire: Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England. With an Essay on Imperialism*, ed. C. F. G. Masterman, 2nd ed. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907 [1901]), 308–400.

24. Martin Plaut, *Promise and Despair: The First Struggle for a Non-racial South Africa* (Johannesburg: Jacana, 2016), 32.

25. Frank Owen, *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George, His Life and Times* (London: Hutchinson, 1954), 98.

26. Plaut, *Promise and Despair*.

27. Quoted in Andrew Porter, "The South African War and the Historians," *African Affairs* 99, no. 397 (2000): 635.

28. Plaut, *Promise and Despair,* 635.

29. C. F. G. Masterman, "Realities at Home," in *The Heart of Empire: Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England. With an Essay on Imperialism*, ed. C. F. G. Masterman, 2nd ed. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907 [1901]), 8.

30. Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 203.

31. Quoted in Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*, 197.

32. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*, 199.

33. As stated by an Indian politician in 1915. See "Resolution on the Representation of India at the Imperial Conference," SAB, PM, vol. 1/1/36, Ref. PM32/1/1936, National Archives, Pretoria, 14. India, too, had sent its forces, but, presumably, they were not allowed any combative role and thus were excluded from this blood pact.

34. Peter Vale, "Unlocking Social Puzzles: Colony, Crime and Chronical. An Interview with Charles van Onselen," *Thesis Eleven* 36, no. 1 (2016): 35–48.

35. Canada had achieved that status in 1867.

36. As John Seeley was to write in his *The Expansion of England*, 'We seem, as it were, to have conquered half the world in a fit of absence of mind.' John R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (London: Macmillan, 1890), 8;

Bernard Porter, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: What the British Really Thought about Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

37. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*.

38. Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*. See also Sukanya Banerjee, *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in Late-Victorian Empire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010).

39. Sven Lindqvist, *Exterminate All the Brutes: One man's Odyssey into the Heart of Darkness and the Origins of the European Genocide* (New York: New Press, 2002); Patrick Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).

40. Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

41. Quoted in Reginald Kearney, *African American Views of the Japanese: Solidarity or Sedition* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), 19.

42. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*.

43. Martin Kroger, "Imperial Germany and the Boer War: From Colonial Fantasies to the Reality of Anglo-German Estrangement," in *The International Impact of the Boer War*, ed. Keith Wilson (London: Routledge, 2001), 26.

44. As was the practice in South Africa at the time, we use English/British and Boer/Afrikaner interchangeably in this book. The term 'English' referred to speakers of English, including Irish, Scots, Welsh, and English.

45. For this, see Arnold Toynbee, *Acquaintances* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 138–39.

46. F. S. Oliver, *Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union* (London: Constable, 1906). See also John Fair, "F. S. Oliver, Alexander Hamilton and the 'American Plan' for Resolving Britain's Constitutional Crisis, 1903–1921," *Twentieth Century British History* 10, no. 1 (1999): 1–26.

47. Charles Van Onselen, *New Babylon, New Nineveh: Everyday Life on the Witwatersrand, 1886–1914* (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 1982), 3.

48. Milner quoted in Walter Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men: The "Kindergarten" in Edwardian Imperial Affairs* (London: Hodder and Stoughten, 1968), 18.

49. John Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement and Imperial Union* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 8.

50. Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement*, 9.

51. J. R. M. Butler, *Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr), 1882–1940* (London: Macmillan, 1960), 11.

52. When Milner visited Britain on leave from South Africa in 1901, the *Oxford Magazine* had devoted a sonnet to him:

Not as the Roman came from lands forlorn,
Misgoverned for his own aggrendisement,
But without pomp he comes, with labour worn
For those he ruled.

  In Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986), 17.

53. Symonds, *Oxford and Empire*, 63.

54. For more on the group and Curtis's role in it, see the following works: Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*; Lavin, *From Empire to International Commonwealth*; Leonard Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa, 1902–1910* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1960); Carroll Quigley, *Anglo-American Establishment* (New York: Book in Focus, 1981); Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement*; Alexander C. May, "The Round Table, 1910–1966" (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1995); Andrea Bosco and Alexander C. May, eds., *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997); Andrea Bosco, *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire (1909–1919)* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017); Jeanne Morefield, *Empires without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

55. There is surprising little work on the *Round Table* as a species of international relations scholarship. See Timothy M. Shaw and Lucian M. Ashworth, "Commonwealth Perspectives on International Relations," *International Affairs* 86, no. 5 (2010): 1149–65.

56. Not much is known about Perry's later life. He was closely associated with the Kindergarten in South Africa and acted as secretary to the Rand Native Labour Association but left the country in 1910. He first moved to England and from there to Canada. He died in 1935. See Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 198–201.

57. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, ix.

58. Quoted in Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, ix.

59. Curtis was first called 'the Prophet' by Philip Kerr's brother, David Kerr, in 1912 when Curtis was the Beit Lecturer at Oxford. See Shepardson, "Lionel Curtis," 11.

60. Shula Marks and Stanley Trapido, "The Politics of Race, Class and Nationalism," in *The Politics of Race, Class and Nationalism in Twentieth Century South Africa*, ed. Shula Marks and Stanley Trapido (London: Longman, 1987), 7.

61. "Minute of a Meeting at the Hotel Majestic on Friday, May 30, 1919, to Consider a Project for Forming an Institute of International Affairs," Folder 2 (1)—Foundation of RIIA, Paris 1919, Chatham House Archives, London.

62. Lionel Curtis, *The Government of South Africa*, Vols. 1 and 2 (South Africa: Central News Agency, 1908); B. K. Long, *The Framework of the Union: A Comparison of Some Union Constitutions* (Cape Town: Cape Times Limited, 1908).

63. This was first acknowledged by Basil Williams in the introduction to the Selborne Memorandum when it was first publicly released in 1925. See Basil Williams, ed., *The Selborne Memorandum: A Review of the Mutual Relations of the British South African Colonies in 1907* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925). See also Shepardson, "Lionel Curtis," J. W. Shepardson's unpublished biography annotated by Curtis.

64. Shepardson, "Lionel Curtis," 23.

65. Lionel Curtis, *The Problem of the Commonwealth* (London: Macmillan, 1915); Lionel Curtis, *The Commonwealth of Nations: An Inquiry into the Nature of Citizenship in the British Empire, and into the Mutual Relations of the Several Communities Thereof, Part I* (London: Macmillan, 1916).

66. See, for instance, Robert Brand, *The Union of South Africa* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 30–31.

67. S. A. Atkinson to Lionel Curtis, 10 May 1912, MSS Eng. Hist. 777, f. 68.

68. Lavin, *From Empire*; Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*; Butler, *Lord Lothian*; Toynbee, *Acquaintances*; Bosco and May, *The Round Table*; Quigley, *Anglo-American Establishment*; Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement*; Bosco, *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire*; May, "The Round Table"; Morefield, *Empires without Imperialism*.

69. "History," Aberystwyth University, https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/interpol/about/history (accessed 30 November 2018).

70. Except for a recent article by James Cotton and A. L. Bostoc's helpful but inadequate account, SAIIA's origins have not been investigated. See James Cotton, "Chatham House and Africa c1920–1960: The Limitations of the Curtis Vision," *South African Historical Journal*, 68, no. 2 (2016): 147–62; A. L. Bostock, *A Short History of the South African Institute of International Affairs, 1934–1984* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs, 1984).

Chapter 2

The 'South African Model'

THE MISSING 'IDEALIST'

In 1936, the University of Wales, Aberystwyth, appointed Edward Hallett Carr (1882–1982) as the Woodrow Wilson Professor of International Relations. He was the fourth occupant of this chair, founded seventeen years earlier, in 1919, with the 'with the help of a generous endowment of £20,000 given by David Davies, as a memorial to the students killed and wounded in the First World War'.[1] The formal record suggests that 'Davies was moved by a global vision, forged in the fires of war, aimed at repairing the shattered family of nations and, more ambitiously, to redeem the claims of men and women in a great global commonwealth—the League of Nations'.[2] Apparently, Davies and Carr did not get along—indeed, Davies had tried to stall Carr's appointment and, when overruled, stormed out of the selection committee meeting.[3] Davies's opposition to Carr may have been personal, but Carr's political vision did not mesh well with Davies'. The very next year, Carr was to embark on a book—more polemical and less rigorous than all his previous, even subsequent, writings—that was an intellectual stab at Davies's vision.

Carr titled the manuscript *Utopia and Reality*, but, as often happens, the title did not survive the publisher's whim. The eventual compromise with Macmillan was *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to International Relations*. But this was somewhat misrepresentative, for it led generations of students of international relations (IR) to confuse this book with another that the author had also just published, *International Relations since the Peace Treaties*. The latter was a lucid history of the interwar years and was primarily intended as an introductory text for students.[4] *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, for its part, belied the immediate

21

promise of its subtitle. Rather than being an introduction, it was a polemical takedown of the academic study of International Relations during the interwar years.

Intriguingly, however, *The Twenty Years' Crisis* eventually has fulfilled the promise of its subtitle: it has become an introductory text regularly taught in IR courses around the world. For many, the book was prophetic in predicting the most disastrous war of modern human history, World War II, and it is often heralded as the most significant text in the discipline of IR.[5] As Peter Wilson argues, it influenced a whole generation of post-war IR scholars such as Hans Morgenthau, Hedley Bull, Martin Wight, Susan Strange, Joseph Frankel, Nicholas Spykman and John Herz, causing a paradigmatic shift in thinking in the field. Wilson adds that no other book, including Kenneth Waltz's much-hailed *Theory of International Politics* and, more latterly, Alexander Wendt's pathbreaking *Social Theory of International Politics*, has been able to replicate its effect.[6]

Revisionists have suggested that *The Twenty Years' Crisis* was an attempt to take down a strawman of Carr's own creation, 'idealism'.[7] In the book, Carr presented a binary division to explain the intellectual world of IR. Scientific thinking in the field, just like in any other field of human enquiry (including the physical sciences), Carr argued, proceeded in stages of development. The earliest stage in this scientific development was akin to the beliefs of the 'primitive peoples that the evidence of the truth of an idea is not separate from the quality which renders it present', Carr wrote.[8] Likewise, he deduced that in the 'primitive' or 'utopian' stage of IR, 'the investigators . . . pay little attention to existing "facts" or to the analysis of cause and effect, but will devote themselves whole-heartedly to the elaboration of visionary projects for the attainment of the ends which they have in view—projects whose simplicity and perfection give them an easy and universal appeal'.[9] The utopian conception, Carr went on, is teleological: it imagines an end and then creates the arguments that support this goal. Against this, he posited the 'realist' conception—an advance from the 'utopian' understanding of international relations. Realism bases its arguments on 'facts' and existing reality. However, he added, and this is often missed in readings of Carr, that for him realism was not the culmination of scientific IR thought. As mature science, Carr proposed, IR would evolve to create a synthesis of idealism and realism, purpose and power, ethics and force.[10]

Interestingly, perhaps the most resounding criticism of Carr's work has come from a fellow realist, Hans Morgenthau. The German émigré scholar, writing several years later, noticed that Carr's works concealed his own utopianism, which was much worse than that of the interwar idealists.[11] The interwar idealists had fetishized morality; Carr, Morgenthau

alleged, had done the same with power. Morgenthau claimed that Carr's relativist and instrumental conception of morality implied that whosoever held dominance in power also became the purveyor of superior morality. While Carr blamed, justifiably so for Morgenthau, nineteenth-century liberal thought, Western democracy, national self-determination and laissez-faire economics for a retrogression of political thinking in the West, Carr's own preference for a collectivist state had pushed him periodically to defend Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin. His *The Twenty Years' Crisis* had championed the appeasement of Hitler (in the first edition, he had called Munich the model for negotiating peaceful change),[12] and his subsequent works were dedicated to the defence of the Soviet state.[13] In a terse but devastating summary of Carr's life work, Morgenthau concluded, 'It is a dangerous thing to be a Machiavelli. It is a disastrous thing to be a Machiavelli without *virtù*'.[14]

Thus, Morgenthau criticized Carr not only for being utopian but also for demonstrating a lack of any stable moral compass—or transcendental ethic—in pursuing his idealism. Distinguishing Carr's idealism from the morality of his positions, Morgenthau emphasized a difference Carr himself had failed to make in criticizing the British idealists. In his criticisms of idealists, Carr had assumed that utopianism and morality were intertwined. His definition of a utopian was one 'who bases a political system on morality alone'.[15] Consequently, while denouncing early IR 'theory' for its lack of realism, Carr had elevated it to a moral high ground.

Understanding the disciplinary narrative that has come down to us in this exchange is important for a book concerned with race, which is why we have spent some time with it. By equating British idealism with morality, Carr inadvertently sanitised IR's deep and regressive racism. Indeed, an understanding of race as 'natural' was common to most political analysis until World War II,[16] but curiously Carr's (and, later, IR's) equation of 'idealism' with morality succeeded in erasing the issue of race from IR's disciplinary memory. Another, distinctly sharper-eyed political commentator, George Orwell, was quick to point this fallacy out in a consideration of the schemes of world union. In the same year that Carr's book was published, American journalist Clarence Streit's *Union Now*[17] was issued. Calling for a union of major 'mature' democracies of the world, the book was well received in British 'idealist' circles. To this Kantian call, Orwell responded,

> What would really be happening if Mr. Streit's scheme [of a Union of World's democracies] were put into operation. The British and French empires, with their six hundred million disenfranchised human beings, would simply be receiving fresh police forces; the huge strength of the USA would be behind

the robbery of India and Africa. Mr Streit is letting cats out of bags, but *all* phrases like 'Peace Bloc', 'Peace Front', etc. contain some such implication; all imply a tightening up of the existing structure. The unspoken clause is always 'not counting niggers'. For how can we make a 'firm stand' against Hitler if we are simultaneously weakening ourselves at home? In other words, how can we 'fight fascism' except by bolstering up a far vaster injustice?[18]

Orwell noted the deep-seated racism inherent in all such schemes, which was missed by most IR critiques of this idealism, including Carr's. But before we make our leap into analysing the issue of race in IR, let's first see which idealists Carr had fingered.

In *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, Carr draws on arguments and statements variously from Norman Angell, Arnold Toynbee, Alfred Zimmern and Woodrow Wilson, to mention a few. However, in the preface to the second edition of the book that appeared after World War II, he states that 'nearly all thinking, both academic and popular, about international politics in English speaking countries from 1919 to 1939' exhibited this form of idealism.[19] The academic rumination around this accusation has muddied the water by arguing that those fingered by Carr were not such woolly-headed 'idealists' who exclusively relied on moral arguments for the creation of a 'world state'. Rather, it is claimed they were sufficiently 'realist' in their writings. However, remarkably, there is one individual who is almost never mentioned in these debates about the supposed 'idealism' of the interwar years—in fact, even Carr doesn't refer to him. And yet, if one has to point to someone who best epitomised this form of 'idealism' and a work that almost perfectly fits all of Carr's descriptions of this scholarship, it is Lionel Curtis, who is at his idealist best in his three-volume study *Civitas Dei*, published between 1934 and 1937.[20]

Lionel Curtis's absence from IR's disciplinary chronicles could be partly attributed to the man himself—he consciously underplayed his own role in establishing the discipline, being the quintessential behind-the-scenes man as a matter of both habit and methodological choice.[21] Technically, he was only one of the many acknowledged founders of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), but, as Chatham House was once to admit, Curtis was the founder in 'a special and unique way'.[22] It was he who initially organised meetings of the American and British representatives on the side lines of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 where a 'Joint Institute' (of international affairs) with branches in England and the United States was first discussed.[23] However, when the Americans did not show much enthusiasm for this particular form of association, the British members founded an independent British institute in 1920. As Executive Council of the RIIA put it on Curtis's eightieth birthday, the 'labour and inspiration for . . . [this] . . . Institute' came

from Lionel Curtis.[24] In the years that followed its founding, Curtis sustained the institute almost single-handedly by garnering the necessary funds. He conceived of the RIIA and a series of other institutes that were later opened across the world as 'laboratories for the scientific study of international questions'.[25] In the words of the Canadian-born merchant banker Edward Robert Peacock (1871–1962), 'the greatest contribution . . . [of Lionel Curtis] is this conception of his that the scientific method must be applied to the study of international affairs. In founding the Institute, he did for international affairs what was done for science when the Royal Society was founded'.[26] High praise, indeed.

We shall see that the research methodology for the 'new' discipline followed the routines and techniques that Curtis was almost singularly responsible for and drew upon his South African experience. Throughout his life, Curtis returned to implementing this South African model of knowledge, authority and social control in his work around the world. It is in this late-imperial context that many of the founding ideas and institutes of contemporary IR were developed throughout the world.

CIVITAS DEI

As we have already established, Lionel Curtis arrived in South Africa during the Anglo-Boer War in the fall of 1899, and by 1903 Alfred Milner had made him the assistant colonial secretary of the Transvaal. Although Milner left South Africa in 1905, the group of young apparatchiks—by then known as 'Milner's Kindergarten'—took upon themselves the task of fashioning a federation of the South African colonies. Curtis was the unstated but decided leader of this group. The 'organic union' of South Africa became both their motto and mission, but once this was achieved, key members of the Kindergarten left the country for London. Here their task was to refashion the British Empire by drawing on their modus operandi in South Africa. In the 1910s, many across the British Dominions joined the cause of creating an organic union of the empire, which envisioned recalibrating the empire along federal lines, through an association of societies that were joined together under the generic title the Round Table. The driving force behind this idea was Curtis, who travelled, researched, networked and wrote extensively on the idea of the organic union, which was later to morph into the British Commonwealth of Nations.

In December 1918, Curtis's article 'Windows of Freedom', published in the *Round Table* journal, proved decisive in fortifying the idea that the ultimate objective of the imminent League of Nations must be a world government speaking and acting in the name of humankind and relating directly to

all peoples.[27] At this point, Curtis was convinced that 'the Commonwealth of Dominion nations together with the mandates and dependencies must . . . [become] . . . the model for a world government'.[28] In addition, during this period, he also played a crucial role in drafting constitutional schemes on the future of India and Ireland, for which a British member of Parliament once referred to him as 'the man who created dyarchy in India and anarchy in Ireland'.[29]

Over the next few years, Curtis argued for what was effectively 'world government' in increasingly theological terms.[30] By now he had also become one of the principle critics of the League of Nations, for it became an inter-governmental body rather than an organic one.[31] The publication *Civitas Dei* was the final product of this thinking, where he perceived the world common-wealth as a 'living society' governed by the same principles of conscience and reason that ought to govern Christian life. This direction, however, enabled Curtis to refashion the cruder and Kiplingesque nineteenth-century idea of the 'white man's burden' into a seemingly more benign form of Christian trusteeship for the twentieth century.

In *Civitas Dei*, Curtis argued that the basic principle of (what he called) the commonwealth was a sense of duty of each individual to each other. The most advanced societies should rest on a sense of duty and goodness towards each other rather than a sense of duty or obligation to the state or the monarch. Not only did this sense of obligation contribute towards a progressive polity, but through it, such a society or state would also morally uplift the individual. State and individual were therefore communally linked to each other on an elevated plane. Such a society could not be without conflict, however, he clarified. Not every individual can be expected to have a sense of duty towards others, even if that was the predominant societal feature. Furthermore, there could also be different interpretations of how one understood one's duty towards others. So a minimal armed force to maintain internal peace was required. Consequently, it was possible to achieve an ideal society where the end towards which societal interaction was geared was the moral uplift of all citizens, not just the pursuit of peace. Ancient Greece, he argued, had arrived at such a conception of society where the principles of statecraft were derived from an individual's duty towards others: it was a place where people, not monarchs, ruled for the sake of the common good of the people.

However, the problem with the Greek commonwealth was that this sense of duty was not naturally extended to 'all' individuals.[32] Instead, Curtis argued, 'mankind at large, the barbarian world, was beyond the range of this principle'. In interpreting this, he turned both to Greek philosophers and to the Christian Bible, writing, 'Aristotle thought, as did Ezekiel, that the care of a righteous God . . . [was] . . . limited to the Hebrews. The Gentiles were beyond it'.[33] And consequently, 'in dealing with other democracies they

recognised no right but the might of the stronger. Their failure to conceive the principle of the Commonwealth on a national scale accomplished the ruin of Greece'.[34]

What Aristotle or Ezekiel could not fathom was preached by Jesus Christ. 'The fatherhood of God meant the brotherhood of man, the brotherhood not merely of Jew with Jew, or Greek with Greek, but of Jew with Greek, of man with man', Curtis wrote.[35] The message of Christ was one which universalised the Greek principle of 'infinite duty of each other to all'.[36] Thus, Christ 'applied to the whole human race the principles which had begun to be imperfectly realised within the narrow limit of the Greek Commonwealth, principles which he foresaw must perish in the existing framework of the orderly Roman Empire'.[37]

Over the many centuries, however, this particular message was lost in religious idiom: until the experiment was repeated on a larger scale in Britain, which, for the first time, realised the principle of the commonwealth on a national scale and created an empire that was based on the notion of this sense of duty. Across the Atlantic, the same principle was applied in America, leading to the merger of the thirteen colonies, but with one major difference. The American commonwealth was based on a conception of self-interest and, like the Greek, refused to extend the principle of mutual duty to others. The British Empire, in contrast, had continuously expanded its boundaries to include more and more people into its commonwealth,[38] hence providing a better model for a world state than any other form of commonwealth.

World War I, or the 'Great War'—as Curtis (and many others) called it— had pushed the world back into troubled times comparable to the last days of the Greco-Roman civilisation when St. Augustine wrote his *De civitas dei*, or *The City of God*. As St. Augustine had presented an ideal of *The City of God*, the world commonwealth was the ideal towards which the world should strive. What Augustine did not realize, according to Curtis, was that the world commonwealth was this City of God: a place of eternal bliss, or the 'Commonwealth of God', as the book's American title suggested.[39] Hence, as Curtis had it, the world commonwealth would be the final embodiment of the principles of Christianity. Deborah Lavin, Curtis's biographer, notes that 'by the simple expedient of working backwards and ruthlessly selecting his historical evidence in line with his political conclusions, Curtis was able to produce a coherent and logical argument to show that the principles of society propounded by Christ were "those of a commonwealth and not a Kingdom".'[40] However, his theological argument was also steeped in 'a cloudy Darwinism', and as a later editor of the *Round Table*, Harry Hodson, wrote, it 'was so selective and neglectful of facts injurious to his theories as to make his more critical comrades often wince'.[41] The book was, as a later commentator put it, 'Christian gospel in political dress'.[42]

E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis* and Lionel Curtis's *Civitas Dei*, although written almost in parallel, visualise two different worlds. For Curtis, a world commonwealth was imminent; for Carr, in an unequal world, any conception of a world commonwealth that expects equal obligations and rights and disregards force of power is a pipe dream.[43] For Curtis, the world commonwealth arose from his 'hatred for war',[44] and this assumption is not merely a moral injunction but, in Carr's reading, leads to the fallacy of assuming that everyone hates war. Rather, Carr argued, war is seen differently by status quo powers and revisionist powers—for the latter, war provides many benefits. Curtis's teleological reasoning would indeed be a red herring to the historian within Carr, as the former's arguments are drawn in a Whiggish fashion, selectively marshalled to serve the needs of his argument for the present.[45]

In fact, *Civitas Dei* is so 'utopian', to use Carr's term, that even the 'idealist' Arnold Toynbee critiqued the book for being too far from reality.[46] More damagingly, Toynbee termed Curtis's views of the commonwealth both 'comic' and 'blasphemous'.[47] Even within the Round Table grouping, Curtis and Philip Kerr were identified as extreme idealists. Therefore, it is hard to imagine how Carr is not responding to Curtis—who was a fellow member of the Executive Council of the RIIA (Carr had joined Chatham House in 1922 and headed its Nationalism Study Group)—and his book, the first edition of which had sold two print runs in as many months. The book itself was reviewed in 110 papers around the world, was translated into many languages and also adorned the shelves of politicians across the globe, such as the British queen, Adolf Hitler and the South African politician D. F. Malan,[48] who would lead the Afrikaner Nationalists to an electoral victory in 1948.

Ultimately, Curtis and Carr were writing about the world of the 1930s from opposite ends, and it is no wonder that the ultimate fate of the two books was decided by the events of 1939. Carr's book was to become a classic, while Curtis's was forgotten—so much so that even academic efforts at resuscitating the 'idealists' do not write about it. As Curtis's biographer argues, '*Civitas Dei* appeared at the most inappropriate moment conceivable for the British Commonwealth to be held up as a model for moral education or political coherence'.[49]

But *Civitas Dei* is interesting for many other reasons, least of all because it is a quintessential idealist text. Published in 1937 (the same year that Carr started writing *The Twenty Years' Crisis*), at the tail end of that era of supposed 'idealism', the book is, in Carr's own terms, the final product of that 'primitive' stage, after which the science of IR enters the new age of 'realism'. However, it is also decidedly representative of what 'idealism' truly meant and how this averredly benign scholarship masked imperialism and racism in the cloak of internationalism. The perception and legacy of 'idealism' in

International Relations hide the context and thrust of its assertion. Indeed, the concern for peace in the aftermath of World War I needs to be placed in the context of its actual enunciation—namely, imperialism.

POSTIMPERIAL IMAGINATION

'Few books', Curtis's biographer Deborah Lavin writes, 'could have defined a vision of the future so out of touch with the real world of the 1930s'.[50] Curtis, of course, believed otherwise. Responding to his critics who called him utopian, Curtis once identified his own role as akin to that of a 'consulting physician'.[51] He argued that the purpose of a political thinker was to dispassionately study the subject in a nonpartisan manner, much like a physician does with a patient, and to advise the patient to undergo a surgery when it is required. It was after years of such dispassionate study, he claimed, that he had concluded that the system of sovereign states was the ultimate cause of war, and his advice was a wholesale political reconstruction without which the world was doomed.[52]

Pre-empting his critics, he notes, 'If they are asked to conceive a world in which all these national states are incorporated into one commonwealth to which every human being in the last resort owes his allegiance, they feel at once that they are asked to enter the realms of fantasy'.[53] Sceptics were held prisoners to the belief that 'the national commonwealth [was] the last word in political construction'.[54] However, he writes, 'I refuse to consider any ideal as deserving the name, unless I believe that it can and will be realised in practice. I must, therefore, endeavour to demonstrate how I think that a world commonwealth can be brought into being'.[55] The scheme is thrashed out in the last chapter of *Civitas Dei*, titled 'The Day of Small Things'.

'The first and critical step', Curtis wrote, 'must be taken by two or more states which have carried the principle of the national commonwealth to its furthest expression: the fewer the easier'.[56] For him, one of the two candidate states was obvious: Great Britain, which was the best expression of the commonwealth idea in the modern world. It was easier to bring together states with a common language, similar constitutions and common security arrangements. Hence, Australia or New Zealand or both together would be 'best able to construct the first foot-bridge' to move from the national to the international commonwealth.[57] The federal union of Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand would include 'a legislature as well as an executive, a legislature empowered to impose and collect from the tax-payers the revenues required to enable the executive to discharge the international functions imposed on it'.[58] Progressively, the commonwealth would enlarge to include India and Egypt, even though—in Darwinist terms—it would be 'long before

they [had] reached the stage of self-government like England, Australia or England'.[59] Consigned to what Dipesh Chakrabarty calls 'the waiting room of history',[60] these states would still be governed by Britain, but within an 'international commonwealth'. Other states of Europe, which were 'directly interested in the route from the west to the east' controlled by the enlarging commonwealth, would also become interested in joining this political community. For him, the League of Nations was proof enough that states in Europe could be drawn together under an international arrangement, despite the difference in spoken languages. Once 'an international commonwealth built from countries within the British Empire came to include countries in Europe which had never been part of that Empire, the most difficult stage in that growth to a world commonwealth . . . would have been crossed'.[61] Eventually, it would be possible for South Africa, Ireland and Canada to join this commonwealth too. Canada would provide 'the bridge whereby the people of America may pass from national isolation to partnership in the world commonwealth'.[62] With the major powers in Europe and northern America within the commonwealth, international peace would be secured. Having crossed this critical threshold, other nations could also be persuaded to join this political community.

But what of the colonised people? At the very end of the book's nearly one thousand pages, Curtis briefly touches upon a 'sense of duty' towards the colonised populations in Darwinist terms, writing, 'The countries which had merged their sovereignties in an international commonwealth would also have transferred their control of backward peoples to the government of their commonwealth. I can think of it controlling the natives of Africa, New Guinea and Java with a policy consciously directed towards fitting these peoples to govern themselves and to join in the government of the commonwealth as a whole'.[63]

Read a full eight decades after publication, this reads like a racist and jarring addition that Curtis included at the end of his book—it is literally on the second-to-last page and appears almost as an afterthought. But as the Nobel laureate Toni Morrison pointed out in her Tanner Lecture, 'Certain absences are so stressed, so ornate, so planned, they call attention to themselves; arrest us with intentionality and purpose'.[64] The fact that Curtis does not develop this argument at all may well point to something else—namely, that social Darwinist explanations of race and colonialism were core underlying assumptions of International Relations, especially of the British idealist kind. Indeed, as Hodson acknowledged about British idealists, 'the doctrine of indefinite white and particularly British responsibility for the "backward races" was broadly accepted by all'.[65]

Several scholars have pointed to how race and imperialism were the foundational questions of IR.[66] However, Curtis is particularly placed in that

history. Arnold Toynbee once credited Curtis for being 'the first political thinker in the Western World to hold and declare that non-western peoples had the same human right to self-government as Western peoples and also the same inherent human capacity for governing themselves'.[67] Toynbee was, however, only partially correct. Curtis was certainly one of the few, if not the first, Western thinkers to think deeply and write copiously about incorporating non-Western people into his political projects, but this was not done to make non-Western people equal to their Western counterparts. Instead, Curtis was more preoccupied with finding a fit between the liberal demands of equality and the imperial requirements of dominance. In the words of Jeanne Morefield, Curtis's project was one of 'post-imperial imperialism'.[68] A crucial early move in this regard was his refashioning of the 'organic union'—a federation of white settler colonies—into a multiracial British Commonwealth of Nations.[69]

He first developed the conception of the British Commonwealth in an internal memo sent to the Round Table in June 1912. Unlike the organic union that only made the white settler states 'co-heirs of the Empire',[70] the British Commonwealth of Nations, he insisted, was premised on the idea of duty towards all others. In other words, imperial citizenship was defined not by who has the rights but by who performs what kind of duty. This way, for him, the British Empire had no subjects, only citizens.[71] This is indeed a remarkable move, for it erases the unimpeachable line between citizen and subject and between white and non-white. However, he also adds that the sense of duty differs according to the stages of civilisation. Among the whites there existed a fraternal duty towards each other, whereas they had a paternal duty towards those who were on the lower scale of civilisational hierarchy—since the latter had not yet fully developed capacities to exercise their duty in a responsible manner. Citizenship operated thus through different registers; there were different kinds of citizens—some more advanced than others. This idea of exclusion through inclusion—to use Giorgio Agamben's phrase—was to become the crucial lever through which Curtis served to make 'imperialism post-imperial'—to return to Morefield's idea. The principles of the British Commonwealth, so defined, were also to form the kernel of his world commonwealth in *Civitas Dei.*

Curtis's text is indicative of the broad thread that runs across the writings of the purported British idealists of this era—these include Alfred Zimmern, Gilbert Murray, Arnold Toynbee, Leonard Woolf, Leo Amery, John Hobson and the South African Jan Christiaan Smuts.[72] Their implacable faith in the values of the British Empire, namely, liberal democracy and self-governing institutions, was always accompanied by justifications of colonialism and racism masked as an imperial 'responsibility'. These ideas, which were so central to IR as an intellectual practice as well as to the founding of its most

prestigious institutions, were intertwined with the goal of the creation of a global racial empire.

Idealism in IR historiography has long been held as a distinctive belief in reason, progress and harmony of interests in international affairs that emerged after World War I.[73] While political theorists have long exposed British idealists for their janus-faced idealism,[74] the discipline of International Relations has only recently been attentive to the racist nature of their scholarship.[75] In light of this, a more critical probing of British idealism in the making of IR is long overdue.[76] Simultaneously, we need to investigate the premise, canonised as disciplinary history, that IR developed as a 'scientific field' to study the possibility of peace after World War I. The first of these issues must be directed towards an understanding of the term 'peace'—how was this understood in that period? Second, what was the ideological context of the emergence of the discipline? Conventional accounts view the 'Aberystwyth moment' as a sudden epiphany—we hold that it was not. The theoretical unease with the concept of national sovereignty and the strong urge to imagine something beyond it underlie much thinking—a condition that may have been strengthened by the disastrous circumstances of the Great War. This said, British idealism's conceptual framing and practical zeal was characteristic of the Edwardian era that proceeded it. While some scholars are written off as 'idealists' in the post–*Twenty Years' Crisis* era, it is necessary to point out that they were amongst the most ardent champions of the era's 'new imperialism'. In what manner, then, did IR and its early scholars borrow from ideas, concepts and methodologies from the years that preceded World War I? This question becomes important because the development of International Relations in Britain, and later around the world, centred on a set of institutional innovations that were triggered by a people who belonged to the pre-war Round Table Movement—a movement for the organic union of the empire—and chief amongst these was Lionel Curtis.

RACIAL PEACE

The first chair of International Relations, which was established at the then University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, was named for the twenty-eighth president of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. Trained in the field of public administration, Wilson had in his writings consistently endorsed 'neo-Lamarckian scientific racism'—the belief that acquired cultural characteristics are also racially inherited.[77] As the first post–Civil War president from the South, he had actively carried out racial segregation during his term in office.[78] His was the first ever federal government to discriminate against its

civilian employees on the basis of race.[79] In 1915, at the White House screening of D. W. Griffith's Ku Klux Klan propagandist movie *Birth of the Nation*, the president is said to have exclaimed, 'All so terribly true'.[80] On hearing of Wilson's championing of 'self-determination' at the Paris Peace Conference, which drew wide praise, the African American scholar Rayford Logan commented, 'It is . . . one of the enigmas of history that Mr. Wilson should have been so vitally interested in the welfare of Bantus, Oulofs, Manidingoes, Doualas and other tribes of which he had never heard while he remained deaf to the pleas of black peons in the country under his direct administration'.[81] But was Logan perhaps a tad generous towards Wilson? His pleas for self-determination were restricted to eastern Europeans and excluded the non-white races.[82] Furthermore, revelations about Wilson's racism during his earlier tenure as president of Princeton University are, if only tangentially, a reminder of the colonial and racial underbelly of the post–World War I 'peace' that birthed IR.[83] The conventional IR understanding of post–World War II peace is limited to viewing the interwar interregnum in terms of the absence of war in Europe. Lost in this interpretation, however, is often the fact that post-war peace efforts were about sealing a racial compact among 'white' nations as they attempted to delegitimise war as an instrument of international relations.[84] In fact, as any standard account of the Paris Peace Conference suggests, without the system of mandates, no peace could have been tabled at Versailles. So, in limiting its historical memory to recounting tales about the hopes for peace, IR buried an uncomfortable, dark part of its very own history. In fact, no authentic account of the idea of internationalism and its role in the development of IR can be told by expunging the issue of imperialism—and its racial consequences—from it.[85]

Invariably, genealogies of the Paris Peace Conference have several threads, one of which is an anonymous article that appeared in the *Round Table* in December 1918. Penned by Curtis—interestingly, this was his first appearance in this journal—the article had an enormous influence on how the post-war world would unfold.

But before discussing it, some background: Members of the Round Table agreed that one of the main reasons advanced for the outbreak of World War I was European rivalry over the trading rights in their respective colonies. Indeed, an internal Round Table memorandum by Curtis and Edward Grigg, then editor of the *Round Table* and later governor of colonial Kenya, had argued that 'the most likely causes of War between civilised governments' had to do with competition for resources and raw materials in the non-Western world'.[86] It was circulated in July 1914, the very month in which *Weltkrieg* (the original German term whose translation, 'world war', became universally used) started.[87] The memorandum argued that 'in the

lower civilizations lies . . . the chief menace to the peace of the world',[88] and so it was essential to find a way not only to keep these 'lower civilisations' pacified but also to ensure that such conflicts in these areas did not spill over into Europe.

With the defeat of Germany and its allies, a crucial issue was the fate of their various colonies. How would they be governed? By whom? There was one ready and available template: the Berlin Conference of 1884–1885, at which Africa had been divided between the various European powers. But this option was tricky—not only because of the disastrous rule of King Leopold in Congo but because the European powers did not have any trading powers in one another's colonies and because European hostilities had been replicated across African frontiers. Against this backdrop, the idea of mandates arose, which would foster a specific understanding of the interlinked issue of race relations and colonial control. Interestingly, Lionel Curtis, Philip Kerr and Jan Smuts, the three people who were responsible for thrashing out this idea, had cut their political teeth in South Africa, where each had played a part in devising a system of racial segregation.[89] Kerr, then advisor to British prime minister David Lloyd George, did the original drafting of Article 22 on the mandates at the peace conference, while Smuts advanced the mandate proposal first in his polemic *The League of Nations: A Practical Suggestion*. However, these ideas, Curtis later claimed, were shaped by his own Round Table article.[90] Parenthetically, this was not the first time that a Curtis idea was made popular by Smuts. In May 1917, Jan Smuts had also given wide popularity to the term 'British Commonwealth of Nations' through an address to the British parliament.[91]

On 15 October 1918, just as Woodrow Wilson had propounded his Fourteen Principles on Peace, Kerr wrote to Curtis about the need to educate Wilson about the American president's 'childlike faith in the virtues of democracy and laissez faire' with regard to 'politically backward peoples'.[92] Kerr argued that 'the inhabitants of Africa and Asia have proved unable to govern themselves, not because they were inherently incapable of maintaining any kind of stable society, but because they were quite unable to withstand the demoralizing influences to which they were subjected in some civilised countries, so that intervention of an European power is necessary in order to protect them from these influences and give them time and opportunity to establish a form of self-government which is strong enough to withstand these influences'.[93] A cursory reading of this might suggest that Kerr was referring to the genocidal role of the Germans and Belgians in their colonies, but he quickly dismissed these interpretations. Instead he argued—and it is necessary to quote him at length—that it was the nefarious influence of Western civilisation that 'the native' was not able to cope with:

This war has liberated destructive forces infinitely more powerful than any which have hitherto been unknown. Not only have you got such familiar factors as the drink merchant, the arms dealer, the capitalist who gets a native population into his hands by buying up land and property and the political adventurer or trust who buys political parties, religious organisations or politicians and judges in order to promote their own nefarious ends. You have got now started in the world an active, aggressive religion of social destruction—Bolshevism. It seems pretty clear that the peoples of South America, Africa, China will be quite incapable of resisting these destructive forces unless the western powers help them to do so. . . . [T]he western powers will have definitely to make themselves responsible for seeing that the disorders which are likely to follow this war in the backward lands do not go beyond a certain point. The extent of this work after the war, sometimes known as the white man's burden [*sic*], will be so hard that it will never be accomplished at all unless it is shared in proportions equal to their strength by the four allies now united in fighting the Germans.[94]

Crediting Curtis as the author and proponent of these views, Kerr urged that Curtis—the principal propagandist of the Round Table—should go on a 'comparatively short pilgrimage through the United States [which] might have an immensely far-reaching effect on the whole future of the English-speaking world seeing how vital the problem of backward peoples is going to be'.[95] Kerr was clear that American assumptions about democracy were too naive when applied to 'backward peoples', and it was important to educate and influence American publics on these issues.

Further, as Kerr rightly points out, both Curtis and the Round Table had argued about possible forms of political rule for backward peoples in the discussion of imperial federation/commonwealth. In 'Windows of Freedom', Curtis had urged the acceptance of certain international principles with regard to (what he termed) 'the derelict territories'.[96] In such places, accordingly, 'where their inhabitants are not yet able to furnish this guarantee [of cultivating peace, order and good government], some democratic power shall be made responsible for creating and maintaining peace, order and good government, subject to conditions . . . [for which] the guardian state shall be held responsible to the League of Nations'. The conditions were (1) maintaining 'equality of opportunity to the traders of all nations', (2) prohibiting forced labour, (3) banning the traffic in liquor, (4) abstaining from 'organising native troops' except for basic policing functions and (5) undertaking policies towards 'fitting the people to govern themselves'.[97] These essentially paternalistic views were hidden behind the benign term 'trusteeship', which Curtis had used to describe the new system.[98] But, he added, there were to be exceptions to trusteeship. He argued that the system should not be applied to German South-West Africa (the present day

Namibia) because German colonialism had only managed to establish 'a peace in creating a solitude'.[99] He did not mention, however, that this 'peace in solitude' had been ushered in through a systematic extermination of about 80 per cent of the Heroro people and 50 per cent of the Namaqua by German colonisation.[100] Indeed, Curtis claimed that South-West Africa was a 'vacant territory admit[ting] of white colonisation' and hence should be directly given to South Africa instead of being ruled as a mandated territory.[101] (This intervention plainly aimed to help Smuts, who had laid the South African claim to the German South West Africa.) On the fate of German colonies in the South Pacific, Curtis wrote that they were 'the home of primitive barbarism with its typical features of slavery, head-hunting and cannibalism—a barbarism which left to itself is without hope of redemption'.[102] 'The only way', he wrote, 'to preserve their independence is to exclude them from all contact with the world without. The fleets of some Power must patrol these seas and prevent the traders of any civilised country from landing on their shores'.[103] And if one had to find reason for why 'the uncivilised races' could not be trusted to run their own governments, one only had to look towards Liberia: it represented 'the worst tyranny under which the African people labour today'.[104]

What is striking in these examples is that Curtis, even as he draws on specific examples, was not dealing with the racial question as a local problem. Generally speaking, white statesmen, as exemplified in the Paris Peace Conference, were reluctant to discuss the question of race as anything but a domestic matter. In contrast, Curtis was not willing to keep the racial question within the confines of domestic space: for him, race was not a domestic but an international issue that needed to be dealt with by agreeing on universal principles of conduct.

THE WORLD STATE

When the first reviews of *Civitas Dei* appeared, Lionel Curtis was criticised for his zealous idealism even by some of his close friends and associates. His former collaborator at the *Round Table*, Edward Grigg, wrote, 'Lionel Curtis is already widely suspected and denounced as one of those idealists who undermine empires; he may now be extending his activities to the Church'.[105] Harold Nicholson shrugged off the book as 'sentimentality dressed as scholarship', and Arnold Toynbee took him to task for his idealisation of authority and complete neglect of the idea of sovereignty. The political scientist Harold Laski called the book 'the incantation of a mystic rather than the analysis of a scientist'.[106] Curtis's close friend T. H. Lawrence called it 'a puzzling awkward book'.[107] Among the few admirers of the work, however, were younger

scholars in the country where Curtis had first sharpened his arguments, South Africa. Eric Walker, professor of history at the University of Cape Town and, as we shall discover, one of the founders of the South African Institute of International Affairs, wrote, 'In these days of shirts and jack-boots and sedition bills, a reasoned defence [of democracy] is to be prized above rubies'. Another South African professor, S. H. Frankel, wrote from the Johannesburg-based University of the Witwatersrand, 'You have done great service in showing us to what ends we should direct our thoughts and actions'.[108]

But there is an aspect of the book that most assessments neglect. More than any other writer on these issues at the time, Curtis believed in the power of the text—and this is important in the context of the origins of IR. As his lifelong work indicates, he grasped that knowledge creates reality rather than the other way around. For him, intellectuals played a crucial role in shaping public opinion, which was always the basis of reality. Indeed, the Royal Institute of International Affairs was founded on the very same idea—namely, that the 'scientific study of IR' could mitigate the possibility of war through influencing public opinion and changing the decisions on which policy rest. From its very outset, then, IR was a normative project. When critics like Toynbee derided him for being dismissive of national sovereignty in his articulation of a world state, Curtis reminded them that sovereignty, for all its hold on state power, was a construct that could be transcended. Indeed, in 1951, near the end of his life, Curtis blamed the intellectuals for not saying that sovereignty was responsible for the two world wars and for not pointing out that it had to be transcended for the sake of peace. Confronted with the question of how this could be done, Curtis turned to the very example that served as the model for all his ideas on the commonwealth and the Union of South Africa. He pointed out that the Anglo-Boer War had pushed the politicians and intellectuals in the four colonies of southern Africa to transfer their individual sovereignties into a greater union, thereby forever ending the possibility of war.[109]

Hence, if there was one model for a world state and achieving peace, it was South Africa. It was a theme (and a place) that he would often turn to, to justify his ideas and methods. In almost all his writings, the Union of South Africa remains the starting point of discussions towards any federal scheme. Importantly, too, the South African example was so potent in Curtis's thinking because it was achieved not by a random realization of ideas but through a calibrated, thought-through process of knowledge creation and dissemination.

In the works of Curtis and the Round Table, the United States is often mentioned as a model for a federal union. But it is from South Africa that their ideas derive legitimacy. Indeed, in his Dominion tours in the 1910s, to the annoyance of many, Curtis called himself a South African, notwithstanding his British birth and citizenry. In the Round Table's lore, the Kindergarten's work in South Africa is raised to the level of a myth.[110]

Indeed, most of Curtis's works actually start with setting out the work of the Kindergarten in South Africa and explaining how this epistemic group was able to 'birth' a union (of autonomous political entities). In a set of lectures delivered in the United States in the early 1920s, he said, 'South Africa is the microcosm in which human problems can be studied as a physicist studies the forces of nature in the test-tube of a laboratory. The problem of finding some stable relation among the three great elements of mankind lies at the root of all South African questions. It is, I suggest, the ultimate problem of the world'.[111] So, in the mythology of Milner's Kindergarten and the Round Table Movement, repeated endlessly verbally and textually, South Africa becomes *the* original act of social engineering, which establishes the authority of the Kindergarten and its members' thinking in imperial circles.

Although this is also a more contested aspect of Curtis's legacy. Near the end of Curtis's life, with all his ideas of a world commonwealth unlikely to come to fruition, one commentator saw him 'as the Ancient Mariner of All Souls, meandering from the organic union of the Empire to the organic union of the world in *Civitas Dei* (a book which few of his colleagues read but referred to as *Civitas Mei*) . . . and button-holing visitors in the quad to help him draft a constitution for the world'. His 'idealism' became a matter of regular satire, even within Round Table circles; his belief in the British Commonwealth bordered on the theological, for which Arnold Toynbee referred to him as a 'monomaniac'.[112]

But the imprint of South Africa in the later workings of Curtis and the Round Table is not just in the domain of ideas; crucially it is also in institution building. In a letter to Philip Kerr in 1936, Lionel Curtis wrote,

> When Union [of South Africa] was achieved, more rapidly than ever we had hoped, we felt that it was up to us to apply the same process to Imperial Relations, more especially in view of the German menace. The Round Table Groups and the magazine were the result.[113] . . . Our years at the Round Table experience had taught us the supreme importance of genuine research; but it had also taught us that genuine research is hampered in so far as it was concerned with any element of propaganda. The *Round Table*, founded by people who believed intensely in the British Empire, necessarily suffered from this limitation. We therefore set out to establish a separate organ of research in which people of all differences of opinion, however great, could unite, an organ debarred from all propaganda. All this was settled in Paris in 1919.[114] . . . [T]he time is gone when we need to be afraid of admitting at a dinner like this that Chatham House was the outcome of Round Table work. I have always lived in hope that a day would come when my Round Table colleagues would acknowledge their child and drop the habit of imputing its sole parentage to me.[115]

On several occasions, like this, Curtis acknowledged that ideas and institutions connected the study of South Africa and later world affairs. Curtis's role as an institution builder has perhaps had the longest life in International Relations. Not only was he instrumental in founding Chatham House, but his own efforts and the networks he set up during his Dominion tours were crucial to the founding of several IR institutes across the Dominions and the United States. These became the instruments for the discipline's 'scientific study' within the British Empire in the interwar period; IR's academic chairs, journals and institutes were largely the initiatives of the same episteme. So, not only were most of the newly established IR chairs occupied by Round Table members, but the interwar IR institutes opened in Canada (1928), Australia (1933), South Africa (1934), New Zealand (1934) and India (1936) also drew upon the same network. Institutionally, each was tied to Chatham House, and except for the Indian iteration, each was based on Round Table Societies founded by Curtis during his Dominion tours in 1910s.[116] In the 1940s, most of them established IR journals that drew upon Curtis's original methodology and mission in their editorials: the gathering of 'facts' for the bringing about of world peace.[117] Indeed, Arnold Toynbee, whom Curtis had recruited into Chatham House, once identified 'salesmanship' as Curtis's defining characteristic. He wrote, 'If [Curtis] had hired himself out to Madison Avenue, he could hardly have failed to make a fortune. But he was indifferent to money, and to honours as well. He was devoted, heart and soul, to the promotion to his series of good causes, and he used his talent as salesman solely for this disinterested and unremunerated purpose'.[118]

We have written elsewhere how the study method that he first fashioned in South Africa eventually became the 'method' of studying international politics after 1919.[119] Two crucial points of this method need highlighting here: (1) seeking 'truth' through a dispassionate study, and (2) efficient salesmanship. While there have always been individual philosopher-politicians (and supposedly nonpartisan institutions) who have influenced policymaking through the influence of members, Curtis's ideal of the academic-policy interface was both novel and impressive. In his view, general intellectual effort lacked scientific intent, as it emerged from largely individual and, so, necessarily subjective viewpoints. The metaphorical death of the author, as Michel Foucault was later to suggest, was necessary for the birth of scientific expertise.[120] Real scientific knowledge could only emerge from a rigorous process of research and constant scrutiny by an elevated class of intellectuals. However, just finding the 'truth' was not enough: it needed to be propagated. And consequently, while the first stage of scientific work required methodical and objective work, the second stage of propaganda necessitated both passion and a sense of missionary zeal. The contradictions of Curtis are seamlessly entwined, when one assumes that he sought to

combine in himself the idealism of an intellectual and the real-world zeal of a missionary. International Relations, as a discipline founded on the belief that 'scientific study of international politics *will* mitigate war', emerges out of these convictions.

The institutional story of IR is, of course, only one part of a wider whole. The second chief characteristic of this interwar IR is that it develops out of this age of 'new imperialism'. The world state of the 1930s is an 'organic' extension of the earlier calls for a federal structure of the empire. The latter desired the coming together of the white settler colonies with Britain to strengthen imperial governance. So, instead of the emphasis falling on Britain as a ruling state, much was now made of the idea of a 'British race'.[121] The most assiduous champion of this ideological turn was the imperial proconsul Alfred Milner. 'Religio Milneriana', as Henry Campbell Bannerman famously called Milner's views on empire,[122] was captured in the following thoughts:

> My patriotism knows no geographical but only racial limits. I am a British Race Patriot. . . . It is not the soil of Britain, dear as it is to me, which is essential to arouse my patriotism, but the speech, the tradition, the spiritual heritage, the principles, the aspirations of the British race. They do not cease to be mine because they are transplanted. . . . I feel myself as a citizen of the empire. I feel that Canada is my country. Australia my country, New Zealand my country, South Africa my country, just as much as Surrey or Yorkshire.[123]

This invocation of the British race, and not the British state, is notable for several reasons. First, it is an important discursive move to unite two different and often opposing nineteenth-century threads of thinking on the empire. The Conservatives viewed the empire as the extension of the English state and equated Britishness with Englishness, founded upon Anglo-Saxon institutions of monarchy, Parliament and the Anglican Church (the Celts were, for instance, seen as inferior to Anglo-Saxons, but Scots were included in the Anglo-Saxon identity). Thus the empire was a project of expanding Englishness. Against this, Gladstonian liberalism recognized national diversity within the empire, emphasising that the imperial connection must be based on freedom and voluntary association (of white communities). This stream of thought, often decried as that of the 'Little Englander', was about allowing each colony to develop its own sense of nationhood and maximizing autonomy as part of a common empire.[124] Milner, by invoking the British race, attempts to marry these two ideas by seeing all white nations in it as part of the common racial identity. An Anglo-Saxon identity for him was more British than it was English.[125]

His use of the term 'race' to identify a common bond is also indicative of an emerging 'colour line', as W. E. B. Du Bois famously called it, in the

twentieth century. While Milner is only referring to the Anglo-Saxon world, race indeed is only now being seen exclusively as a matter of pigment. In nineteenth-century Britain, the term 'race' was used rather loosely to refer to different groups. The Irish, the Afrikaners, the Jews, the Indians, the Chinese and the Africans were often referred to as distinct 'races'. Indeed, the historian Greta Jones has argued that race and class were interchangeable terms for much of the nineteenth century.[126] Even the French aristocrat Arthur de Gobineau, the progenitor of scientific racism, when describing his racial categories of black, white and yellow, deduced his racial picture of the world from similar social classes at home. Likewise in Britain, the poor, the working class and 'inferior' races were often placed side by side on the racial scale. The superiority of the white race is also expressed in the supremacy of the middle and upper classes.[127] It is only in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that strictly biological notions of race became common sense. This occurred as Charles Darwin's theories were interpreted to assert that social hierarchy was generated by natural (biological and environmental) causes and not social laws.[128] Discursive elements aside, there was also a series of calibrated political moves by the socially deprived white classes, chasing upward mobility, to freeze the colour line beneath them.[129]

In Milner's case, the need for racial unity was prompted by broader imperial factors. For Britain, the settler colonies not only provided hope for a stronger empire, militarily speaking, but also buttressed the three levels of imperial being: empire, state and society. While race as a marker of identity was expressed in the idiom of the 'British race' or 'Anglo-Saxon race' (to use Cecil John Rhodes's phrase) to provide an imperial identity, 'race' was also elevated into an issue of the emerging 'British world' in another way. Unlike the British state itself, the white settlers continuously grappled with the 'native problem'—as it was commonly called. This trope drew upon a common history of genocidal wars and the perennial fear of being 'swamped' by the natives. In an influential book, Charles Pearson captured these fears in the following words: 'the day will come, and not perhaps far distant, when the European observer will see the globe girdled with a continuous zone of black and yellow races, no longer too weak for aggression or under tutelage, but independent, or practically so, in government, monopolising the trade of their own regions and circumscribing the industry of the European'.[130] On those frontiers of empire, where both social and political conflicts were arranged more frontally along a line of colour, racial discourse had a much sharper edge. As white settler colonies were accommodated at the imperial table, race became an empire-wide issue. Indeed, 'the administration of natives' and the 'native problem', along with the question of defence, became the only truly imperial matters, to the extent that imperial unity was often achieved by

diluting British liberal opinion and its concerns about the treatment of non-white populations.[131]

Once the empire was reimagined as an organic union of white settler colonies, its conflicts were arranged along racial lines between whites and non-whites. From being essentially an issue of domestic politics concerning the frontiers of empire, race became its central organizing principle.

Let us layout the argument we will make in the subsequent chapters about the undocumented lives of International Relations. Race and empire, as recent scholarship has suggested, are very central to the understanding of the emergence of the discipline.[132] The natal moment in the history of IR is not when realists and idealists collide in the 'first great debate': we believe, rather, that there is no single natal moment in the field. The origins of IR are located, instead, in the process of transition of the empire into the international.[133] Imperial frontiers were where these ideas were discussed, fleshed out and implemented, accompanied by the adventurist and often crassly racist spirit of the 'romance of the veld'—to use a phrase from Bill Schwarz. By framing IR's origins within these interstices of imperialism and internationalism, its disciplinary history allows us the opportunity to explore its multiple genealogies. In proposing such a course, David Long and Brian Schmidt have challenged disciplinary historians to get their 'hands dirty by reading texts, journals, memoirs and other sources that have been standing dormant on library shelves' and track different narratives of the origins of IR.[134]

The development of IR from these interstices, we argue, is best represented in the work of Milner's Kindergarten in South Africa. In its labour, particularly the role played by Lionel Curtis, we follow a single thread that links the consolidation of the gold deposits of Johannesburg to the Union of South Africa to the British Commonwealth to a unified world government, which is the idea that organs of social control need to be organically, not mechanically, brought together.[135] In terms of the principle, there was little difference for Curtis between the early planning of the city of Johannesburg and creating a world state. To know the story of the latter, therefore, we need to start with the story of Johannesburg. But there is no understanding of Johannesburg without interrogating capital, race and empire; nor indeed is there international relations without cross-examining the same.

NOTES

1. What is not mentioned is that Davies only provided one-third of the individual emolument that totalled 60 per cent. Each of his two sisters, Gwendoline Davies and Margaret Davies, contributed an equal amount. Davies later published an

eight-hundred-page tome on the ways in which international peace could be gained. See David Davies, *The Problem of the Twentieth Century* (London: Ernest Benn, 1930).

2. "History," Aberystwyth University, https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/interpol/about/history (accessed 6 January 2018).

3. Jonathan Haslam, *Vices of Integrity: E. H. Carr, 1892–1982* (London: Verso, 2000). See also Brian Porter, "Lord Davies, E. H. Carr and the Spirit Ironic: A Comedy of Errors," *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (2002): 77–96.

4. Haslam, *Vices of Integrity*, 69.

5. Peter Wilson, "E. H. Carr's The Twenty Years' Crisis: Appearance and Reality in World Politics," *Politik* 12, no. 4 (2009): 21–25.

6. Wilson, "E. H. Carr's The Twenty Years' Crisis."

7. Brian Schmidt, "Lessons from the Past: Reassessing the Interwar Disciplinary History of International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1998): 433–59; R. Palan and B. Blair, "On the Idealist Origins of the Realist Theory of International Relations," *Review of International Studies* 19, no. 4 (1993): 385–399; Andreas Osiander, "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited," *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1998): 409–32; Peter Wilson, "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate,'" *Review of International Studies* 24, no. 5 (1998): 1–16; Joel Quirk and Darshan Vigneswaran, "The Construction of an Edifice: The Story of a First Great Debate," *Review of International Studies* 31, no. 1 (2005): 89–107; Cameron Thies, "Progress, History, and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist-Realist Debate," *European Journal of International Relations* 8, no. 2 (2002): 147–85; Lucian Ashworth, "Where Are the Idealists in Inter-war International Relations?" *Review of International Studies* 32, no. 2 (2006): 291–308.

8. E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1946), 5.

9. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis*, 5.

10. Sean Molloy, "E. H. Carr and the Complexity of Power Politics," in *The Hidden History of Realism: A Geneology of Power Politics* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

11. Hans Morgenthau, "Review: The Political Science of E. H. Carr," *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (1948): 127–34.

12. Haslam, *Vices of Integrity*, 73. On Morgenthau's Schmittian realism and its relationship to ethics, see Michael Williams, "In the Beginning: The International Relations Enlightenment and the Ends of International Relations Theory," *European Journal of International Relations* 19, no. 3 (2013): 647–65; Nicolas Guilhot, "The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory," *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (2008): 281–304; Nicolas Guilhot, "American Katechon: When Political Theology Became IR Theory," *Constellations* 17, no. 2 (2010): 224–53; W. E. Scheuerman, *Morgenthau: Realism and Beyond* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2009).

13. Along with *Twenty Years' Crisis*, Morgenthau was reviewing the following works: E. H. Carr, *Conditions of Peace* (London: Macmillan, 1942); E. H. Carr,

Nationalism and After (London: Macmillan, 1945); E. H. Carr, *The Soviet Impact on the Western World* (London: Macmillan, 1946).

14. Morgenthau, "Review," 134.

15. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis*, 97.

16. Christian Guelen, "The Common Grounds of Conflict: Racial Visions of World Order, 1880–1940," in *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s*, ed. S. Conrad and D. Sachsenmeirer (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 69–96.

17. Clarence K. Streit, *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic* (London: Harper & Brothers, 1939).

18. George Orwell, "Not Counting Niggers," *The Adelphi* (July 1939). Available at https://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/o/orwell/george/not-counting-niggers (accessed 8 August 2018).

19. Carr, *Twenty Years' Crisis*, vii.

20. Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei: The Commonwealth of God* (London: Macmillan, 1938). In a PhD dissertation, Aysen Lekon argues that Curtis bridges the gap between realists and idealists of the era. See Aysen Dilek Lekon, "The Interplay of Realism and Idealism in the Thought of Lionel Curtis: A Critique of the Conception of 'First Debate' in International Relations" (PhD diss., London School of Economics and Political Science, 2003).

21. Curtis is hardly the main figure in intellectual histories of IR, although commonwealth historians have written copiously on him. In IR, he appears only periodically in institutional histories. See Inderjeet Parmar, *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of the Role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939–1945* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2004).

22. "Message from the Council of the Royal Institute of International Affairs to Mr Lionel Curtis on His 80th Birthday," MS. Eng. Hist. c. 853, f. 119, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

23. "Institute of International Affairs Founded in Paris 1919: Minute of a Meeting at the Hotel Majestic on Friday, 30 May 1919, to Consider a Project for Forming an Institute of International Affairs," Folder: 2 (1), Chatham House Library, London. On the Americans involved in this effort; see Inderjeet Parmer, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

24. "Message from the Council," 119.

25. Lionel Curtis, *World War: Its Cause and Cure: The Problem Reconsidered in View of the Release of Atomic Energy*, 2nd ed. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1946), xxii.

26. See MS. Eng. Hist. c. 853, f. 66.

27. Lavin, *From Empire*, 160–61.

28. Lavin, *From Empire*, 260.

29. See R. H. Brand to Ivor Macadam, 14 January 1944, MS. Eng. Hist. c. 853, f. 25, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

30. Gerald Studdert-Kennedy, "Political Science and Political Theology: Lionel Curtis, Federalism and India," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 24, no. 2 (1996): 197–217. For the role of theology in the making of IR, see Guilhot, "American Katechon."

31. See Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis, *The Prevention of War* (New Haven, CT: Institute of Politics and Yale University Press, 1923).

32. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 888.

33. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 882.

34. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 896.

35. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 883.

36. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 883.

37. Quoted in Lavin, *From Empire*, 266–67.

38. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 873–87.

39. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, vii–viii.

40. Lavin, *From Empire*, 265–66.

41. H. V. Hodson, "The Round Table's Early Life," *Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 264 (1976): 417.

42. A. B. Hughes, "Lionel Curtis: Young Man Who Helped to Draft the Union Constitution," *Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg), 26 November 1955. See also Studdert-Kennedy, "Political Science."

43. Carr was equally opposed to nation-states remaining the primary units of world politics, but his future conceptions veered more towards a collection of multinational groupings that were internally functionalist as a more plausible future. See Carr, *Nationalism and After*.

44. Lavin, *From Empire*, 259.

45. See E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1961).

46. Lavin, *From Empire*, 268.

47. Arnold Toynbee, *Acquaintances* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 133–34.

48. Lavin, *From Empire*, 268.

49. Lavin, *From Empire*, 273–74.

50. Lavin, *From Empire*, 273. For a comparison of Carr's and Curtis's writings, see Lekon, "Interplay of Realism," 219–27.

51. Lionel Curtis, "Political Experts and Their Function," in *World War: Its Cause and Cure: The Problem Reconsidered in View of the Release of Atomic Energy*, 2nd ed. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1946), 3.

52. Curtis, "Political Experts," 3.

53. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 902.

54. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 902.

55. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 902.

56. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 933.

57. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 933.

58. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 932.

59. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 935.

60. Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and His-torical Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

61. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 937.

62. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 937.

63. Curtis, *Civitas Dei*, 937–38.

64. Toni Morrison, "Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-America Presence in American Literature," Tanner Lectures on Human Values, 7 October 1988, https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_documents/a-to-z/m/morrison90.pdf, 16.

65. Hodson, "The Round Table's Early Life," 417.

66. John Hobson, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western Inter-national Theory, 1760–1910* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); David Long and Brian C. Schmidt, eds., *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005); Jeanne Morefield, *Covenants without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005); Siba Grovogui, *Beyond Eurocentrism and Anarchy: Memories of International Order and Institutions* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). However, it is important to note that the racial and imperial logics could also be contradictory; see Eric T. Love, *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

67. Toynbee, *Acquiantances*, 135.

68. Jeanne Morefield, *Empires without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

69. A concise version of Curtis's thesis was sent to Indian civil servants on 27 June 1912. See MSS. Eur. 136/10, f. 50–60, India Office Records and Private Papers, British Library, London.

70. G. L. Craik, "Note on the Principle of Indian Representation," MS. Eng. Hist. c. 826, 3.

71. He makes a threefold classification of citizens: active, latent and nonactive.

72. See, for instance, Torbjørn L. Knutsen, "A Lost Generation? IR Scholarship before World War I," *International Politics* 45, no. 6 (2008): 650–74; Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism*; Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009); Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London: Allen Lane, 2012); Christopher Stray, ed., *Gilbert Murray Reassessed: Hellenism, Theatre and International Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Peter J. Cain, *Hobson and Imperialism Radicalism, New Liberalism, and Finance, 1887–1938* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Keith W. Hancock, *Smuts: The Sanguine Years, 1870–1919* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962); Keith W. Hancock, *Smuts: The Fields of Force, 1919–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).

73. Hedley Bull, "The Theory of International Politics,1919–1969," in *The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics 1919–1969*, ed. Brian Porter (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 33–36; John Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics: A Critique* (London: Francis Pinter, 1983), 13–19; Trevor Taylor, "Utopianism," in

International Relations: British and American Approaches, ed. Steve Smith (London: Basil Blackwell, 1985), 92–107; Michael Joseph Smith, *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1986), 54–67; Torbjörn Knusten, *A History of International Relations Theory: An Introduction* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1992), 184–207, 268–70; Charles W. Kegley Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf, *World Politics: Trends and Transformation* (New York: St. Martins, 1989), 12–15; William Olson and A. J. R. Groom, *International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation* (London: HarperCollins, 1991), 69–92; Peter Wilson, *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth Century Idealism* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 11–22.

74. See Michael Freeden, *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986); David Boucher and Andrew Vincent, *British Idealism: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Continuum, 2012).

75. Hobson, *Eurocentric Conception*; Stray, *Gilbert Murray*; Cain, *Hobson*; David Long, "Paternalism and the Internationalization of Imperialism: J. A. Hobson on the International Government of the 'Lower Races,'" in *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, ed. David Long and Brian C. Schmidt (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 71–92; G. K. Peatling, "Globalism, Hegemonism and British Power: J. A. Hobson and Alfred Zimmern Reconsidered," *History* 89, no. 3 (2004): 381–98; Morefield, *Covenants*; Grovogui, *Beyond Eurocentrism*.

76. British idealism in IR has been a theme of many scholarly interventions in recent years.

77. For an extended discussion on the relationship between neo-Lamarckian scientific racism and imperialism, see Richard Peet, "The Social Origins of Environmental Determinism," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 75, no. 3 (1985): 309–33.

78. David Levering Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race, 1868–1919* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1993), 1:506.

79. In fact, W. E. B. Du Bois, who had renounced his membership in the Socialist Party to publicly campaign for Wilson after he promised to work for the uplift of African Americans in 1912, was utterly disappointed to find not only that Wilson did nothing to fulfil his promise but also that his administration endorsed an explicitly antiblack agenda. See W. E. B. Du Bois, "My Impressions of Woodrow Wilson," 1939, W. E. B. Du Bois Papers, Series 1A. General Correspondence. Credo, Library, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b088-i264 (accessed 1 August 2018).

80. Lewis, *W. E. B. Du Bois*, 506.

81. Rayford W. Logan, "The Operation of the Mandate System in Africa," *Journal of Negro History* 13, no. 4 (1928): 426.

82. Benjamin de Carvalho, Halvard Leira and John M. Hobson, "The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (2011): 750.

83. Wilson, as Princeton's president, had barred African Americans from enrolling in the university. Corey Robin, "We Have the Woodrow Wilson/P.C. Debate

All Backwards: Protestors Are Forcing a Debate Princeton Has Whitewashed for Debates," *Salon*, 21 November 2015, https://www.salon.com/2015/11/21/we_have _the_woodrow_wilsonp_c_debate_all_backwards_protesters_are_forcing_a_debate _princeton_has_whitewashed_for_decades; Arthur Stanley, *Woodrow Wilson: The Road to the White House* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947), 502.

84. Antony Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Martti Koskenniemi, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). See also Oona A. Hathaway and Scott J. Shapiro, *The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade the World* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2017).

85. Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism*; Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Robert Vitalis, "Birth of the Discipline," in *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, ed. David Long and Brian Schmidt (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 159–81.

86. The original memorandum, called the Brown memorandum, was written by Curtis but was met with some objections at the Moot, with suggestions that its opening chapter of twenty-four pages be revised. Edward Grigg took on the task of revision and substituted his own revised document for the first twelve pages of Curtis's chapter. See "Lionel Curtis to Edward Grigg, 29 July 1914," Ms. Eng. Hist. c. 778, f. 76–79.

87. Heather Jones, "WW1: Was It Really the First World War?" *BBC News*, 29 June 2014, https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-28057198.

88. "Whitsdunite Memorandum," Ms. Eng. Hist. c. 778, 9.

89. Lionel Curtis, "Windows of Freedom," *Round Table* 8, no. 3 (1918): 1–47.

90. Lavin, *From Empire*, 160. On how Smuts used Curtis's draft, see Hancock, *The Sanguine Years*.

91. The term "British Commonwealth of Nations" was first used by Curtis in 1909. The idea of a British Commonwealth came to him through a conversation with William Marris, while they were touring Canada in late 1909. Curtis summarized this discussion later as follows: 'So far I had thought of self-government as a Western Institution, which was and would always remain peculiar to the peoples of Europe, just as a Hindu thinks of Hinduism as a religion to which man must first be born. It was from that moment that I first began to think of "the government of each and all by all" not merely as a principle of Western life but rather of all human life. I began to think of the British Commonwealth as the greatest instrument ever devised for enabling that principle to be realized'. Lionel Curtis, *Dyarchy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920), 42. See also M. S. Donnely, "J. W. Dafoe and Lionel Curtis: Two Concepts of Commonwealth," MS. Eng. Hist. c.853, Bodlean Library, Oxford, 1959. Also, while Curtis was certainly the first one to write in detail about creating a political union in South Africa, on the political side, much of this initiative was taken by Smuts.

92. Philip Kerr, "Letter to Lionel Curtis, 15 October 1918," in *Annals of the Lothian Foundation* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1992), 1:383.

93. Kerr, "Letter," 283.

94. Kerr, "Letter," 384.

95. Kerr, "Letter," 385.

96. Curtis, "Windows," 25.

97. Curtis, "Windows," 26.

98. Curtis, "Windows," 33.

99. Curtis, "Windows," 28.

100. David Olusoga and Casper W. Erichsen, *Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism* (London: Faber and Faber, 2010).

101. Curtis, "Windows," 28.

102. Curtis, "Windows," 29.

103. Curtis, "Windows," 29.

104. Curtis, "Windows," 31.

105. Lavin, *From Empire*, 268.

106. Lavin, *From Empire*, 268.

107. Lavin, *From Empire*, 268.

108. Quoted in Lavin, *From Empire*, 272.

109. Lekon, "Interplay of Realism," 9.

110. G. A. Leyds, *A History of Johannesburg: The Early Years* (Cape Town: Nasionale Boekhandel, 1964).

111. Lionel Curtis, "The Union of South Africa," in Kerr and Curtis, *Prevention of War*, 80.

112. As Toynbee argues, he actually believed that if Christ came to earth, he would see that his precepts were being best practiced in the British Commonwealth (Toynbee, *Acquaintances*, 146).

113. Lionel Curtis to Philip Kerr, 6 December 1936. Letter reproduced in "The Lionel Curtis—Philip Kerr Correspondence," *Annals of the Lothian Foundation* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991), 395.

114. "The Lionel Curtis–Philip Kerr Correspondence," 395.

115. "The Lionel Curtis–Philip Kerr Correspondence," 396.

116. Lionel Curtis, "Dominion Tour Diary," MS. Curtis 142, Bodleian Diaries.

117. These journals include the *Australian Journal of International Affairs* (formerly *Australian Outlook*), *International Journal*, *Pakistan Horizon*, *India Quarterly*, *South African Journal of International Affairs*, and *New Zealand International Review*. For editorials that echo Curtis's vision, see R. J. F. Boyer, "Foreword," *Australian Outlook* 1, no. 1 (1947): 4; R. M. Fowler, "Foreword: To First Issue of International Journal," *International Journal* 1, no. 1 (1946): 5–6.

118. Toynbee, *Acquaintances*, 133–34.

119. Vineet Thakur, Alexander Davis and Peter Vale, "Imperial Mission, Scientific Method: An Alternative Account of the Origins of IR," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 46, no. 1 (2017): 3–23.

120. Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (London: Penguin, 1984), 101–20.

121. For this, see Bill Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, vol. 1: *The White Man's World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

122. Quoted in Andrea Bosco, *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire (1909–1919)* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 122.

123. Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, 99.

124. John Ellis, "'The Methods of Barbarism' and the 'Rights of Small Nations': War Propaganda and British Pluralism," *Albion* 30, no. 1 (1998): 49–75.

125. Srdjan Vucetic, *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialised Identity in International Relations* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011); Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

126. Greta Jones, *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction between Biological and Social Theory* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1980), 144–46.

127. G. Jones, *Social Darwinism*, 144–46.

128. G. Jones, *Social Darwinism*, 142.

129. Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (London: Routledge, 1995); Charles van Onselen, *The Seed Is Mine: The Life of Kas Maine, a South African Sharecropper, 1894–1985* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996).

130. Quoted in Martin Plaut, *Promise and Despair: The First Struggle for a Non-racial South Africa* (Johannesburg: Jacana, 2016), 50.

131. Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); David C. Atkinson, *The Burden of White Supremacy: Containing Asian Immigration in the British Empire and the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017); Robert A. Huttenback, *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies, 1830–1910* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976); Charles Price, *The Great White Walls Are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australiasia, 1836–1888* (Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974).

132. Vitalis, *White World Order*; Hobson *Eurocentric Conception*.

133. Olson and Groom, *International Relations*, 47; Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism*, 9.

134. Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism*, 4.

135. Lavin, *From Empire*, 40–45.

Chapter 3

Reimagining Empire

THE TERRIFYING VISION

Charles Dilke, a self-professed English radical, wrote in his travelogue, published as *Greater Britain* in 1868, 'The Anglo-Saxon is the only extirpating race on the earth. Up to the commencement of the now inevitable destruction of the Red Indians of Central North America, of the Maoris and of the Australians by the English colonists, no numerous race has ever been blotted out by an invader'.[1] Exuding the celebratory confidence that marked this high age of colonialism, he predicted that 'the dearer are, on the whole, likely to destroy the cheaper peoples, and Saxondom will rise triumphant from the doubtful struggle'.[2] This 'bizarrely vernacular Darwinism' was to receive high praise[3]—the book was a best-seller. When confronted with the English race, Dilke argued, the churning wheels of universal progress made it inevitable that the 'cheaper races' would die, or—to use his term—be 'extirpated'. Although prevalent, miscegenation—inbreeding of different races—would 'go but little way toward blending races';[4] for the 'cheaper races', he concluded, extinction was inescapable.

Two and a half decades later, a London-born history professor living in Melbourne wrote a book that suggested the opposite. Charles Pearson argued in *National Life and Character: A Forecast* that Dilke's understanding fundamentally misrepresented the nature of change in the world. The assumption that 'higher races' were triumphing over 'lower races' was not borne out by the evidence. Instead, Pearson argued that the 'industrial races', in which he included the Chinese, the Hindus and the Africans, had proved resilient against the forces of extinction. Unlike the non-Western martial races that opposed the Europeans and consequently were defeated, these 'industrial races' adapted to modernity and civilisation, so much so that they had found

creative ways to both survive and 'swarm'.[5] In the economic realm, for instance, they outcompeted the white worker by underselling their labour. Over time, as manual work was undertaken by non-white races, forms of labour became a dishonourable profession for whites. In such ways, the industrial races made themselves both useful and necessary to modernity and thus not only survived it but flourished unabated.[6]

　　This was not an entirely original argument, however. The eugenics movement, founded by the polymath Francis Galton (1822–1911), had already pointed to the false promise of 'natural selection'.[7] The latter was originally the preferred term of Charles Darwin but was replaced by Herbert Spencer's crass, although theologically safer, coinage, 'survival of the fittest'. Galton questioned this fungibility between 'natural selection' and 'survival of the fittest'. Industrial Britain had seen quite the opposite, he argued: the poor bred far more than the rich. As a result, in Britain, not the fittest but the weakest had survived.[8] Indeed, he suggested, this had been the case with civilisations as far back as the Greeks. Higher birth rates were actually evidence of the inferiority of the breeding poor. So, against the theory of natural selection, Galton put forward the idea of a 'eugenic selection' that will allow only the fittest of the society to survive. Over time, the eugenics movement emphasized that while 'survival of the fittest' functioned somewhat seamlessly in colonial contexts where civilized men faced savages in a more 'natural' environment, in the European context a functional civilised society worked against the extermination of the comparable European brutes, to paraphrase Colonial Kurtz from Joseph Conrad's novel *Heart of Darkness*.

　　For his part, Pearson broadcast more bad news from the frontiers: the natives were not only surviving but constantly producing, reproducing and 'swarming' the tropics, and they were preparing to raid the colonial citadels. The 'white man's burden'—the term was still to be coined by Rudyard Kipling—had turned into a deadly curse. British settlers had marched into the colonial frontiers, domesticated them and, in so doing, altered the 'state of nature'. This allowed 'the natives' to emerge from their decadent existence. As their numbers grew, the non-whites also moved to other regions—the Chinese, for example, travelled all over Southeast Asia. A parallel development to the increasing colonisation of lands by the non-whites was the development of institutions of state in the white world. The consolidation of the welfare state weakened the entrepreneurial skills of the white man, which, Pearson suggested, had flowered in the age of colonisation. The civilising process in the colonies and the welfarism of the state in the metropole had together blunted the edges of Darwinism and prevented the upward march of the white race. Drawing on the popular environmental theories on race, he advised that the white races should turn

the areas of their numerical majority (i.e., temperate zones) into fortresses and concede the tropics to the non-whites. Such geographical division of the world, he surmised, would be the only guarantee of a peaceful world order.

Writing from Australia, Charles Pearson used two South African cases to demonstrate the ideal type of white-black interaction. In the Cape Colony, he argued, although the white community was in the minority, 'the influx of blacks [was] not yet so great as to have made manual and unskilled labour discreditable to the white man'.[9] In contrast, the situation in the colony of Natal was more 'instructive of what [might] be expected in Africa generally'. The British rule brought

> order and peace, industry and trade, and the enjoyment of property under fairly equal laws. . . . [However,] to the African native the establishment of a colony like Natal is like throwing open the gates of paradise. He streams in, offering his cheap though not very regular labour, and supplying all his own wants at the very smallest expenditure of toil. . . . Sooner or later the black race will be educated to a point where it will demand and receive a share in these employments and in the government. Whenever that happens, the white race will be either absorbed or disappear. . . . Now the fate of Natal is bound to be the fate of those parts of the African continent which lie to the north of Natal and south of the desert of Sahara.[10]

Pearson had challenged the then dominant social Darwinist notion that the white/non-white encounter invariably led to either extinction or the slow incorporation into civilisation of the latter. In both, he argued, the telos of history wrongly projected Europe as the future of the world. Marilyn Lake argues that Pearson's book gave the racial discourse in the white world 'a new and alarming turn'.[11] A contemporary reviewer noted that Pearson 'cloaks the most gloomy prophecy as to the future of society'.[12] His assertions had 'startled the reading world', noted Oxford historian and author of *The American Commonwealth* James Bryce. Britain's Liberal prime minister Willian Ewart Gladstone strongly recommended the book to everyone who was 'concerned or interested in world affairs'.[13] Germany's Kaiser Wilhelm II's Sinophobic rhetoric around 'the Yellow Peril' was inspired by reading this book.[14] But Pearson's writings were followed even more closely in the settler world. Edmund Barton, Australia's first prime minister, held Pearson's copy in his hand and quoted from it at length when he rose to make his speech in favour of the Immigration Restriction Bill of 1901, which secured the policy of 'White Australia'.[15] He was ably supported in his appeal by his attorney general and his immediate prime ministerial successor, Alfred Deakin, who was mentored by Pearson at the University of Melbourne. In Jim Crow America, the gains of Reconstruction had fuelled white conspiratorial theories of 'race

suicide'.[16] Theodore Roosevelt, who warned of 'race suicide' in a speech in 1903, was to write that Pearson's book was 'one of the most notable books' and offered 'deep and philosophical insight into the world-forces of the present'.[17] He agreed with Pearson that 'it is impossible for the dominant races of the temperate zones ever bodily to displace the peoples of the tropics. It is highly probable that these people will cast off the yoke of the European conquerors sooner or later, and will become independent nations once more'.[18]

However, Roosevelt added that while the Chinese, Indians, or Africans might create their own states, it was improbable that they would become any threat to the white countries in the North. China, he argued, was 'merely an aggregate of provinces with a central knot at Pekin [*sic*] . . . [which] could be taken any time by a small trained army',[19] India with the removal of European rule would descend into 'famine and internecine war . . . and sink back to her former place', and any thought of Africa being a menace to Europe was so removed from reality that 'even prophecy must not look too many thousand years ahead'.[20]

Pearson thought otherwise, however. The white world was safe in its own backyard, but this was not permanent. He wrote,

> A hundred years hence when these races, which are now as two to one to the higher, shall be as three to one; when they have borrowed the science of Europe, and developed their virgin worlds, the pressure of their competition upon the white man will be irresistible. He will be driven from every neutral market and forced to confine himself within his own. Ultimately, he will have to confine himself to the Oriental standard of existence, or, and this is the probable solution, to stint the increase of population. If he does this by methods that are inconsistent with morality, the very life-springs of the race will be tainted.[21]

For Pearson, the very character of the white race was being shaped by the ongoing contact with indigenous people, and thus colonial adventuring needed to cease. Otherwise eventually, 'with civilization equally diffused, the most populous country must ultimately be the most powerful; and the preponderance of China over any rival—even over the United State of America—is likely to be overwhelming'.[22] He presented a spectacular vision of the future, as this lengthy quote suggests:

> The day will come, and perhaps is not far distant, when the European observer will look around to see the globe girdled with a continuous zone of black and yellow races, no longer too weak for aggression or under tutelage, but independent or practically so, in government, monopolizing the trade of their own regions and circumscribing the industry of the European; when Chinamen and the nations of Hindostan, the States of Central and South Africa, by that time

predominantly Indian, and it may be African nations of the Congo and the Zambesi, under a dominant caste of foreign rulers, are represented by fleets in the European seas, invited to international conferences, and welcomed as allies in the quarrels of the civilized world. The citizens of these countries will then be taken up into the social relations of the white races, will throng the English turf, or the salons of Paris, and will be admitted to intermarriage. . . . We shall wake to find ourselves elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile, and thought of as bound always to our needs. The solitary consolation will be, that the changes will be inevitable.[23]

Marilyn Lake has called Pearson the 'prophet of Decolonisation',[24] and the paragraph above certainly testifies to this. However, it is important to note that for Pearson this outcome presented a foreboding of the inevitable decline of Western civilisation.

Although impressed with Pearson's analysis, many (including liberal thinkers) were dismissive of this inevitability of decline. However, in South Africa, Pearson's warnings were taken seriously. While the question of the survival of the white race was either theoretical or stretched too far into the future for much of the Anglo-Saxon settler world where the non-European races were in minority, South Africa presented a different challenge because whites were in the minority. Indeed, soon after the Boer War, the major worry for South African whites, prominently English liberals, was referred to as 'the native question'. But its focus was not 'the native' but the survival of white dominance in the country.

In one of the first epistemic formations in Johannesburg, called the Fort-nightly Club, one observer, W. Weber, noted,

During the last few years we have been busy trying to settle the relative position of the two white races [Afrikaner and English] in South Africa, that we have not had sufficient time to study what must eventually prove a far more important problem—the relative position of the white and the black races in the country. To our minds there can be only one successful solution to this problem, and that is that white man should continue to be the ruler, and we are all agreed that if this result cannot be secured, the white man will and must cease to exist here. There can be no half measure, we must either rule or be wiped out. Which is it to be?[25]

The argument was that the only condition of the survival of the white race in the country was its continued dominance as the ruler race. By making this a question of survival, and not just political or economic prosperity, Weber had invoked what Patrick Brantlinger calls the 'extinction logic'. This was indeed a central feature of the European imperial and racial discourse of the nine-teenth and early twentieth centuries.[26] As Brantlinger writes, 'A remarkable

feature of extinction discourse is its uniformity across other ideological fault lines: whatever their disagreements, humanitarians, missionaries, scientists, government officials, explorers, colonists, soldiers, journalists, novelists and poets were in basic agreement about the inevitable disappearance of some or all primitive races'.[27] Often this extinction was allegedly self-inflicted by the 'savagery'—continuous strife and infighting—of the natives. Furthermore, when they came into contact with 'civilisation', they were not able to adapt to it; contact with external civilisation disturbed their 'natural habitat', making their survival difficult. The process, it is important to note here, was deemed almost always auto-genocidal. In other words, it wasn't colonialism but 'natural selection' that led to this outcome. In Weber's analysis, however, the extinction logic was applied in reverse in South Africa. Weber argued that contact with Africans would lead to the eventual extinction of the white race in South Africa, mostly because the latter were in the minority. This is indeed what turns the country in the first decade of the twentieth century into the primary arena of action for imperial enthusiasts.

THE IMPERIAL QUESTION

To understand the churn of ideas at the start of the twentieth century, it is necessary to reach backward. The idea of South Africa long predated its eventual formation. The term 'South Africa' made noticeable appearances in writings from the 1830s, loosely referring to the territorial expanse from the Cape to the Zambesi.[28] Over the years, this idea gained more traction at the imperial centre than it did in these distant places. A type of 'Anglo-world' was being fashioned in North America, Australasia and southern Africa through a mass migration, which saw around 12 million Britons permanently emigrating to these places between 1815 and 1930.[29] With the proliferation of 'little Englands'—as they were adoringly called—across oceans, Britain felt a paternalistic responsibility towards them. However, there was a concomitant fear of alienating the settlers, lest they follow the insurrection that resulted in the American War of Independence. As a result, Victorian England often buried the expansion of its empire to these lands under the narrative of a 'civilising mission', proclaiming the settlers as 'pioneers'.

During this period, 'ideas, methods and men' travelled more fluidly between London and these far-off places.[30] One such 'idea' was the abolition of slavery, effected in the mid-1830s, which was to lead to the deterioration of relations in southern Africa between the English and the Boers. Partly in response to the emancipation of slaves, which challenged the established Boer notions concerning their relations with non-whites, but broadly within a context of the Anglicisation policies of the Cape Colony, the Boers trekked

into the interior of the subcontinent to secure—with varying orders of success—their own territorial enclaves. By the mid-1850s four different 'proto-states' had emerged in what was, eventually, to become South Africa—two of these polities were under British control; two were Boer republics.[31] In the late 1850s, there were several attempts at creating a South African confederation under the encouragement of the British governor of the Cape Colony, Lord George Grey. But the Colonial Office in London, ever worried about imperial expenditure, turned these down. In response to Grey's ideas, however, a strong republican tradition, drawing on the American example, developed among the Afrikaners.[32]

Nonetheless, from the 1860s onwards, the ideas of imperial federation—some form of centralized control over a federated British Empire—gained momentum in the metropole. There were many reasons for this development. The mid-Victorian fascination with the ideas of 'free trade' and the individualism of the Manchester School, which, from Adam Smith onwards, had derided the value of colonies, espoused sentimental fears about losing the empire.[33] For others, it was driven by exactly the opposite reason—namely, the need to create 'the Great Commercial Republic of the World' by integrating all parts of the empire into a singular economic and political whole.[34] This approach followed Lord Palmerston's understanding that 'it is the business of the Government to open and secure the roads for the merchant'.[35] Hence, the government must pursue a policy of forcing open the colonies to free trade and, simultaneously, draw them closer to London, the imperial centre.

Towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century, as the rise of United States and Germany (and later Japan) challenged British supremacy, some considered the establishment of an imperial federation as imperative for the future of the empire. The Colonial Society (founded in 1868 and later named the Royal Colonial Institute) and the Imperial Federation League (1884–1893) promoted this perspective. Aided by new technologies that compressed time and space—particularly important were the telegraph and the railway—ideas like 'Greater Britain' or imperial federation increasingly seemed possible. For an imperial federation to work, however, a closer union between the colonies in southern Africa was a precondition—only when southern Africa was united in a single political union could a closer imperial association be envisaged. But, as we have noted, Britain was unwilling to invest resources in fashioning a political union in the region. In the 1870s, Colonial Secretary Lord Carnarvon, who had proposed a 'Monroe Doctrine' for Africa, reinvigorated Lord Grey's scheme for a South African federation, but these ideas, too, were opposed by the British government as well as the Cape colonists, who were worried about hostility from the significant Afrikaner population in the Cape.[36] For Britain, the expenditures incurred by the

Anglo-Zulu and First Anglo-Boer wars put paid to any schemes about further expenditure in South Africa.

This approach swiftly changed with the mining revolution in the subcontinent. Before the discovery of diamonds and gold, the two colonies, the Cape and Natal, were of interest to Britain only as strategic ports on the route to India. As long as the Boer republics of Transvaal and Orange Free State could be kept weak enough not to endanger this strategic interest but strong enough to resist the surrounding African chieftains, Britain's concerns were allayed.[37] But the riches offered by mining fundamentally changed the political and economic calculations offered by the region for several reasons. For one thing, access to these resources, especially to gold, which underwrote the global economy, became Britain's prime objective. Second, the mineral revolution attracted huge numbers of British citizens—both capitalists and workers—to the country. Indeed, the white population of South Africa doubled between 1891 and 1904.[38] Third, the new economic rationale in the region produced reasons for tighter political rule and state supervision—this, in turn, imposed increased state machinery onto the erstwhile frontiers.[39] Unsurprisingly, British anxiety about expenditures was somewhat offset by these new economic and strategic interests.

Yet the most significant development was the imperial-centred agenda of one man who rose to political and economic prominence during this period. This was Cecil John Rhodes, who disregarded both the lack of commitment for resources from the British government to fight the independent republics of Transvaal and Orange Free State and the arguments from the Cape Afrikaners who opposed his ambitions to unite the subcontinent and bring it under the Crown.[40] Investing his own resources and showing indifference to the opinion of his fellow politicians, he sanctioned (what is notoriously called) the Jameson Raid of 1895. This was an attempt by a private militia to annex the Boer republic of Transvaal to the Cape Colony. The juggernaut released by this event only stopped seven years later with the victory of the British in the Anglo-Boer War. But, as we have noted in the introductory chapter, the war itself proved to be a major tipping point in the development of the idea of British imperialism.[41] Until then imperialism—at least with regard to the Dominions—was largely considered to be a noble cause, which stood for 'the federation of Great Britain with her colonies for the purpose of spreading what was best in English civilisation, the application of justice and the message of freedom'.[42] The Boer War, however, generated a distaste for imperialism, pushing a host of liberal writers and politicians to denounce Britain's role in South Africa and turning imperialism into a term of 'partial abuse'.[43]

The implied anti-Semitism of some of the liberal writers, like John Hobson, during the war—putting the blame on Jewish capitalists—and Kaiser Wilhelm II's overtures towards the Paul Kruger administration, apparent

in the infamous 'Kruger Telegram' sent after Jameson Raid, also pointed to the threat of Germany as an imperialist force.[44] The Anglo-Boer War had generated considerable support for the two South African republics in Germany partly because the Boers were considered one of the 'Germanic tribes', even if they were only embraced as 'low Germans'. With a German colony, South-West Africa, bordering the Cape Colony, the British in South Africa were constantly worried about a coming war with Germany.[45] E. H. Carr intriguingly gestured towards another shift six and half decades later. He wrote, 'The Kaiser's Telegram and Germany's naval programme spread the conviction amongst British philosophers that Hegel was less good a philosopher than had been supposed'.[46] In other words, German knowledge traditions were also closed off from intruding into 'British spheres', and as Carr would know better than anyone—he was trained in the Classics—Greek political thought emerged as the reigning alternative.

So the Boer War not only marked a literal shift from the Victorian to the Edwardian era but also reflected a transformation of the ideas that were central to statehood and empire. In the new age, imperial federation, South African statehood and imperialism underwent a discursive crisis of sorts.

South Africa was also the most difficult of the challenges faced by the white settler colonies. Canada (1867), Australia (1901), New Zealand (1907) and Newfoundland (1907) were already British Dominions, and given their largely white British populations, their linkages with imperial Britain were strong. In contrast, South Africa had recently undergone a devastating war, and the thought of it becoming a single political unit under British suzerainty was, at best, premature. Two of the four colonies—Transvaal and Orange River—showed only begrudging loyalty to the empire. Importantly, and this is an aspect only recently flagged in a stunning work of political history by Charles van Onselen, the South African colonies also jostled for competing ideas of state making between Britain and the United States. Van Onselen's work shows that at the time American mining engineers in South Africa included some of the highest paid in the world. Not only were they skilled mining technicians, but they also brought with them the ideas of revolution and republicanism, which were in strict contrast to the more conservative aspirations for southern Africa of the British.[47] But, as we will see, these Americans strongly influenced ideas of racial segregation in South Africa.

In an intriguing way, South Africa and the empire were mirror images of each other. The movement towards closer sovereign union in both was strongly motivated by a perception of increasing threat. The Bambatha Rebellion of 1906 had temporarily—though emphatically—drawn the white colonies in South Africa closer together, while the rise of German naval power pulled Britain and the Dominions into a closer embrace. For the members

of Milner's Kindergarten, South Africa was a miniature of the empire in all its problems and prospects. The prevailing view was that if the southern African colonies remained separated, they faced political doom: likewise for the empire. But if the southern African colonies could unite, and if the settler colonies could be drawn together in an imperial federation, they could dominate their respective regions and perhaps even the world.

This similarity was not only about tracing parallels between these two political formations—achieving the one might well provide the stepping-stone for the other. The formation of statehood in South Africa, it was hoped, might also offer a model for the empire to achieve a similar feat on the wider scale. These tethered processes allowed the members of Milner's Kindergarten to exercise a series of political and methodological choices: to put the issue metaphorically, the brushes that helped them sketch South Africa would later also allow them to paint on the larger canvas of the empire.

The Fortnightly Club (1906–1908)—a members-only private discussion group—was the first experiment in this direction: within the group's confines, members discussed and sharpened their arguments on empire, state and race in the context of creating a political union in southern Africa.[48]

We will now turn to exploring these discussions.

THE FORTNIGHTLY CLUB

One of the first initiatives to flesh out the barebones of Alfred Milner's thinking for South Africa was the establishment of a regular gathering called the Fortnightly Club. Formed in September 1906, the 'club' was one of the earliest attempts at fostering an intellectual life in the mining-obsessed political topography of Edwardian Johannesburg. In essence, it was a gathering of a group of young intellectuals, bureaucrats, lawyers and journalists who assembled to think about and discuss the intellectual foundations of the empire. Its meetings were modelled on the New College Essay Society, Oxford, and were held after supper at the house of one of the club members. The membership of the club was closed (the list of members included white men) with a maximum possible strength of forty members.

Over the course of twenty-one months between September 1906 and May 1908, a total of twenty-six papers were presented to the Fortnightly Club. Unfortunately, only fifteen of the papers have survived the archival journey. Amongst those lost were 'On the Objects and the Constitution of the Fortnightly Club' by J. F. (Peter) Perry; a paper by one of the finest modern architects, Herbert Baker (1862–1946), titled 'On the Relation of the Government to Art', and another titled 'Women's Suffrage' by. S. S. Taylor.

In academic literature, even on South African political history, the Fortnightly Club finds little mention. Perhaps the most authoritative text on the South African unification, *The Unification of South Africa* by British-born historian Leonard Thompson, does not even mention the club, although he does quote extensively from the inaugural paper delivered to the club by Richard Feetham.[49] Walter Nimocks's *Milner's Young Men* describes the club in a couple of lines before focussing on the Selborne Memorandum.[50] John Kendle's fine work on the Kindergarten acknowledges that 'the [Fortnightly] Club served as an excellent place for the Kindergarten to air their ideas and form their opinions' with 'the presence of a number of men not normally a part of their inner committees'.[51] South African–born Cambridge historian Saul Dubow calls the Fortnightly Club a 'political think-tank with close ties to the Kindergarten'.[52] But, like Kendle, Dubow refers only to Feetham's paper.[53]

While limited in number, the papers presented to the Fortnightly Club provide a window into the thinking of young enthusiasts positioned at the empire's margins. Both for them and the project of empire, the idea of speaking from the frontiers was important. Ideas on reforming the empire, of course, were not new. In the Victorian era, strands of 'Greater Britain' or 'imperial federation' thinking had also argued on these lines.[54] But in these early iterations, ideas were pushed from London, making colonial nationalists—as well as anti-imperialists in Britain—sceptical of their purpose. For many liberals and colonial nationalists, such doubts turned into abhorrence of imperial thinking mainly as a result of the Boer War. The crucial difference between these two moments, however, was that the Kindergarten positioned itself as the authentic voice from the frontiers on the reform of the empire rather than advancing ideas from the metropolitan centre.

Although most of the people involved in or associated with the club were British, the group remained conscious of the perception that its ideas should be seen as emerging from the imperial periphery. To do this, it tried its utmost to co-opt Afrikaner leaders into discussions of the later Closer Union Societies. However, the Fortnightly Club was restricted to Britons alone—almost certainly with deliberate intent. Notwithstanding these obvious limitations, the club had an important role in initiating ideas, generating a discussion on them and creating a clearer picture of both the empire and South African statehood for those who participated in its deliberations. Because these discussions remained private, they did not directly enter into the broader political debates at that time, but they significantly impacted the writings (and the subsequent careers) of many club members—especially Lionel Curtis and Philip Kerr.

Members of the Kindergarten were fascinated by ideas of imperial federation or Greater Britain, which had been in circulation from mid-Victorian

times. The empire, they all seemed to agree, needed to be calibrated to the new global and intra-imperial realities. The idea of imperial federation, they argued, had no appreciation of the realities of empire such as the question of autonomy of the settler colonies, or problems caused by widespread immigration of the Asian population, or the emerging 'race' question. However, the notion of Greater Britain was restricted to being either a cultural aspiration or a utilitarian choice for strong defence.[55] In order to be understood and appreciated beyond the British elite circles, the idea had to be thrashed out at the levels of empire, state and society: only once this was plain could an organic conception of empire be created. In this way, they were the first theorists of the British Empire to conceptually map imperialism from the bottom up.

Richard Feetham's paper, which inaugurated the club, was titled 'Some Problems of South African Federation and Reasons for Facing Them'.[56] Rather unpersuasively, it set out to make the case for bringing about a federation in South Africa, but it was neither an elaborate exposition nor a conclusive one. It succeeded in laying out the problems facing the fostering of a federation and invited others to engage with the issue.

The club's rules of conduct were also listed at the same meeting on 4 October 1906 at Feetham's house. Then newly built, this Herbert Baker–designed house still stands on the Valley Road in the leafy Johannesburg suburb of Parktown. The house, named 'the Moot House, i.e. the House of Assembly and Debate',[57] gained legendary status in Round Table circles as later each Round Table meeting was called a 'Moot'. The club was to meet, if possible, every fortnight—hence the club's name—in the house of one member, who would chair the meeting. The meetings usually started after supper at 8:30 or 8:45 p.m., and the discussions would continue until midnight. A paper would be presented at each meeting, and each member had a maximum of ten minutes to reply to it. The minutes accompanying the papers presented did not note the comments that followed each, possibly to allow for frank and forthright discussion.[58]

A few months later, in April 1907, the club was turned from an ad hoc body of members into an organisation with paid memberships and an Officer's Committee of five members. George Richardson acted as honorary secretary for the first few months but was soon replaced by a young member, Philip Kerr, who had just turned twenty-five years old. New rules were added regarding conditions, subscriptions and termination of memberships. Amongst these was the stipulation that three consecutive absences from meetings, without asking for leave, was a ground for the termination of membership. Although it was not possible for the group to meet every fortnight—there were two instances when its meetings were held after more than three months and other instances of gaps of a month—efforts were made to keep to

the fortnightly schedule. The last meeting of the Fortnightly Club was held on 16 June 1908 with a note in Kerr's diary that the meetings were discontinued during the parliamentary session. But meetings of the club never resumed, and the reasons are not known. Even in most of the latter writings—both public and personal—of the members of this club, there is very little mention of its activities. We must limit, therefore, our analysis to the papers presented at the club that survive in the archive. It is fair to assume that the club was more of an intellectual exercise that helped some of the leading members of the group to develop their own ideas about South Africa and the empire. By June 1908, those ideas had begun to shape the reality, and the group moved from the stage of private deliberations to public propaganda: this was to come in the form of Closer Union Societies and the journal *The State*.[59]

A THEORY OF POLITICAL RULE

The attention of the Fortnightly Club was focused on developing a conception of statehood in southern Africa that would in turn buttress the organic unity of the empire. Although each of the papers touches on a specific aspect of the federation of South Africa, collectively they present a remarkable set of ideas about these issues. Nonetheless, if one paper were to capture the central theme of the club's activities, it is Lionel Curtis's, which was presented on 9 May 1907.[60] The late Marxist historian Martin Legassick identifies Curtis's paper as a defining text that provided a theoretical coherence to the idea of segregation in South Africa.[61]

In important ways, this paper is unlike Curtis's other writings. A prolific writer during his lifetime, Curtis wrote the Fortnightly Club paper after finishing his first weighty political document, the Selborne Memorandum. The contrast between the two documents is evident in both style and candour. The memorandum is written for public consumption and is considerably restrained, although racist when it comes to the native question. The Fortnightly Club paper is frank, overtly racist and spectacularly lacking in moderation in language or form. In the Selborne Memorandum he is concerned with making a case for a federation in South Africa; in the Fortnightly Club paper Curtis frames the question of South African statehood in the context of the political form of the empire. In the course of this framing, his total devotion to the British Empire becomes clear.[62]

The idea of the British Empire, he argued, was based on the ideal of the 'best system of government in each community compatible with local conditions'. This he contrasted with another ideal within imperial thinking—namely, the equality of the rule of law. For Curtis, the proponents of the latter were greatly mistaken for two reasons.

First, the empire itself was not framed through a single preordained theory. Rather, empire building, he wrote, 'was the result of many different causes and motives to which the sea-faring habits of the British race gave free play'. Hence, the empire emerged from contingency rather than any grand scheme of colonization. So American colonisation was a result of religious persecution; Canadian colonisation resulted from fear of American republics; Australia was a replacement for America as a dumping ground for convicts; South Africa was 'acquired simply as the commercial half-way house to India'; and India was colonised to 'provide it with a government compatible with the maintenance of the great commercial interests'.[63] Consequently, Britain has had to implement practical solutions that aimed first at securing the colonies from internal and external troubles. As a result, the mandarins of empire were not afforded a theoretician's distance and abstractness to ponder the question of political rule from a scientific and objective vantage point.

Second, any theory of political rule had to acknowledge the diversity within the empire. For Curtis, it was chiefly composed of two kinds of civilisations: modern and ancient. The former were those 'civilisations' that had developed faculties of change in human organization—namely, the Europeans. These, he suggested, had over generations adapted to changes and progressed significantly in developing modern institutions of self-government. Within Europe, various cultures developed at different paces, which gave these 'modern civilisations' an internal hierarchy. Britain had become the most developed race because it had perfected the art of self-government and free institutions. Others, like the Germans and the French, were on a lower scale but were capable of self-development to achieve better institutions. In contrast to these higher forms, 'ancient civilisations' remained culturally and politically static, without any internal capacity for political change. Consequently, autocracy was the most viable and understood form of rule in these places. More pessimistically, there was no hope of these tipping over to become modern. Unlike other social Darwinists who argued that backward peoples could be pulled into the modern era through the 'civilisation mission'—something that he had argued in the Selborne Memorandum—here Curtis suggested that the principles of progress, externally or internally driven, could only work within modern societies.

A further reason flows from this position. Any arrangement of political equality throughout the empire was contrary to the intrinsic traits of the diverse races within it. Racial or cultural characters determined the form of rule, and therefore political rule was to be tailored to the respective stage of civilisation.

These arguments were not new, but taken together, their logic differed from the Victorian liberal reasoning on a crucial point. Unlike others, Curtis had not argued that the British rule was good because it would act as a

civilising influence on non-Europeans. On the contrary, he believed that the attempts at civilizing non-Europeans were often counterproductive because the superior races were more likely to be pulled down if they were to cohabit with non-Europeans, rather than pulling them up. For him, the originality of British imperial rule was the ability to develop institutions that were compatible with local conditions. Put differently, he argued that Britain was the most advanced nation in the world not because it had some innate capacity of uplifting other populations but because it had developed the genius for tailoring institutions well suited to every stage of civilisation. So the British Empire gave the people the best form of government they could expect.

Accordingly, he reckoned that since the task of political subjugation of colonial peoples had almost been completed with the Boer War, this afforded an opportunity to think about, and perfect, a theory of political rule of empire. In its wider setting, British rule had to keep two further considerations in mind: (1) minimising imperial intervention and, thereby, reducing British expenditures, and (2) maximising political freedom across the empire. Minimal investment of resources was necessary in order to keep the empire a sustainable economic project, while maximisation of political freedoms was made contingent by 'British imagination [which] hastens to picture this Empire less as a privilege and a right than as a mission to justify it to the subject peoples as such'.[64]

In response to these challenges, Curtis proposed a conceptualization of his own: a three-tier approach to political rule in the empire. The first concerned colonies that were composed of predominantly European populations, such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The second entailed colonies such as India with almost wholly non-European populations. The two colonies in South Africa, the Cape and Natal, that contained a significant European settler community within an overwhelming non-European population were the third.

Canada, Australia and New Zealand—'almost empty before they were occupied by Europeans'—were to be granted full self-government. Populated mostly by Europeans, with a majority of English speakers, these colonies were to be encouraged to 'exercise the most direct control over their own administration'.[65] There was only a negligible Aboriginal population which 'constitute[d] no social or political danger'. In these places, the white community '[could] be trusted to look after them as they look after kangaroos and elk, as a sort of national curiosity'. This would free Britain from expending resources in these colonies while maximizing their political freedoms.

India was the other extreme. The country was almost wholly populated by non-Europeans. In Curtis's view, this meant that culturally and historically the only form of rule that its people understood was autocracy. However, the

problem of Oriental autocracy was that all power was concentrated in one person. Invariably, 'the human conscience is atrophied by the exercise of unbridled . . . power over others'; consequently, this autocracy degenerates into despotism. The result was that political freedoms were non-existent. The solution for Curtis was not democracy, which was an alien institution in India, but a mediated form of autocracy that was efficient as well as bound by some form of responsible authority: rule through a bureaucracy that was accountable to the public conscience in Britain, 'sufficiently remote to prevent constant interference but near enough to prevent free government from degenerating into despotism'. This married the best of Weberian bureaucracy with Oriental autocracy. It also provided an optimal fit between maximised freedoms and minimal expenditure.[66]

Between these two extremes was South Africa, a place composed of a non-white population 'less capable of self-government than those in India' and a European community less numerous but sufficiently strong to demand self-government. Kenya and Rhodesia, as colonies in the making, added to this distinct category of colonialisation.[67] In his book *The Government of South Africa*, Curtis had written, 'South African governments are called upon to deal with at least two separate societies, whose ideas, aims and interests are kept apart from each other by a wide hereditary gulf'.[68] Furthermore, within each of these communities there were major cleavages not faced by the other colonies. The European community was fractured between the British and the Boer—a divide that straddled the two extremes of civilisation within the broad category of Europeans.[69] Amongst the non-Europeans, there was a significant population of Asians relatively more advanced than the other group, the Africans. The former demanded rights commensurate with their position in their own countries, and the latter had only a rudimentary conception of political rule, Curtis argued.

Cast in this fashion, the issue of South African statehood was intricately linked to the very nature of the empire. Curtis's solution to the problem was to employ a mix of nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century environmental determinism, the ideas of segregation, separation of political and economic spheres of work and ownership of responsibility by South Africa's white population. The political unity of the latter, he surmised, could be achieved by entrusting the responsibility for internal security (against, say, native rebellion) to them. The overwhelming numbers of natives and the constant threat of rebellions, he argued, were incentive enough for the disparate white community to pull together to forge some sort of union. The condition for this was that the British government should refuse to intervene in internal matters like these. Left to fend for their own security, the different colonies would have no choice but to cooperate with one another: as we have pointed out, this had happened previously during the 1906 Bambatha Rebellion.

Thus, self-government for the whites in South Africa was not only prudent from the point of view of liberal ethics but also consistent with the country's political needs.

Curtis had simply dismissed any notion of making Africans any part of the formal political process, even though this was practiced in the Cape Colony. As noted, he had repudiated conceptions of social Darwinism. Echoing Pearson's fears, he had argued that the superior races were more at risk of descending the civilisational ladder than the inferior races were likely to scale it. His solution to this was complete segregation, where 'natives' would be ruled through a Weberian-like bureaucracy. This understanding would be followed with some deviations and degrees of strictness in setting the direction of race policy for the next ninety years in southern Africa.

In the paper, Curtis advocated the creation of 'native enclaves' such as the territory of Basutoland, now Lesotho, where all natives would enjoy political rights commensurate with their progress.[70] He did not, however, elaborate what these rights would, should, or could be. While acknowledging that the land available for these territories was very limited, he dismissed the notion that they would be overcrowded. 'Hadn't Britain's population grown from mere thousands to 40 million in the British Islands?' he asked.[71] Further, he argued that much of the African population would live temporarily in white areas where they would be employed. For him, it was imperative that the Africans be pushed from agriculture into the industrial or mining sectors of the economy. Limiting land for agriculture would help to propel them in this direction without a concomitant demand for political rights. Likewise, for Asians he believed that their political rights were limited to the area of their territorial origin (i.e., India and China), for that was where a form of rule specific to their condition had been designated. Recognising that immigration was in some ways the economic lifeline of the empire, Curtis advanced a view that political rights were tied to territorial, cultural and climatic origins. This prompted him to scale up the segregation argument by arguing for a separation of races within the empire based on latitude. So he recommended that the temperate regions be reserved for Europeans and the tropical ones for non-Europeans.

This vision of the world brought together the two conflicting visions of Charles Dilke and Charles Pearson discussed above. As for Dilke, Anglo-Saxon dominance, for Curtis, was both a moral good and a political fact. He also acknowledged Pearson's cautionary warnings, which suggested that the white man was under siege. However, he disagreed that these contrasting visions were inevitable—neither Anglo-Saxon dominance nor its decline was predestined. Rather, through a calibrated strategy, British dominance could not only be perpetuated but also fruitfully harnessed for the benefits of empire. In modern parlance, the empire needed to be rebooted.

One of the central pathways to this was through the policy of 'segrega-
tion'. In South Africa, while racial segregation in one form or other dates
back to the arrival of the Dutch East India Company in the seventeenth
century, the theoretical coherence and ideological vigour that unpinned
segregation, as the work of social historians such as Paul Rich, Martin
Legassick and Saul Dubow has shown, was fleshed out by English liberals
in the first decade of the twentieth century. This fed into specific policies
that turned the South African state into first a segregationist and then an
apartheid polity. Indeed, two of the most crucial figures in this fashioning
were Howard Pim (1962–1934) and Lionel Curtis—both members of the
Fortnightly Club. As we have seen, Legassick argued that Curtis's paper (to
the Fortnightly Club) was the first instance in South Africa when the word
'segregation' was used.[72] The term had, however, been used earlier. Dubow
shows that it was used in the Cape parliament by the governor general in
1902, and Paul Rich also refers to a 1903 usage by the Cape liberal law-
yer Richard Rose Innes.[73] But more importantly, Dubow also argues that
Pim should be credited for theoretically mapping out its context in South
Africa.[74] Both Dubow and Legassick agree that Pim and Curtis set the
policy in a more coherent context than ever before and provided ideological
rationalisation not before articulated.

SOUTHERN SEGREGATIONS

As we have pointed out, Pearson's prediction of the non-whites swamping the
world appeared cataclysmic to pre-union South Africa, especially in a time
when the formation of a new state was underway. In this process, the issue
of political rights for Africans (and other non-European groups) was under-
standably the central question. Unlike in other settler colonies and even the
American South, Africans were in a large majority. James Bryce, whose three
volume *The American Commonwealth*[75] had played 'a key role in educating
English-speaking peoples around the world about what he called the "negro
problem"'[76]—to the extent that the white ruling classes in South Africa and
Australia considered it a 'bible'[77]—explained this after a visit to South Africa
in 1895 at the invitation of Cape liberal politician John Merriman: 'In the
whole United States the whites are to the blacks as ten to one; in Africa south
of the Zambesi it is the blacks who are ten to one to the whites. Or if we
compare the four South African colonies and republics with the fifteen old
slave States, the blacks are in the former nearly four times as numerous as the
whites, and the whites in the latter twice as numerous as the blacks'.[78] While
Bryce noted that on the whole the African population in South Africa seemed
'submissive and not resentful',[79] South African whites viewed the situation

as a time bomb. They argued that in South Africa, the native population was numerous, comparatively well organised and largely resistant to the forces of extinction (i.e., violence, diseases and savagery). Furthermore, the majority had been able to mimic the coloniser to the extent that its inherent traits of 'self-destruction' were hidden, and it had made itself useful for the colonial venture.

On this issue, we have briefly alluded to the paper by W. Weber that was presented to the Fortnightly Club on 23 May 1907. In it Weber expressed fears of white extinction by arguing that natives were constantly 'studying and unfortunately, imitating' the white population and crystallising their dislike and distrust of the whites. Howard Pim, in a paper delivered to the club some months later, argued in similar vein: imitation ought not be confused with assimilation because it concealed hatred for the white man. The two races, Pim argued, were diametrically opposed on every human trait. 'The native', he wrote, 'was low on the scale of human evolution' and exhibited 'absence of any real sense of individual security', simplicity in the tribal system, want of a learned class, lack of any system or scale of land measurement, totemic beliefs and complete lack of written or other 'means of recording their thoughts', no sense of responsibility, want of foresight and arrest of mental development revealed through 'known differences of brain structure and nerve development'. This condition would prevail 'as long as we retain our self-respect'.[80]

Born in Dublin, Pim came to South Africa in 1890 as a professional accountant for Cecil John Rhodes's British South Africa Company. Over the years, he was considered an expert on race relations and native affairs, helping found the South African Institute of Race Relations in 1929. Before joining the Fortnightly Club, Pim had fleshed out his ideas on segregation in a paper delivered at the 1905 meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Johannesburg on 1 September.[81] His notes for this paper, which are also archived at the University of the Witwatersrand, suggest the first theoretical exposition of the segregation idea.[82] Quoting, ironically, from W. E. B. Du Bois's recently released book *The Souls of Black Folk*, Pim argued that whites, especially those in South Africa, should take very seriously Du Bois's assertion that 'the problem of the colour line is the problem of the 20th century'. The 'native problem', for him, was not just a 'black problem'; it was also a 'white problem'. The increasing contact between the white and black races in South Africa arose primarily because of the mining revolution in the country. This had created a situation where the value of labour had diminished to the point that white men considered mining a discredited profession. Echoing Pearson's assertions, he argued that the general protection provided by white civilisation and rule had increased security for Africans, allowing them to develop a capacity for industry.

Furthermore, 'this terrible contact' has taken the natives away from 'their ancient habits and customs, their beliefs and modes of living . . . and as a result, [they have] come to assume towards us an attitude vastly different to that of their fathers and grandfathers, they have come to adopt it, as it were, in spite of themselves, their better selves'.[83]

Segregation as a political ideology emerges from the inherent contradictions of an industrialising (and/or commercial agricultural) settler society. The non-white labour is essential to profits, but the increasing interracial contact leads to fears about 'cultural pollution', often a euphemism for maintaining white supremacy.[84] Controlled contact was seen as the key. As a result, Pim argued it was essential that the pace and nature of interracial contact was controlled. During slavery, he quoted Du Bois, the 'best Europeans' and 'best Africans' lived in close proximity. On the contrary, the 'civilizing' mission usually brought the worst natives to live in close proximity with the Europeans, especially in urban spaces, since the best ones became self-sufficient and tilled their own land. Quoting another African American scholar, Booker T. Washington, Pim noted, 'The negro is at his best in most cases when in agricultural line, in too many cases he is the worst in city life'.

Of course, Pim draws here on what Michel Foucault refers to as the distinction between 'savage' and 'barbarian'.[85] The 'noble' savage is pre-civilisation; the 'barbarian' is post-civilisation. The former exists in the absence of civilisation; the latter lives as its after-effect. And precisely because the barbarian is created in opposition to the civilised, it can never be 'assimilated'. Indeed, interaction with the barbarian invariably also corrupts the civilised too. The African before the coming of the white man was the noble savage, who once corrupted by civilisation, turned into a potential barbarian.

It is indeed significant that the debates among African American intellectuals were being closely read and analysed by white intellectuals in Johannesburg. The proletarianisation of Africans, Pim argued, was happening at the cost of their traditional way of living. While acknowledging that some Africans could be educated, he argued that the 'civilised' Africans would always remain a small minority. As a race, Africans showed no inclination towards adopting the ways of the white man and would remain 'mentally' inferior. Accordingly, it was better if the form of their political rule and their education was aligned with their mental faculties. Based on Booker T. Washington's idea of vocational education, he proposed that the natives should only be given industrial education and not be taught the general sciences and the humanities. Likewise, African political development ought to be along indigenous lines; hence native chiefs should be made responsible for political rule. His conclusion after a close reading of Du Bois and Washington was that their writings were 'a cry for the reestablishment of chieftainship, for a

reversion to some modified tribal system'. Pim argued that while Americans needed to create such a system, in South Africa 'tribal systems' were already in existence and should be utilised for governing. Moreover, the natives must be segregated into 'reserves', completely separate from the white areas, where the former could practice their own forms of political rule. Here, the role of whites was akin to that of the European missionary, who only acted as the supervisor, while the governing body of the native church was distinctively African. Likewise, whites could only intervene as supervisors or trustees in native political affairs.[86]

Pim elaborated further on these ideas in his Fortnightly Club paper. If anything, his opinions had become even more reactionary on the race issue, which was amplified by the fact that the paper was presented at a private gathering. He claimed that Africans were 'mentally and morally' inferior and that 'each [colonising] race in succession has left the negroid peoples where it found them, and no civilised race has transmitted to them the distinctive features of its religion, society or knowledge'. The attempts at assimilation or social and political uplift of the native races by Europeans were entirely misplaced, and he called for 'reverting to the idea of Chieftainship, working through a central and permanent department of native affairs'.[87]

While Pim constantly referenced America, ironically drawing from the work of leading African American thinkers, it was another American, the mining engineer William L. Honnold, who fully sketched out the 'Negro problem in America' for the club.[88] In his paper, he argued that the Africans had an internal trait of, what he called, 'retrograde development', and he went on to provide several examples. He suggested that left to himself, the black individual was a debased human being whose instincts were 'inimical to survival', and knowing 'little self-control, obligation and cooperation', he was always moving towards self-annihilation. Honnold used the same logic to justify slavery, suggesting that whatever its ills, it had saved the black population from self-inflicted extinction because of the intervention of the 'parental' hand of the white man. In contrast, wherever the native population resisted this parental hand, extinction was natural, and sometimes the white colonisers had to push through social changes in the service of 'civilisation'.

These positions were patently influenced by developments in America, where some white pundits opined that after the Reconstruction period, the segregationist Jim Crow South had reversed demographic trends. Whites were 'steadily outstripping' the blacks, which meant—in the words of one observer—that 'the evils which are now created by the presence of so many negroes in the South will not relatively and proportionately grow more dangerous'.[89] The black race was going extinct in America on account of blacks'

inability to cope up with industrialisation, as they were in competition with rather than under the tutelage of whites. A proponent of the 'new South' thesis, the historian Patrick Bruce, wrote in his 1905 book,

> The day will come in the South, just as it came long ago in the North, when for lack of skill, lack of sobriety, and lack of persistency, the negro will find it more difficult to stand up as a rival to the white working man. Already it is the ultimate fate of the negro that is in the balance, not the ultimate fate of the Southern States in consequence of the presence of the negro. The darkest day for the Southern whites has passed. . . . The darkest day for the Southern blacks has only just begun, for in this age of the world, no race can in the long run hold its own in a civilized land, unless it has all the moral qualities necessary to meet successfully the trying conditions of life prevailing in a highly organized modern community.[90]

Commenting on Honnold's thinking on these matters, Curtis later wrote that the 'longer experience of the United States has a bearing on the future composition of society in South Africa, the importance of which is difficult to overrate'.[91] In his book *The Government of South Africa*, Curtis acknowledged that 'the degree of liberty which acts like tonic on European society, becomes an intoxicant when administered to a race of children endowed with the passions of grown men'.[92]

However, the American example could only provide limited direction. The fact was, as the members acknowledged, the native population in South Africa was overwhelmingly large, which limited the value of the American comparison. Pim and Weber had noted that through their sheer numerical superiority, unlike in America, local 'natives' had been able to wade through the fallouts of industrialisation and contact with 'superior civilisation'. Further, unlike in America, the needs of labour-hungry mines could not be fulfilled predominantly through the white working class. This meant that while in America the black population became an appendage of industrialisation, in South Africa black workers were its very motors.

Consequently, Pim and Weber had argued that in South Africa the extinction logic was applied in reverse: extinction was no more a corollary of civilisation but its antithesis. They believed that in the shorter run, the natives made themselves useful to the colonial venture through their labour, but in the long run the white population faced the spectre of extinction. This called for a policy that would not only keep Africans and whites separate, on a far bigger scale than applied in the American South, but also allow for access to a constant supply of labour. Since the project of South African statehood was explicitly organised around mining capital, labour was a central and constant concern. The centrality of this issue meant that race, immigration and social hierarchy were strung together in a peculiar form of statehood whose claim to

legitimacy rested on political, economic and social exclusion of the greatest number of subjects.

A 1906 paper titled 'The Transvaal Labour Problem', written by J. F. (Peter) Perry, addressed the issue of labour. The native population in South Africa, Perry argued, was insufficient for providing the labour required for the mines.[93] Consequently, it had been drawn from elsewhere. The Portuguese colony of Mozambique, for instance, with one-ninth the native population in South Africa, provided three-quarters of the latter's mining labour. This highlighted a fundamental contradiction in the search for statehood in South Africa—namely, that the country drew its major workforce from beyond its future sovereign boundaries. Hence, instead of having a workforce that was 'natural, free and permanent', South Africa could only get 'artificial, restricted and temporary' labour.[94] Given this contradiction, the only long-term solution was to increase white immigration to the country.

But there was a problem here too. In *The Government of South Africa*, Curtis pointed out that more white people were emigrating out of, than immigrating into, South Africa.[95] Given this, Curtis warned that 'South Africa will . . . sink to the level of States such as those of central and southern America—republics in name and not seldom tyrannies in fact unequal to the task of their own internal government and too weak to exert an influence on the world's affairs'. But if white immigration was actively promoted, the country would 'gradually assume its place besides England, the United States, Canada or Australia, as one of the powers of the world and share in shaping the direction of its future'.[96]

Perry argued in a similar vein that the more white settlers could be brought into South Africa, the lesser the long-term concerns would be for the country's future. However, a further problem presented itself: whites would not be able to sustain themselves if they had to compete with the low wages that the Africans were paid. It was precisely the temporary, artificial and restricted nature of the labour that kept these wages low. The migrant Africans lived in the cities without families and in meagre fashion—this ensured the profitability of mining.[97] These linkages suggested how capitalism and state formation in southern Africa were simultaneously compatible and contradictory. While the former unleashed the centralising imperative of state formation, it also limited the possibilities of the creation of a white-only state.

Faced with this predicament, what should the whites do? The political solution to this question had been provided by Curtis, and almost everyone at the time was in agreement with it. The four colonies—which were destined to become South Africa—must draw together to forge a nation-state so that all the white strength could be pooled against any native rebellion.[98] Socially, Pim, Weber and Honnold advocated the same political and social segregation of the Europeans and non-Europeans that Curtis propagated. Assimilation

was dangerous, for the native not only pulled the European down but also threatened the latter with extinction.

There was a lone dissenter to this schema: a young South African–born lawyer, James Stratford, who would go on to became the chief justice of South Africa. Stratford presented a paper titled 'The Policy of Permitting Free Immigration of Asiatics' on 13 September 1907.[99] He argued that segregation was unnatural in South Africa—and elsewhere—because assimilation was a defining principle of the Anglo-Saxon model of progress. The only way for segregation to work, he stated, would be if the world were restored to medieval times—an age when segregation was the natural order of things. While Stratford certainly adhered to the principal of racial hierarchy—European, Asian and African—he did not believe that each race was frozen in time. In fact, he argued that the progress of some of the Asiatic races, such as the Japanese, was attributable to assimilation and adoption of Western-inspired modernity. So the true advance of Western civilisation could only be achieved by promoting immigration and assimilation in the empire. The natural way to counter the problem of races was therefore to promote a progressive form of assimilation.

Stratford's most stringent comments were directed towards Curtis. His Fortnightly Club paper, delivered almost four months after Curtis's, tore into the latter's environmental determinism and into the theory of permanent antagonism of the Europeans and the non-Europeans, arguing that schemes of racial segregation, whether according to latitude or other considerations, were abnormal. He pointed out that one-third of the white territory in Australia was south of the Tropic of Capricorn. Further, based on Curtis's scheme, China would lose three-fourths of its territory, and a full two-thirds of the earth's territory would have to be reserved for whites, despite their being in the minority.

But almost everyone in the Fortnightly Club seemed to concur on one solution to South Africa's racial dilemma: white immigration needed to be increased. This, as one paper after other argued, was the only long-term solution to the problem of racial dominance. One problem naturally was the huge number of whites needed for this task. But the more insidious question regarded the dignity of labour. In South Africa, the whites saw labour as a native occupation and hence below the station of whites. Consequently, white unemployment was preferred to participation in some forms of labour; this led to the 'poor white' problem. Unless the dignity of labour was restored in the country, Curtis argued, white immigration would only compound social problems. In the short term, therefore, Curtis conceded that Africans would have to comprise the majority of the labour force.

Honnold offered a different solution. He argued that white immigration to South Africa could be made attractive if the country's agricultural resources

became internationally competitive.[100] He suggested that one dared not take a long-term view of the transient mining resources; instead, if commercial agriculture was promoted, a 'good type' of European immigration into the country would be encouraged. An agricultural immigrant—stable, family oriented and moral—was usually a better type than a mining immigrant, who was invariably unstable, individualistic and immoral. An agricultural immigrant was also more likely to neutralise and overshadow the 'unfavourable' influence of the native, as opposed to the mining immigrant, who was unlikely to maintain a high standard of civilisation in the squalor of the mines. This near class analysis asserted that the white race in Africa, so long as it remained faithful to its European heritage, was not in danger. In the overwhelming presence of Africans, there was continually a danger of 'throwing back', as it was termed: the pulling down of Europeans into barbarism, as with the Boers and with poorer whites in the American South.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION

Other papers in this Fortnightly Club archive speak to themes identified by Curtis and Feetham. Some are related to issues of sovereignty, such as the nature of the relationship between the empire and South Africa. The general agreement here was that statehood in South Africa would both strengthen this relationship and help to transform the empire into a federated structure. However, for this to happen, it was imperative that a genuine separation of powers be established (and maintained) between the imperial metropole and the South African state.

Dougal O. Malcolm, in his paper 'The Relations between Downing Street and the Self Governing Colonies,' identified the limits of both the imperial power and the colonies but set these against the backdrop of the specific circumstances in South Africa.[101] For Malcolm, the relations within the empire were of a form different from those within both the international and the domestic realms. The empire was positioned midway between the international and the domestic, and what made this possible was a convenient separation of powers. He likened the link between Britain and the Dominions to the relationship between a senior and a junior partner in a commercial firm. In this case, the former could interfere only in matters that were of interest the firm but not in the personal matters of the junior. Most matters of political authority, he argued, could readily be consigned to one of two spheres. Defence, foreign and fiscal policies fell into the domain of imperial affairs, and matters of domestic legislation were concerned with internal affairs of the colony. Taking a less abstract and thoroughly functional view, he argued that British government was no more than 'the body of permanent officials

who carry out and to a great extent influence the policy of the government'
and who were inclined to take less rather than more responsibility. This
implied that Downing Street was more likely to leave matters in the hand
of colonies, except when interference was absolutely necessary. Hence, in
practice the principle of separation of power would work in the favour of
colonies.

But there was one issue, particularly relevant to South Africa, that was
difficult to place in either the imperial or the domestic sphere: this was the
question of Asian immigration. Two major Asian groups had migrated to
Transvaal: the Chinese and the Indians.[102] In the case of the former, Malcolm
argued, if, say, the Transvaal made discriminatory policies or chose to deport
all Chinese, it remained a matter intrinsic to the government in Transvaal.
Any interference by London was indefensible because the issue could not
affect imperial affairs in any way: no 'special' imperial authority would be
required for Transvaal to do this. Moreover, there was no fear of any con-
flict between Transvaal and a foreign power or another colony. The Chinese
government could not complain because it had agreed to these provisions
through the Anglo-Chinese Labour Convention in 1904. Even if there was
moral outrage in England over the issue, it would not be sufficient for an
imperial intervention. However, it would be a different matter if Indians were
expelled from the Transvaal. Any such measure was likely to provoke matters
in India, and this, in turn, would jeopardise that country's security. This, then,
was very much within the imperial realm, and London would have the right
to intervene in such matters.

After considering the 'rights' of the colonies, Malcolm outlined their
'duties'. He argued that power came with certain responsibilities, and the
self-governing colonies could not expect to enjoy one without performing
the other. Britain obviously bore disproportionate responsibility for protect-
ing the empire, even when the self-governing colonies enjoyed veritable
forms of autonomy. He proposed that each colony would be required to
contribute a proportional quota to the cost of both imperial defence and
diplomacy. In return, each colony would have a say in these matters through
an 'Imperial Council', which would be made up through a system of pro-
portional representation. Along with proposing 'home rule' for all self-
governing colonies and the idea of an Imperial Council, Malcolm's scheme
of 'imperial federation' involved developing a common civil service for the
empire. He explained this as 'a civil service common to the whole [empire]
serving indifferently throughout it, so that the government of one part of the
Empire may never be handicapped by lack of knowledge or sympathy with
every other part'.[103]

These proposals were the first occasion when the notion of an imperial
federation was schematically discussed by members of the Moot—many of

whom later became enthusiastic champions of the idea. While Malcolm's most innovative contribution to the scheme was the idea of a common civil service for the empire—this was a significant advance over Richard Jebb's earlier suggestion to open the Indian Civil Service to Rhodes Scholars from the settler colonies[104]—he was not an unqualified champion of bureaucracy. On the contrary he saw it as an impediment to the development of the state. In another paper delivered to the club on 17 March 1908, titled 'Socialism and Civil Service', Malcolm elaborated on his view of bureaucracy.[105] In it, he argued that state bureaucracy was a force of conservation not creation—it acted like a 'brake', not as 'a driving wheel'. Hence, the state should concern itself with functions of rules and regulations and leave the productive work in the hands of private interests. The empire and its common bureaucracy, he implied, must be confined to creating the environment that would help the capital to drive the state towards progress. (Read today, this approach appears in sync with how Malcolm's own life would unfold—a civil servant while he penned these thoughts, he would soon join a private corporation, albeit one that looked and acted like a state, the British South Africa Company.)

The other concern that Malcolm had highlighted but not discussed in detail in his paper was the issue of defence. On this issue, it is interesting to note how Edwardian advocates of imperial federation drew two Victorian schools of thought on the issue together. The opponents of a Greater Britain in the nineteenth century—Gladstonian liberals, in particular—had warned of the dangers posed by imperial overstretch and argued against excessive defence spending as a reason behind their 'little Englander' policy.[106] However, the proponents of imperial federation advanced the same argument to achieve the opposite outcome. The responsibility for defence of colonies, they argued, must be given to—even forced upon, as Curtis had argued—the colonies themselves. The envisaged federation would be stronger if the colonies, collectively, contributed to the defence of the empire. This position would also give Britain more resources to draw on if called upon to ward off the challenge of emerging powers like Germany and Japan.

The same issue was broadly the main concern of two other papers presented to the club. One of these, by John Cavendish Lyttelton (then aide-de-camp to the high commissioner and later Britain's undersecretary of state for war from 1939 to 1940), was titled 'The Military Policy of the Liberal Government'. The second, presented by C. L. Anderson (an accountant who later commanded a South African Light Horse regiment), analysed how South Africa might contribute more significantly to its own and also to the empire's security.[107] Titled 'A Paper on the Defences of South Africa', it reviewed the nature of defence arrangements in five southern African colonies—the then colony of Southern Rhodesia was counted in with the

four South African ones. Irrespective of whether the federation of South
Africa was achieved or not, the paper argued, the defence in South Africa
must be taken up as a question of priority—this was largely because of
the fear of a general native uprising. Referring to this particular threat, he
declared, 'South of the Zambesi we [South African whites] have one com-
mon enemy'.[108] In the Zulu uprisings, the cooperation among the white
colonies in South Africa had also set an important precedent of coopera-
tive defence. But there was a worry that a war in Europe might also spill
over, and if faced with this, the South African colonies would be forced to
fight together. 'With five different organisations, working under different
conditions and regulations, the defence of South Africa as a whole cannot
claim to be on a satisfactory footing', he warned. He strongly advocated
setting up a permanent South African Defence Council; the establishment,
following the example of Australia and Canada, of a navy; and enrolment
of 'permanently paid volunteer or militia force' by each colony.[109] A pro-
fessional defence force, while paid for by the colony, could also be called
upon to serve anywhere in South (read: southern) Africa or even within the
British Empire. Anderson emphasised that this was important not only from
the point of view of defence but also for setting up a moral compass. Call-
ing for universal conscription, the colonies, he argued, must set an example
of 'truer patriotism' for Britain, which (he insisted) was on the wane in the
latter.

This discussion of the papers that were presented to the Fortnightly Club
offers a glimpse into the Edwardian mind. Entering into the twentieth
century, empire, state and society—the three levels of imperial commu-
nity—were being re-thought and re-imagined. Empire was being threatened
by the rise of contending powers such as Germany, the United States and
Japan; capital had reached the far ends of empire and was challenging the
power of state control over social relations; and neither extermination nor
social Darwinism could be convincingly drawn to deal with the reality of an
overwhelming non-European population against a minority in a country in
formation.

It is in these openings that the project of International Relations begins
to take shape, for it is important to understand that the labours of the Fort-
nightly Club did not end but rather evolved into another project—Closer
Union Societies. Based on the discussions in the club, these societies were
then formed to collectively advance the idea that a closer union in South
Africa was needed for the sustenance of the white race. Within six months,
a journal—*The State*—was instituted and became the mouthpiece of this
wider schema.

And it is towards this wider horizon that our attention will now turn.

NOTES

1. Charles Dilke, *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries during 1866–67* (London: Macmillan, 1869), 1:260.

2. Dilke, *Greater Britain*, 346–47.

3. Bill Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, vol. 1: *The White Man's World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 74.

4. Dilke, *Greater Britain*, 346–47.

5. 'Swarming' was a term often used in the settler colonial world to refer to Asian immigration.

6. Charles Pearson, *National Life and Character: A Forecast*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1913 [1893]). See, in particular, chapter 1, titled "Unchangeable Limits of the Higher Races."

7. Francis Galton coined the term 'eugenics' in his *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development* (London: Macmillan, 1883).

8. Greta Jones, *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction between Biological and Social Theory* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1980), 100.

9. Pearson, *National Life*, 38.

10. Pearson, *National Life*, 39–41.

11. Pearson, *National Life*; Marilyn Lake, "The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White Australia," *History Workshop Journal* 58, no. 1 (2004): 41–62.

12. C. H. Lincoln, "Reviewed Work(s): National Life and Character: A Forecast by Charles H. Pearson," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 5, (1895): 140–43.

13. Lake, "The White Man under Siege," 41.

14. Richard A. Thompson, *The Yellow Peril, 1890–1923* (New York: Arno Press, 1978), 4.

15. Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 137–38.

16. Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Colour: Against White World Supremacy* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923); Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race: Or, the Racial Basis of European History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916); William Archer, *Through Afro-America: An English Reading of the Race Problem* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1910).

17. Theodore Roosevelt, "National Life and Character," *Sewanee Review* 2, no. 3 (1894): 353–76.

18. Roosevelt, "National Life," 362.

19. Roosevelt, "National Life," 364.

20. Roosevelt, "National Life," 365.

21. Pearson, *National Life*, 137.

22. Pearson, *National Life*, 138.

23. Pearson, *National Life*, 89–90.

24. Lake, "The White Man under Siege," 42.

25. W. S. Weber, "Can the White Race Continue to Dominate South Africa?," 23 May 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg

26. Patrick Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).

27. Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings*, 1.

28. Saul Dubow, *A Commonwealth of Knowledge: Science, Sensibility and White South Africa, 1820–2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 123.

29. James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 58.

30. Belich, *Replenishing the Earth*, 51.

31. The Canadian rebellions (1837–1838) marked a watershed in imperial relations as Britain granted self-governing status to the settler colonies. By 1860, there were eleven self-governing colonies in the British Empire.

32. Charles Van Onselen, *The Cowboy Capitalist: John Hays Hammond, the American West and the Jameson Raid* (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 2017), 39–40.

33. Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 4. See also John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson, "The Imperialism of Free Trade," *Economic History Review* 6, no. 1 (1953): 1–15.

34. Ronald E. Robinson, John Gallaghar and Alice Denny, *Africa and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (London: Macmillan, 1961), 3–4.

35. Robinson, Gallaghar and Denny, *Africa and the Victorians*, 4.

36. Saul Dubow, "Colonial Nationalism, the Milner Kindergarten and the Rise of 'South Africanism,' 1902–10," *History Workshop Journal* 43, no. 1 (1997): 62.

37. Robinson, Gallaghar and Denny, *Africa and the Victorians*.

38. Quoted in Ian van der Waag, "Hugh Wyndham, Transvaal Politics and the Attempt to Create an English Country Seat in South Africa, 1901–1914," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 31, no. 2 (2003): 138.

39. Van Onselen, *The Cowboy Capitalist*.

40. In the 1880s, he had been instrumental in the early demise of two Boer republics, Stellaland and Goshen.

41. John G. Goddard, *Racial Supremacy, Being Studies in Imperialism* (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1905), 227.

42. Richard Koebner and Helmut Dan Schmidt, *Imperialism: The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964): 230. See also Bernard Semmel, *The Liberal Idea and the Demons of Empire: Theories of Imperialism from Adam Smith to Lenin* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

43. Koebner and Schmidt, *Imperialism*, 221–49.

44. The telegram, received with much concern and criticism in Britain, was sent on 3 January 1896. It read, 'I express to you my sincere congratulations that you and your people, without appealing to the help of friendly powers, have succeeded, by your own energetic action against the armed bands which invaded your country as disturbers of the peace, in restoring peace and in maintaining the independence of the country against attack from without'.

45. Tilman Dedering, "The Ferreira Raid of 1906: Boers, Britons and Germans in Southern Africa in the Aftermath of the South African War," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 26, no. 1 (2000): 43–60.

46. E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1961). See also Peter Vale, "If International Relations Lives on the Street, What Is It Doing in the Classroom?," *International Relations* 28, no. 2 (2014): 141–58.

47. Van Onselen, *The Cowboy Capitalist*.

48. Fortnightly Club Papers (1906–1908), A 146, Wits Historical Papers, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

49. Leonard Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa, 1902–1910* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1960), 62.

50. Walter Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men: The "Kindergarten" in Edwardian Imperial Affairs* (London: Hodder and Stoughten, 1968), 95–96.

51. John Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement and Imperial Union* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 26.

52. Dubow, "Colonial Nationalism," 59.

53. J. F. (Peter) Perry, "On the Objects and the Constitution of the Fortnightly Club," 25 April 1907; Herbert Baker, "On the Relation of the Government to Art," 13 December 1906; and S. S. Taylor, "Women's Suffrage," 20 December 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

54. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*.

55. See Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*, for detailed history of the idea of Greater Britain.

56. Richard Feetham, "Some Problems of South African Federation and Reasons for Facing Them," 4 October 1906, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

57. J. R. M. Butler, *Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr), 1882–1940* (London: Macmillan, 1960), 19.

58. Philip Kerr, *Diary*, 1906–1908, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

59. In this period, between September 1906 and June 1908, the ideological foundations of the idea of a singular state between the Cape and Zambesi were being laid. Before the Selborne Memorandum was even conceived, the Afrikaner leader Jan Smuts had had presented to the colonial office in London a memorandum on the Transvaal constitution. He argued that within five years of a popular constitution in Transvaal, a South African federation or union might be achieved. (However, a plutocratic constitution in his view would kill this idea since the Cape and the Orange River Colony would not be keen to federate with a Transvaal dominated by the mine owners.) See Keith Hancock and Jean van der Poel, *Selections from the Smuts Papers*, Vols. 1 and 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 224.

John Merriman, the Cape politician and Smuts were both keen on some form of a unified South Africa but were deeply sceptical of the mine owners and the English politicians and administrators. The Kindergarten, they felt, were intent on making South Africa an appendage to Britain in its empire. South Africa, Smuts and

Merriman rightly perceived, was part of the scheme for Greater Britain that had been championed from England since the mid-Victorian era. Earlier attempts at achieving a federal South Africa, in the 1850s and 1870s, had both been motivated by concerns about England rather than South Africa. The Kindergarten, Smuts and Merriman believed, were likewise the pied pipers of the empire. Hancock and Van der Poel, *Selections from the Smuts Papers*, 95–100, 160–61,169–73, 303–56.

60. Lionel Curtis, "The Place of Subject People in the Empire," 9 May 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

61. Martin Legassick, "British Hegemony and the Origins of Segregation in South Africa, 1910–1914," in *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, ed. William Beinart and Saul Dubow (London: Routledge, 1995), 43–59.

62. Philip Kerr remarked once that "Lionel's God is the British Empire and he worships and serves it day and night" (quoted in Deborah Lavin, *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis* [Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1995], 128). Curtis's essay was an early affirmation of this belief.

63. Curtis, "The Place."

64. Curtis, "The Place."

65. Curtis, "The Place."

66. Curtis, "The Place."

67. Dane Kennedy, *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Rhodesia, 1890–1939* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987).

68. Curtis, Lionel. *The Government of South Africa*, Vol. 1 (South Africa: Central News Agency, 1908), 106–7.

69. The Kindergarten retained extreme derision towards the Boers. Kerr once called Boers "worse than the Irish. . . . [T]hey cannot understand, and cannot be expected to understand, the advantages of civilisation" (quoted in Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire* [Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986], 65).

70. Basutoland was indeed a model for several early theorists of segregation in South Africa. Dubow points out that the chairperson of the South African Native Affairs Commission (1903–1905), which first advocated the policy of "territorial separation," was Godfrey Lagden, a former resident commissioner of Basutoland. Similarly, Pim employs the Basutoland example several times. See Saul Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology," in *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, ed. William Beinart and Saul Dubow (London: Routledge, 1995), 147, 169. See also Paul Rich, *Race and Empire in British Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 21; E. H. Brookes, *The History of Native Policy in South Africa from 1830 to the Present Day* (Cape Town: Nasionale Pers, 1924), 99–107.

71. Curtis, "The Place."

72. Legassick, "British Hegemony," 50.

73. Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology," 147.

74. Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology," 147.

75. James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, 3 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1988).

76. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*, 49.

77. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*, 7.

78. James Bryce, *Impressions of South Africa* (London: Macmillan, 1898), 457.

79. Bryce, *Impressions*, 459.

80. Weber, "Can the White Race?"

81. The seventy-fifth conference of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was held in South Africa. The meetings for different sections were held in Cape Town and Johannesburg. See *Report of the Seventy-Fifth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, South Africa, August and September 1905* (London: John Murray, 1906); J. S. Browne, *Through South Africa with the British Association* (London: Speir, 1906); Alan G. Morris, "The British Association Meeting of 1905 and the Rise of Physical Anthropology in South Africa," *South African Journal of Science* 98 (July–August 2002): 336–40.

82. See Howard Pim, "Some Aspects of the Native Question," 1905, A881 (Fa) 1–4, Howard Pim Papers, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

83. Pim, "Some Aspects of the Native Question."

84. Kennedy, *Islands of White*, 4–5.

85. Michel Foucault, "3 March 1976," in *Society Must Be Defended*, ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 189–214.

86. Pim, "Some Aspects of the Native Question."

87. Howard Pim, "The Question of Race," 15 November 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

88. W. L. Honnold, "The Negro in America," 21 May 1908, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

89. Patrick A. Bruce, *The Rise of the New South* (Philadelphia: G. Barrie and Sons, 1905), 468–69.

90. Bruce, *The Rise of the New South*, 469.

91. Curtis, *Government of South Africa*, 164.

92. Curtis, *Government of South Africa*, 109.

93. At the end of the Boer War, Milner's administration faced the problem of acute shortage of labour. Displacement of a large number of the indigenous population, the needs of rebuilding after the war, and efforts by mine owners to reduce wages on account of the losses during the war led to a drastic shortage of labour. Perry, as Milner's secretary, was deeply involved in negotiations that attempted to fill this shortage from Basutoland, Swaziland and the Portuguese Territories and eventually, when even that proved insufficient, to bring Chinese labour to Transvaal.

94. J. F. (Peter) Perry, "The Transvaal Labour Problem," 1 November 1906, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

95. In 1907, 37,991 white people immigrated into the country, but 50,494 left. See Curtis, *Government of South Africa*, 153.

96. Curtis, *Government of South Africa*, 157.

97. The only other alternative to African labour, for Perry, was Asian (Indian and Chinese) labour, which was cheaper and less prone to deviant behaviour.

98. C. L. Anderson, "A Paper on the Defences of South Africa," 26 September 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

99. J. Stratford, "The Policy of Permitting Free Immigration of Asiatics," 13 September 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

100. Honnold, "The Negro in America."

101. D. O. Malcolm, "The Relations between Downing Street and the Self-Governing Colonies," 18 October 1906, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

102. Between 1904 and 1907, 63,695 Chinese were brought to Transvaal to work in the gold mines. See R. K. Bright, *Chinese Labour in South Africa, 1902–10* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 22.

103. Malcolm, "The Relations between Downing Street."

104. Richard Jebb, *Studies in Colonial Nationalism* (London: Edward Arnold, 1905), 305.

105. D. O. Malcolm, "Socialism and the Civil Service," 17 March 1908, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg.

106. Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain*.

107. J. C. Lyttelton, "The Military Policy of the Liberal Government," 24 October 1907, Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg; Anderson, "A Paper on the Defences of South Africa."

108. Anderson, "A Paper on the Defences of South Africa," 2.

109. Anderson, "A Paper on the Defences of South Africa," 4.

Chapter 4

Writing the State

A week before the Christmas of 1908, a monthly journal appeared in the soon-to-be-Union of South Africa. The Dutch version of the journal was titled *De Staat*, and its English version was named *The State*. The fact that the journal was called by this name and materialised before the state in question was formed, reinforces the well-worn theoretical nexus which links knowledge and its making to the pursuit of social and political power. Initially edited by Philip Kerr and enjoying the strong support of 'Milner's Kindergarten', it was advertised as a forum for ideas around the formation of statehood in South Africa—until then a territorial space comprising the then four British colonies: Transvaal, Orange River, Natal and the Cape.

The launch was preceded by several initiatives, most importantly *The Fortnightly Club* which occupied our attention in the previous chapter. While it is essential to see this journal as integral to the broader imperial agenda and central to the epistemic agenda of the Kindergarten, its appearance was an important development in the academic and intellectual life of politics in southern Africa. This is because it opened the first sustained forum for public dialogue on the issues of nation, statehood, race and empire in the country in the making. As a precursor to *The Round Table*, a journal that embodies the shift of thinking from the imperial to international, the ideas and form of *The State* enable us to cast a net around the disciplinary origins of International Relations (IR). Recent work has showed that *The Round Table*, alongside *Journal of Race Development* (both started in 1910, in November and July, respectively), helped stabilize the notion of IR as an academic discipline.[1] Credence is added to these links because *The State* was the first 'academic' publication of the very cohort who would go on to establish the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

85

In this chapter we discuss the ideas that were proffered through this journal, but it also offers a long-due intellectual history of the journal itself. Although historians in southern Africa have noted the important role that *The State* and its benefactors played in fashioning the Union of South Africa,[2] none have closely documented its journey. The sole exception is a short, largely descriptive, book chapter which is written by the South African cultural theorist, Peter Merrington.[3] But here we are interested in more than the history of the journal. We are interested too, in the ideas promoted by it not only in the context of the formation of statehood but with a particular eye on its role in fashioning early IR.

SETTING UP THE JOURNAL

Writing about *The Round Table*, the one-time exiled Black South African scholar Bernard Magubane wrote:

> The Round Table . . . helped to construct a conceptual framework within which the colonial ideology could be defended . . . In . . . [its pages] . . . readers could participate in the dialogue of experts who shared information and set up moral standards of what was "just" and "unjust" in the treatment of "lesser breeds" and see how they resolved problems that they perceived to be common and which could prove unsettling to the empire.[4]

The same words could be used to describe *The State*.

As we have established, between 1906 and 1908, the members of the *Fortnightly Club* were the predominant voices in the push for political unity in southern Africa.[5] By 1908, however, this cause of political union had been taken up by Afrikaner (and pro-Afrikaner) leaders such as Louis Botha (1862–1919), Jan Smuts (1870–1950) and John X. Merriman (1841–1926). Addressing these issues half a century later, the American historian Walter Nimocks observed that the challenge which faced the Kindergarten was not to work for a common state—since this outcome seemed imminent given the political support, but to ensure that British interests in the Union-in-the-making were not damaged.[6] This necessity arose from the fear that its constitution would be engineered by the 'South African 'Dutch'(read Afrikaners) alone in order to 'leave the British or more advanced sections of population at a disadvantage, and so perpetuate racial trouble'.[7] To prevent this outcome, the Kindergarten decided to take the matter of South African statehood into the public domain through the creation of two vehicles: a) local organisations in each population center which would be combined in an area-wide league and; b) publication of a periodical to disseminate propaganda. These measures were

directed at rallying sympathisers around the idea of statehood, keeping the public informed about the process of unification and educating and imbibing a spirit of common nationalism and common allegiance to the empire among the citizens of the four colonies which would comprise the political union.

The first vehicle was the Society for the Promotion of Closer Union in South Africa—shortened to, Closer Union Society. Its first branch was opened in Cape Town where the former Premier of the Cape Colony, W. P. Schreiner (1857–1919), was elected its president. Within a month, the society's second branch was established in Johannesburg. Over time, branches were formed across the four colonies in South Africa. By March 1909, there were 59 branches—36 in the Cape, 17 in Transvaal, 4 in Natal and 2 in Orange River Colony[8] (at its peak the number stood at 64). The first national meeting of these societies—then numbering eleven—was planned for October 1908 in Durban. This was to coincide with the National Convention on South Africa where leaders of the four colonies were deliberating on a constitution. Here, an overarching body, The Association of Closer Union Societies, was established with two subcommittees: the Cape Town-based 'Organising Committee', chaired by Robert Ruthford Brydone,[9] which was tasked with promoting new societies throughout South Africa, and a Johannesburg-based 'Magazine Committee', chaired by Patrick Duncan. As the name suggests, the latter spearheaded the establishment of a common journal as the mouthpiece of the association—the sub-committee itself was dominated by members of the Kindergarten. Apart from Duncan, two other Kindergarten members, Lionel Curtis and Richard Feetham served on the Magazine Committee. As we have already noted, Philip Kerr, the youngest member of the Kindergarten, was appointed the editor of the journal.[10]

When it came to naming the journal, the preferred name was the *New Federalist*. This choice was probably spurred by a recently published biography of the American thinker and politician, Alexander Hamilton, the author of *The Federalist Papers*, by F. S. Oliver—a businessman who was to later become an important member of the Round Table in London. Oliver's book had ignited the interest of the Kindergarten in finding a scheme for establishing a federation in South Africa,[11] and, according to Leo Amery—a close associate of Milner and the Kindergarten, this book was the 'Bible of the young men of Milner's Kindergarten'.[12] However, the first choice name for the journal was soon discarded for *The State*. The inspiration for this came from Thomas Macauley's words from his poem *Horatius* which seemed more apt for the Kindergarten's millenarian call: 'Then none was for the party; Then all were for the State; Then the great man helped the poor, And the poor man helped the great'.[13] The funding for the initiative itself came from the mining magnate Abe Bailey (1864–1940), after prompting from Curtis.[14] Bailey was close to Cecil John Rhodes, whom he regarded as a mentor, and

was both complicit in and sentenced for his part in the Rhodes-orchestrated Jameson Raid in 1895. After Rhodes's death, Bailey was elected unopposed to Cape Parliament in Rhodes's political constituency of Barkly West. More importantly for the present purposes, he financed most of the imperial initiatives of the Kindergarten not just in South Africa but also in England. His largesse was the source of two initiatives that would help to chart the destiny of International Relations: these were the journal *The Round Table* and the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

In the months of October and November 1908, some of the members of the Magazine Committee—most prominently, Curtis and Kerr—gathered at the sea-side house of Abe Bailey, named *Rust-en-Vrede* (trans. 'Rest and Peace'), to do the ground work for the first volume of *The State*.[15] (Interestingly, the construction of Rust-en-Vrede was originally commissioned by Rhodes but was completed by Bailey, after the former's death in a modest cottage which stood right next to this house.) Just like Rust-en-Vrede, the Kindergarten, with Bailey's help, were trying to accomplish another of Rhodes's unfinished dreams: a unified South Africa under British control.

There was no mistaking Rhodes's presence in the new project. Indeed, depicted on the cover of the journal was the image of 'Physical Energy', the bronze sculpture by the English artist George Frederic Watts (1817–1904), which was first cast in 1902.[16] This image, in the words of Watts, was a symbol of, 'that restless physical impulse to seek the still unachieved in the domain of material things'. Who but Rhodes—intoxicated in the pursuit of that greatest ideal of material being, imperialism—could signify that 'restless physical impulse'?[17] When the statue was finally installed at the Rhodes Memorial in 1912—a decade after the death of Rhodes, the new journal carried tributes on Rhodes and his restless energy. Thus, the cover was a posthumous tribute to Rhodes and *The State* promised to focus its own 'restless energy' into fashioning 'the still unachieved' goal of statehood in South Africa.

In the months before the journal was published, the Kindergarten had produced two further sets of publications which were also aimed at securing statehood in South Africa. The first of these was a two-volume study, titled *The Government of South Africa*,[18] which first appeared in instalments, and eventually in a consolidated form towards the middle of 1908. The other was a volume titled *The Framework of the Union: A Comparison of Some Union Constitutions* published in the name of the Cape Town Closer Union Society.[19] The anonymity of both these works was intended to project the impression of joint authorship of seemingly disinterested but public-spirited citizens. In reality, the *Government* volumes were drafted by Curtis, with editorial help from a group of people including Duncan, Brand, Kerr and William Marris (1873–1945), a member of the Indian Civil Service then on

deputation to South Africa. *The Framework*, was compiled by B. K. Long (1878–1944), an Oxford friend of the group who would later succeed Kerr as the editor of *The State*.

The *Framework* served essentially as a guide to other federal constitutions. The fact that *The Framework* listed only the federal constitutions in the United States, Canada, Australia, Germany and Switzerland suggests that it was a primer on the desirability of the constitutional arrangement as the preferred pathway to a united South Africa. By the time the National Convention was convened in October 1908, however, an emerging consensus among the political class was towards the formation of a tighter 'Union' rather than a federation. Accordingly, in the final consolidated editions of *The Government,* which appeared in the final quarter of the same year, Curtis veered towards the union option.[20]

The new journal began with a decided bias towards the Union option and, in contrast to the federal option followed in *The Framework,* published a series on political unions in various countries.

WRITING THE NATION

The aims and mandate of *The State* were set down in the first issue. As an organ of the Closer Union Societies, the journal 'will simply promote the cause of the Union by pointing out the evils of disunion by affording the information on which alone a sound and unbiased judgement can be based'.[21] Assuring its readers of its 'non-racial' (a reference to English and Afrikaans distinction) and non-partisan nature, the editorial promised a pan-Southern African outlook, incorporating opinions from all the states between the Cape and the Zambesi. In strong undertones, then, *The State* assigned itself the task of developing 'a national character' for South Africa.[22]

In the mid-1960s, the Canadian cultural theorist Marshall McLuhan wrote that the printed word is the 'architect of nationalism'.[23] This insight was taken further by the Cornell-based political theorist Benedict Anderson in his highly influential book, *Imagined Communitie*s. In it, Anderson pointed out that 'print capitalism' was responsible for constructing the idea of the nation.[24] Both argued that the printed word fostered three essential ingredients for the success of nation-, and consequently, state-building. First, the creation of a national language which is the vehicle through which ideas were communicated horizontally across the emerging political community. Secondly, the printed word helps to generate a memory bank for existing knowledge which was previously inaccessible because of the limited range of individual recollections. In so doing, the printed word invents new memories and traditions, exactly replicable on a mass scale for the first time. This, in turn, creates a

mass consciousness of commonality. And finally, the printed word creates common rituals which inculcate an awareness that events occurred simultaneously in a limited temporal space (namely, the state); that they were being read simultaneously in a particular spatial zone; and that mass affinities, feelings and actions could be engineered simultaneously.

Read against these theoretical understandings, *The State* revealed its true purpose in the first issue. It noted that South Africa was 'not a nation', although 'the bones of a nation are there ready to be brought together and clothed with flesh'.[25] And added that although leadership at the National Convention was trying to build a state, 'a handful of leaders may fashion a state . . . [but] . . . not a nation'.[26] Hence, the journal had undertaken upon itself the task of fashioning a nation. It had assumed the mantle for marshalling the printed word for inventing the 'national spirit', and cautioned that:

> South Africa will never be a great and united country until there is a common sentiment and a common patriotism animating the whole and every part with vigorous national life. The very size of the country prevents that constant association of its citizens which is the surest source of national feeling, and makes it impossible for any daily or weekly journal to serve the needs of everyday from the Zambesi to the Cape. But a monthly magazine can reach all parts of the country and yet not be out of date.[27]

By baptizing *The State* as 'a journal common to all South Africa' (and South Africa imagined right up to the Zambesi), the editor emphasised that it would, for the first time in South African history, be 'read with the same interest and the same sense that it is a "home" and not a foreign publication in Rhodesia [then a hoped-for part of the expected Union] as in Cape Colony. We cannot . . . hope to be thoroughly South African in our outlook unless we are in touch with what is going on in all parts of the country'.[28] Emphasising on this simultaneity of the South African condition was a necessary discursive technique to create a sense of commonality. Put differently, the journal sought to narrate South Africa into existence through creation of a common time, a common political space and common publics. In order to birth the 'nation' into existence, it was necessary to foster a sense of 'national' feeling through a collective celebration of literature, arts, scenery and architecture of *South Africa* itself. These artistic, literary and historical forms were often plucked out of their contexts, in numbers of the journal, and implanted on the consciousness of a nation by their reproduction. Through projections of a common ancestry, architectural style, *South African* scenery, national forms of writing—both prose and poetry, the nation was being imagined retrospectively. The homes of prominent individuals in the region were reviewed and presented as constituting a common *South African* cultural style. Photography was used to disseminate images of collective possession. Such 'cultural

products of nationalism', as Anderson calls them,[29] were used in every conceivable way to project the artificiality of political union as the' natural outcome' of a national longing.

All forms of remembering the past were roped into a proto-history of the South African nation. So, for instance, the South African-born Percy Fitzpatrick (1861–1931), a sometime politician and author of *Jock of the Bushveld*—a popular part-autobiographical tale (with over 100 editions published to date) of the author's travels in the Bushveld region of the Transvaal—was commissioned to write on the main character of his novel, a dog named *Jock*, and narrate its resonance with the upcoming Union. When invited to write for the journal, a befuddled Fitzpatrick, asked the editor: 'But please tell me what in the world has Jock to do with the Union of South Africa?'[30] The following is Fitzpatrick's account of the conversation that followed:

"That is what you have to show the Little People!", was the reply of the editors, still smiling.

But for two days the mere narrator was unable to find the answer; and then the light came from the old familiar quarter—the Little People themselves!

For one of them had said: "I love it because it's full of things that we know, and because it's a true story about our own country!"

Our Own Country!

It was half past five in the morning when the light came . . . the history of Our Own Country![31]

It dawned on Fitzpatrick that the book was no longer a tale of an individual's travel with a dog, called Jock, but a narrative of a common past. It was no more a personal reminiscence narratively amplified for the enjoyment of children, but a cultural artefact: no more a mere journey into Bushveld but, as he said repeatedly and in capitals, 'a history of Our Own Country'.[32] Kerr wrote in the March, 1909 volume of *The State* that *Jock of the Bushveld* 'chronicled with characteristic charm and eloquence the outstanding features of the history of both races [read: Afrikaner and English] in South Africa . . . which may well make them proud of their own descent, and determined for the future to work with—instead of against—one another'.[33] In this remarkable churning of narrative, fiction was turned into history.

Conscious of this historicizing mission, the new journal pursued a narrative that gave claim over the lands in the four colonies (and in Southern Rhodesia) to White Settlers—in so doing, any claims to land by others was exorcised. This was underscored by the 'spectacular presentation of episodes in the history of South Africa', an editorial column claimed in October 1910, which was 'one of the most effective ways of awakening the national consciousness'.[34] The story of European descent in South Africa was celebrated through its telling in a historical form, while the history of the Africans was

presented in a anthropological form of narratives through the reminiscences of Africans by White Settlers.

In similar vein, a series of articles 'in praise of beautiful old buildings' across South Africa was entitled 'The Beginnings of Our Nation' were written by Francis Masey (1861–1912), an architect who collaborated with Herbert Baker[35] from 1896 to 1910.[36] In his first article, Maser explained:

> The title chosen for these articles is "the Beginnings of our Nation"; such can be sought for nowhere else but in the homes of the people, being indeed the first habitation of their ruler, the protection of their lives and property, and the successive sojourning place of those stout old pioneers who controlled the destinies of the South African people in the days of its earliest youth.[37]

Accordingly, the first in the series focused on (the Dutch built) Castle in Cape Town which (as the narrative ran) was the 'first habitation' in the days of 'earliest youth' of South Africa. In recording these provocatively titled 'beginnings', Masey suggested that the history of South African nationhood begins with the landing of Europeans on the South African shore—purportedly in 1652.

THE NATION SPEAKS

There was no other way to imagine South Africa than as 'the home of a European nation', Patrick Duncan wrote in his contribution to the February 1909 issue of *The State*.[38] Although the journal pledged to offer a 'non-racial' perspective on a bi-racial republic, it was deeply embedded within a racist project.[39] Harmonious relations between the English and Afrikaners in order to deliver 'the death-knell of racialism' were central to its imaginary of ordering South Africa.[40] 'Never in the history of the modern world', wrote the editor soon after the formation of the Union of South Africa, 'has a movement for the Union of independent states into a single nation been carried so smoothly and so thoroughly'.[41] Set within this romantic imaginary, the Anglo-Boer War lent an air of dialectic inevitability of the eventual fusion of the two communities—the Afrikaners and the English.[42] The target of this assertion was an emerging Afrikaner counter-narrative, which was premised on the slogan 'Africa for Afrikaners'—a phrase coined by Transvaal's Dutch-born state-attorney from 1876–1877, E. J. P. Jorissen.[43] But in asserting this counter-narrative, a more toxic strain of racism was foregrounded: this was the one between whites and non-whites. 'Of the people of South Africa half are of British; half are of Dutch descent', wrote the editor in the March 1909 volume.[44] Plainly here, Africans (and the Coloureds, Indians and Chinese)

were conveniently erased from the category of 'peoplehood' and placed into the realm of 'problem'—the 'native *problem*'. The two words were always placed together, as if there was no other way to imagine the 'native' except as a 'problem'—and this garnered maximum interest from the writers in this journal in its four-year life. As a handy trope, the 'native problem' was often used to draw the Europeans in South Africa together. Here is what the editor wrote in January 1910:

> There may or may not have been a movement among the natives towards united action, with a sinister motive, at the time of the Natal rebellion [in 1905]. Certainly, it seems to be established that emissaries were travelling to and fro from chief to chief, more especially between the Zulus, the Basutos and the Swazies, with some such aim in view. But it is important to remember that all this was going on while the states of South Africa were still separate states. In fact it is perfectly clear that if the native races of South Africa were ever to try their strength against the white races, there was definitely greater of their acting as a united people with a united impulse while the South African states were separate entities than there is to-day with a South Africa united under a central Government. In other words, if the states had remained separate entities, or even if they had linked by a federal bond, the native mind would probably have arrived at the conception of a native union very much faster than it is likely to reach it under present circumstances.[45]

In this account, the danger of a united action by the native was what compelled the four colonies to form a state. Having prevented a united attack, it was also imperative that the natives were controlled. One of the most important tasks of the Union was to bring together the differing systems of native control practices in the respective colonies under one single authority. So,

> The real native danger in South Africa hitherto has been this: that separate white communities, none of which have been fully certain of their strength to cope with great emergencies, have been insensibly perhaps compelled to shape their policy to some extent according to the measure of their anxieties. Three or four systems of native control, each of which has been influenced in greater or lesser degree by uncertainty as to the strength of the authority, have not only tended to weaken the position of white races as a whole in South Africa, but have lent strength—and would in time no doubt have given direct impulse—to the idea of combination among the native peoples.[46]

Understanding the native, it was argued, was the first requirement of fashioning a viable policy to control them. Although Kerr wrote in the inaugural issue that every white person in the country was 'a Kitchen Kaffir expert',[47] the real 'native problem', he added, lay in the 'native reserves' where the they lived. A true science of the native would involve studying them in their

immediate environment, because it is only there that their behaviour could be properly understood.[48] Distancing native life from 'European lives' in this way—as belonging in 'the reserves'—served to reinforce anthropological perceptions of otherness, and which in turn worked to emphasise a 'natural sense' of affinity between the white populations.

Any sympathetic view towards Africans was termed 'bigoted idealism', and such supporters called openly 'negrophilists' in the journal.[49] Those targeted included people like W. P. Schreiner,[50] prime minister of the Cape Colony during the Boer War, who demanded equal rights for Africans (interestingly, as we noted above, he was also the founding president of the Association of Closer Union Societies). They were set against the conservative politicians of the former Afrikaner colonies who wanted the complete disenfranchisement of all Africans—even those who enjoyed voting rights in the Cape Colony. In important ways, however, both these positions were an anathema to the spirit of the journal. But if a choice had to be made, the Afrikaner politicians were thought to be a more reasonable option. The journal took upon itself the burden of suggesting a convenient middle course between pleasing the liberal conscience and creating a European-type nation.

In the June and July 1909 issues the editor discussed the matter at hand at length. Beginning with the Social Darwinist understanding that 'the white man is the racial adult, and the black man the racial child',[51] Kerr trod the (by then) well-beaten path arguing that the white population had a 'civilising' influence on Africans. But, he added, no matter how conscientiously this civilising task was carried out, the intrinsic racial characteristics of Africans would impede their 'development'.[52] As an anonymous author had written in the same pages, 'one Booker [T. Washington] may educate a thousand negroes, a thousand Bookers cannot whiten one'.[53] Elsewhere Kerr wrote that the civilisation of Africans was an act of mimicry and no matter how hard one may try this would never become the original: inherent racial characteristics could never be overcome. Worse still, Africans would be driven on a path of development which did not arise naturally from their own minds and hence would never be able to develop properly.[54] They would remain caught between two worlds, neither here nor there—they were perpetual 'mimic men', to use V. S. Naipaul's helpful term of decades later. The policy of assimilating Africans into European civilisation was congenitally compromised and, hence, entirely misdirected.[55]

In his editorial review of the month in July 1909, Kerr argued that a 'prudent policy' on Africans was linked to the development of the white race.[56] In the nineteenth century, the native question was only important with regard to maintaining domestic peace. So long as Europeans were secure from Africans, European interference in African matters did not matter, except moral considerations. However, the mining and industrial take-off in South

Africa had placed Europeans and Africans in direct labour competition with each other for the first time in history. With their lower standards of living, African labour was cheaper: this enabled them to capture most jobs in the unskilled sector. Kerr noted that '[h]itherto the native problem has been one of how to keep the restless kaffir tribes peaceful. Today it takes another form—that of an economic struggle for employment'.[57] This situation was complicated by the presence of Asian immigrants—Indians and Chinese—who had filled jobs in the semi-skilled sector. Given their material expectations, Whites could not compete with non-Europeans. Even if they were prepared to do so, the preponderant numbers of non-Europeans in unskilled and semi-skilled labour had created a social barrier—no, a taboo—against Europeans working these categories. Unable to find any work for the white population, South Africa increasingly had a 'poor white' problem: a large population of increasingly poor whites who turned to government to provide social protection. This policy of 'doling'—the welfare-mechanisms of governments to 'spoonfe[e]ed her paupers'[58]—alienated white workers further from labour by 'removing the pressure of want, which is the only thing which can drive these people to work for themselves'.[59] These artificial inducements were not only 'a burden on the community' but also removed any pressure from whites (even if they were poor) to open up the labour market for the white population.[60] This meant that instead of encouraging European immigration, colonial governments had permitted an exodus of whites out of the country.

Nearly 300,000 Europeans had emigrated from South Africa between 1904 and 1908.[61] (*The State* had a far modest number in mind, 20,000.)[62] If this continued, the editor noted, South Africa would turn into a 'second India'[63]—'a small white aristocracy managing a huge protectorate of coloured labour'.[64] Eventually, farms and industries would be dominated by a non-white population who 'in the long run will be masters of the land'.[65]

The conclusion was clear: the lack of a well-thought out 'native policy' could mean the flight of the majority of white population from South Africa—so, the very existence of the 'South African nation' was on the line. Much as the white labour question was a central to the South African nationhood, it was also an important predicament with regard to the question of relationship between state, capital and labour in the South Africa-in-the-making. The Afrikaner political parties charged that English capitalists were happier to employ non-Europeans at lower wages without giving consideration for the welfare of poor whites, most of whom were Afrikaners. The English capitalists considered state-support to the whites against market principles and so blamed this policy for skewing the labour market against the whites. The English called for the eradication of all welfare measures for the white population, while the Afrikaners wanted protectionist measures like forcing

companies to employ one white man on every drill and proscribing labour recruitment from outside the borders of the four colonies.[66]

The Journal took the view that both these positions were untenable. Protectionist measures, it was argued, would effectively shut down mining industries—at least in the short term—while robbing Africans of their jobs. This could have threatening repercussions, as Africans, deliberately uprooted from their lands, were also now deprived of industrial jobs. Furthermore, an open market would lead to non-Europeans demanding higher wages for less skilled work in the long term. Writing in its pages, Patrick Duncan argued that the relative advantage of non-European labour was economically attractive but for a short period only. This was because it came at a much greater political cost—that of making South Africa a non-European nation.[67] For him, the problem with both solutions was that they focused on white wages—and not on the development and sustainability of white civilisation.

For his part, Kerr suggested a more permanent solution to these seeming irreconcilable quandaries: segregation between white and black communities. As we discussed in the previous chapter, this possibility had been advanced by Lionel Curtis and Howard Pim in the meetings of the Fortnightly Club. However, in public documents, the members of the Kindergarten had—until that point—avoided the term, segregation. Given that 'the native question' was a sensitive issue during the National Convention in 1908, they had avoided public debates on the issue until the formation of the Union was a certainty. By June 1909, the draft of the National Constitution had been agreed upon and, through the pages of *The State*, Kerr pursued a coherent argument around segregation and set about pushing the idea as one of the foundation-stones of new South Africa. He saw segregation as based on the belief that the 'contact of white and black is in itself productive of evil to both races'.[68]

A visit to the United States in late 1909 confirmed Kerr's view that segregation was the best policy for South Africa. He travelled to the Deep South, originally with the intention of writing a book on the race question, where the efforts at assimilation had resulted in the purported 'degeneration' of Whites—a development that supported one of the legs of his thinking. However, he also noted that blacks in America had been able to achieve a considerable degree of progress.[69] In his reportage to the journal from the US, he furnished several examples to point to the fact the people of African descent had managed to move across the civilisational barrier. But, he also noted, that there were stark differences between blacks in Africa and America. Unlike the former, the latter were well conversant in the English language (the only language they could learn), because of which they had 'access to the wisdom of the world and to the example of the great in the history of all time'.[70] In contrast, 'his brother in the Dark Continent', who could not speak 'English, or

any civilised tongue', 'has a long and arduous climb before he can reach that great highroad of civilisation'.[71] Furthermore, he asserted that the African-American did not have to forget the African rudimentary customs, traditions and uncivilised ideas of law, morality and society, because they 'had nothing to forget'.[72] They had cut off ties with Africa for so long, that they were born and raised into white civilisation.

While these differences compelled Kerr to conclude that the American experience could not be entirely replicated in South Africa, it also convinced him that given an equality of environment and opportunity, black races had the capacity to reach the same state of development as the white population. However, the American example was also instructive because as black races came more and more into contact with the white civilisation and in the process scaled up the civilisational ladder, racial prejudice and racial conflict became starker, as evident in the Jim Crow American South. Worse still, contact between whites and blacks had an opposite, degenerative effect on whites.[73] For Kerr these understandings suggested that it was best for both races to develop along their own lines, where one group was isolated from the other.[74] At best, he thought that America was an exception to the general rule of white-black relations in much of the non-western world, but nonetheless as a template to learn from—South Africa was the rule.

Kerr's reportage and analysis from the US was reinforced by a series of articles published in *The State* which compared the American and South African experiences. Howard Pim wrote two articles on (what was called) the 'negro problem' in Southern America.[75] The Australia-born Scottish dramatist, William Archer, in a four-part series, argued that it was ill-conceived to bring Africans to the American South because while, in the eighteenth century it might have promoted economic progress, in the nineteenth century their influence had brought degeneration of the South.[76] 'The negro', he said, 'has assuredly been . . . [a] . . . calamity . . . [for the South]'.[77] Like Kerr, he argued that 'monochrome civilisation . . . [was] preferable to piebald civilisation as at present exists in the Southern States'.[78] A strong proponent of segregation, in his book *Through Afro-America* (where his articles for *The State* were reproduced in a section titled 'The Problem Faced'), which was published in 1910, he argued against the prevailing view that African-Americans should be sent back to Africa. 'The negro character has shown no fitness for the very difficult task of combined pioneering and nation-building', he wrote.[79] Instead, he endorsed setting up 'a black man's land' within America. 'A Negro State' somewhere in the American South would not only allow African-Americans to enjoy political and economic rights but also follow their own model of development.[80] The only right they would not have would be the right to immigrate to the white states in America. A complete segregation on these lines was the best way for the two races to live in the same country. And '[i]f

things went horribly wrong and new Haiti threatened to developed in the heart of the Republic', American troops could always be called to take control.[81] He proposed a similar scheme for a separate and segregated province for blacks in South Africa.[82] This policy, he reasoned, would enable Africans to enjoy rights as well as follow their own model of development.[83] Taken together, these views suggested that segregation was not just thought preferable, but was considered desirable, for the preservation of the white race.

Several contributors to the pages of the journal pointed to the primary dilemma in the segregationist position. The natural behaviour of blacks, the journal repeatedly opinioned, pointed towards barbarism and strife. The implication was that among the black race there was an ingrained tendency towards self-destruction: 'the rule of the white race in South Africa is one of the safeguards of the native himself against an immediate relapse into the state of internecine warfare which preceded it', wrote B. K. Long (by then the journal's editor) in February 1912.[84] Ian D. Colvin (1877–1938), the London-based foreign correspondent of *The State* and former assistant editor for the liberal Cape Town-based newspaper, *Cape Times* (from 1902–1907), furnished an example of the black-governed Liberia—'a rotten country and a rotten people'[85]—which had been pushed into 'an uncomfortable state of anarchy' through misrule.[86] Africans, even Kerr argued, could not be left all alone to themselves, even under segregation. 'The habitual acquiescence in tyranny of all uncivilised or half-civilised', he said, 'proves that. . . peoples which are still young in their development need a tyrant. . . . the white man must govern the brown and black today; because if he does not, not only do the inferior peoples suffer themselves, but they commonly disturb the peace and impair the prosperity, and often the health, of their civilised neighbours'.[87] The question then was: how should Africans be governed? Left to themselves, they would surely perish; not left to themselves, they take the white civilisation down with them.

In his writings Kerr often returned to a suggestion that Lionel Curtis had advanced in his paper at the Fortnightly Club. This argued that African and Asian societies were best governed through Weberian-like bureaucracies which insulated white publics from the affairs of these non-European races whilst, at the same time, ensuring that their progression was under the 'guiding hand of white civilisation'.[88] Since he believed that the only form of rule that made cognitive and social sense to non-European communities was autocracy, the idea of directed bureaucracy seemed an acceptable fit between the necessity of autocratic rule and moral requirement of a responsible and efficient government.

Pursuing same lines, Kerr recycling Lord Selborne's idea of establishing a Native Affairs Department which would be headed by a bureaucrat—not a politician—who would enjoy the powers and autonomy of a judge. African

political and social institutions, like chieftaincy, would fall under this structure. Kerr believed that such a department should be overseen by the prime minister, and not a regular cabinet minister.[89] This would mean that the portfolio of 'Native Affairs' would be out of the purview of the white electorate, thus not affected by their prejudices and allow Africans to develop on their own.

Successful segregation along these lines, Kerr argued, could be used as a template for the world on these issues, particularly with regard to the emerging civilisational clash between European and Asian races. As we have seen, fears of this were ignited by Japan's victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–1905 which raised anxieties about the rise of Asia as a counter to European global hegemony. Moreover, in the Dominions, Asian immigrants had laid claims to rights and privileges comparable to those enjoyed by Europeans. Indeed, as Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds have suggested, a transnational solidarity of whiteness had emerged primarily in response to the Asian immigration, which was increasingly couched as threatening or worse—indeed, the German Kaiser had called it a 'yellow peril'.[90] Across the Anglo-Saxon world, tensions between Asian immigrants and the white domicile populations and their respective governments were on the rise, especially as white settler governments were tightening immigration laws. Kerr, in a dispatch to *The State* from Canada, noticed tensions brewing between governments in Ottawa and Tokyo over restrictions on immigration from Japan. These tensions followed upon a series of anti-Asian riots in Vancouver. In South Africa, Indians and (to a lesser extent) Chinese had launched the *Satyagraha* movement under the leadership of Mohandas Gandhi. This was seen as a threat in South Africa's very backyard.

These developments, he believed, offered global lessons: peace in the world could only be guaranteed if the Asian and the European were isolated from each other. In another report from abroad he wrote, '[i]f the statesmen of the world are worthy of the name they will see to it that two races shall never be allowed to intermingle in the same territory in future. South Africa and North America have adopted that policy. It seems likely that the rest of the world will follow suit'.[91]

Calls for racial segregation, however, also drew criticisms. Quite surprisingly, one came from Howard Pim, who had consistently favoured segregation from 1903 onwards and whose contribution to *The State on* the American South had reinforced his standing on the issue. Pim criticised F. W. Bell (who was not published in *The State*) for trying to settle for once the complex and evolving social relations between different races.[92] Glen Grey Act (1894) had established a system of individual land tenure and created a labour tax to force Xhosa men to seek employment in commercial farms or in industry. On these same lines, Bell argued for segregation and constitution of a Native Affairs Department to oversee Chiefs and Headmen governing

designated-African areas. Pim found the solutions too simplistic, and in his critique, he shredded, perhaps unknowingly, the effort being undertaken by the journal to find to a constitutional solution to the issue.

Another commentator, Trevor Fletcher, was even more derisive about the idea of segregation. He argued that the fear that the white race would not be able to compete with Africans was 'nothing but a damning indictment against the white race', and went on to say that 'we are becoming a race of weaklings unable to hold its own against a primitive race'. The fear of blacks overtaking whites, he believed, was 'pure bogey and quite unsupported by history'.[93] For Fletcher, segregation was 'a practical impossibility, to be an attempt to evade our responsibilities . . . [towards] . . . the lower race'. Instead, he favoured an approach that instilled race pride amongst the whites by 'bring[ing the African] under the influence of our religious ideals, and to apply our accumulated experience as far as possible to the particular case of the native by educating him on the broadest lines'.[94] This would be beneficial for the Africans because '[i]f we isolate the kaffir artificially from all contact with the whites and imagine that he will thus undergo a mechanical development peculiar to himself, we shall only ensure his continued deterioration'.[95] Against these views, L. E. De Pyre argued for keeping the white race 'unsullied and predominant in South Africa': no rights whatsoever must be given to the Africans, anywhere in South Africa, until they had brought themselves equal to the European civilisation, he wrote.[96] Another critical voice, G. H. Malan suggested a model of 'class differentiation' where the rights and duties of the citizenry were to be distributed not according to the colour of their skin, but on class grounds.[97] However, he did not elaborate on how class differentiation was any different from racial segregation when it was to be applied within territorial enclaves which were created on racial principles.

The recurrent fear in these writings was that the white population—unless there was emigration into South Africa, *en masse*—would be overwhelmingly underpopulated. Faced with this, *The State* also acted as a front for an active white immigration policy. Patrick Duncan had established the White Expansion Society in Johannesburg in 1909 which according to the journal aimed to 'look to the people of European race to come in and establish themselves (as their superior endowments have allowed them to do elsewhere) as the race which is for the future to inhabit those parts in South Africa in which natural conditions enable them to increase and multiply'.[98] Welcoming the formation of this Society, the journal also cautioned against, what it called, '*uitlanderism*'[99]—a jealousy and dislike of the newcomer which, when it is translated into terms of political action, means a policy hostile to immigration'.[100] The protests against *uitlanderism* were, as we have noted, made only with regard to white immigration: immigration from Asia was considered a danger to the racial unity of white South Africa.

Over time, Kerr's dispatches from Canada and the United States became increasingly anxious about the lack of white immigration to South Africa. Unlike the United States, Canada and Australia, he stated, the country offered scant incentives to the European immigrants, and he blamed this on the white sense of superiority in South Africa. With their social disregard for physical labour, Whites had cultivated an aristocratic self-image: this was a 'country for the man with money. . . for practically every white man in South Africa is what socialists in Europe and America would call a capitalist'.[101] But with little or no employment opportunities in the country, there was no chance of an overwhelming white immigration.[102] He pointed out that Canada and Australia had launched huge campaigns drawing migrants from England and Europe which meant that, over time, immigrants would be unobtainable from Europe. He queried anxiously, 'what will happen to South Africa down the vista of the years with her burden of 6,000,000 natives South of the Zambesi, and the uncounted millions of negroes to the north of it?'[103]

A 'SCIENTIFIC METHOD'[104]

Within a few months of the journal's first appearance, several members of the Kindergarten—including Curtis, Kerr and Robert Brand—moved to London. By this time, the outlines of statehood in South Africa had become clear and the idea of a Union had been enthusiastically taken up by Afrikaner leaders such as Louis Botha and Jan Smuts.

The time was ripe for the Kindergarten to turn to the wider imperial role envisioned early on by Lionel Curtis. The direction of this was contained in a 1907 directive from Lord Selborne who advised the Kindergarten to 'begin some work on the same kind in respect to imperial relations'[105] once the South African unification was accomplished. As his biographer points out, Curtis was 'impatient to apply the lessons of uniting South Africa to the Empire as a whole'.[106] Indeed, he confessed to being no more interested in 'dissipating my energies in looking after the chick I already hatched' when a much bigger canvas awaited him: 'Imperial Egg-boiling' is what he called it.[107] In a letter to Leo Amery in March 1909, Curtis wrote that the Kindergarten had 'acted as an advance party of sappers sent out to build a vital section of the road over which the main force will have to travel later on'.[108] Drawing on the same civil engineering metaphor, we might understand that he was now ready to construct the main road. In July and August 1909, several Kindergarten members travelled to London and organized a series of meetings, presided over by Alfred Milner, with imperial enthusiasts.[109] These were to culminate in a weekend retreat held on 4–5 September 1909 at Lord Anglesey's golf course and cricket pavilion at Plas Newydd, North Wales. The gathering was

attended by former Fortnightly Club members and by close collaborators of the Kindergarten. The latter included the New Zealand-born, William Marris and Georg Lillie Craik, who until recently had been the legal adviser to the Transvaal Chamber of Mines.

The Scots businessman, Frederick Scott Oliver, whose biography of Alexander Hamilton, as noted, had inspired the work of the Kindergarten, was also present. Leander Starr Jameson, the former prime minister of the Cape Colony and the provocateur-in-chief of the Jameson Raid could not come himself, but deputed his secretary Rob Holland to attend in his stead. Lord Lovat, who had raised a special British regiment, the Lovat Scouts, to fight in the Second Boer War, was present; as was Arthur Maitland, Alfred Milner's secretary. Viscounts Howick and Wolmer, son-in-law and son of Lord Selborne, respectively, were the other attendees.

During this gathering the movement was born, although the name, The Round Table, was only to be finalised some five months later. The Plas Newydd meeting discussed, Milner was to write in his diary, what he called 'Curtis's scheme'[110]—a set of proposals for reshaping the British Empire which was faced with the rise of three contending powers—the United States in the Atlantic; Japan in the Pacific; and Germany on the European Continent. Their first task was to identify and 'state the Imperial problem'. This was to be done through the production of a well-researched 'memorandum', which would serve as a common reference for all Imperial Union enthusiasts. In the very manner that Curtis had studied southern Africa before writing the Selborne Memorandum, it was agreed that he would visit all the Dominions before preparing the document. Once it was drafted, it would be shared with like-minded people across the Dominions; they, in turn, would be recruited to fostering a movement towards an Imperial Union. But Curtis, following the South African experience, insisted on launching publications, along the lines of *The State*, which would be used to circulate the 'gospel' of Imperial Union.[111]

Soon after the meeting, Curtis, Kerr and Marris left for Canada—and it was from that country that Kerr took the month-long detour to the United States to research about racial relations. A key goal of the mission to Canada was to pick, through a 'process of personal selection'[112], a small group of imperial enthusiasts as the first recruits to the Round Table Movement. After visiting Canada, Curtis travelled to South Africa, New Zealand and Australia (before returning again to Canada) to recruit more enthusiasts. As decided at Plas Newydd, once these select members were chosen, an 'executive agent' would be appointed for each of the national groups who would be responsible for carrying out its activities. In order to make this empire-wide scheme effective, it was decided, too, that a core group would have to work in London, the imperial centre. In addition, an 'itinerant delegate',

Curtis himself, would visit the various national groups to collect, digest and disseminate information on the ideal of imperial union.

From this kind of back-and-forth, an Imperial statement which set out 'the alternatives involved, the real problem of disruption, the sacrifices needed to avoid it and the successive stages through which the ultimate goal is to be sought'.[113] Once this statement was issued, its goals would be taken up by all groups as 'a creed to which all have contributed, and all have subscribed'.[114]

This approach to building consensus was drawn from the Kindergarten's efforts in South Africa: so, the Round Table Societies that were opened across the Dominions, replicated the Closer Union Societies in South Africa. Just as the publication, the *Government of South Africa,* was a statement for the unification of South Africa*,* Curtis was tasked with the drafting of a memorandum on imperial union. His methodology, too, drew on the South African experience and, interestingly, was a kind of pre-figuration of today's peer review system. How did this work? During his travels, Curtis would study secondary sources, and conduct extensive interviews with 'influential' and 'knowledgeable' individuals. On the basis of the 'facts' gleaned from these encounters, a report would be drafted for circulation among a select group across the Dominions. Following this, wider self-selecting groups would discuss the draft, further entering their comments into interleaved copies. These would be sent back to Curtis, who would then prepare the next draft, and so on. At every iteration, the 'method' involved fieldwork, interviewing, library research, drafting and the proto-peer review. An acceptable draft of the memorandum was only completed after this laborious process.

Consider this example: after his interactions with people in Canada in late 1909 and early 1910, Curtis wrote a draft report entitled 'Memoranda on Canada and the British Commonwealth'—this was also called the 'Green Memorandum'.[115] He finished an early draft of the document in South Africa between March and May 1911, despatching it to London: here, Kerr made copies to be delivered to Curtis when he reached New Zealand. This was the draft that was seen by the selected numbers in New Zealand, Australia, Canada and South Africa. The final document drew on the thoughts of some 200 Round Table members before it was finally released in 1914. Its transnational, but essentially closed, process enabled a male-dominated, all-white thought-collective to construct a new imperial vision of the world.

Curtis was keen to emphasise the 'scientific nature' of this methodology seeking to cloak its closed and self-referential format under the legitimacy of 'scholarship'. In two separate memorandums, one written at the end of his trip to New Zealand and the other after leaving Canada in early 1911,[116] he set out the South African background and methodology of the Kindergarten's approach to these issues. Furthermore, in all his writings, he claimed to be applying 'the methods of scientific study to politics'.[117]

In personal conversations with potential participants, Curtis always empha-sised the objectivity of the approach.[118] In a letter written to Kerr, Curtis wrote of his difficulties in the Dominions to prove that he was not a propagandist:

> The only way I can meet this is to show them the books we produced in South Africa, and to show them then how again and again, as the results of study, we had to discard ideas which we had long held . . . our whole experience in South Africa has taught us there, that if we sit down to get at the facts and to review them on their merits, we are likely, before we have done, to be brought to con-clusions which we little anticipated.[119]

This 'scientific study' of political issues, which would become the 'scientific study of International Relations', was underpinned by several considerations which need to be briefly underscored. Firstly, as Curtis frequently made clear, there was an emphasis on the 'objective' nature of study which would make others less apprehensive about the overall project. Given this insistence, the assertion of detachment cannot not be uncritically accepted. As we have suggested, the ideas operated within racial discourses, and were influenced by the group's goals for the empire. Moreover, the epistemic community within which they worked was a closed one. Secondly, the quest for rigour was adjudged as the best way of ascertaining 'the facts' on which to establish the 'truth'. The latter would emerge once 'the facts' had been written down and 'tested by the criticism of men like themselves in all the countries con-cerned'.[120] And only once this truth was revealed, could Curtis begin to do the 'missionary work with real effect'.[121] As he once put it, 'until I have got a doctrine I can preach, I am conscious of being utterly paralysed so far as influencing the current course of affairs is concerned'.[122] It was no surprise then, that he quickly earned the moniker of the 'Prophet' within the militant and missionary-inclined Round Table movement.

Thirdly, the attention to method points to a significant, but understudied, aspect of early IR: the purported cognitive link between knowledge and reality. The Kindergarten's work in South Africa and the Round Table's work in the Dominions reflected a strong understanding that the codification of scientific knowledge could create reality. *The State* and Kindergarten's other publications seem to not only reinforce this belief, but also provided the project with an air of authenticity. This understanding was rooted in the nineteenth-century British tradition of 'knowing', primarily reflected in (and influenced by) Herbert Spencer's belief that human nature was constantly evolving, and that human history reflected the eternal march of progress.[123] In this understanding, the purpose of science was to empirically establish this history of progress, and authenticate its telos. Once done, humans—and their agency—were required only for the purposes of propaganda. Kerr was

confident that once the truth had been revealed through the Imperial State-ment, it would then only need a few publicly spirited 'men' in each Dominion 'to shout "harooh" (sic) in a spontaneous manner' to create a movement for the end goal, the creation of an Imperial Union.[124] The *Selborne Memoran-dum* and *Government of South Africa* volumes seem to have done the same for the Kindergarten—reveal 'the truth'—and the Closer Union Societies and *The State* had then provided the hoorah!

A key instrument in the spreading of the word on Imperial scale was the founding of a journal, *The Round Table*, which first appeared in November 1910. The original idea was to open a journal along the lines of *The State* in each of the Dominions. However, during their Canadian sojourn in late 1909, Curtis and Marris discussed this approach with the Toronto-based journal-ist, John Willison. He persuaded them that there had to be one organ—not several—for ease of communication among (and across) the Dominions.[125] Curtis hoped that besides connecting people, the journal could also broadcast information about each Dominion to the others, in much the same manner in which *The State* had done in South Africa. To achieve this, each edition of the journal would carry articles from different parts of the Empire. Faced with these 'facts', people across the Dominions would discover a sense of com-monality, and better appreciate why Imperial Union was essential for their own and the empire's future.

The result of this thinking was that on 25 February 1910, a plan for a com-mon Dominion-centered journal was adopted by a meeting of The Moot in London. A committee was formed to guide its affairs; its membership com-prised Brand, Oliver, Robinson, Kerr (editor) and Paterson (sub-editor).[126] Replicating the roles they played in South Africa, Curtis was to encourage participation in the journal during his tours to the various parts of the empire, while Kerr was to manage the magazine from a central London-based office. The South African-based benefactor Abe Bailey pitched in to fund *The Round Table*, as he had done with *The State*. Unlike the South African experience, however, there was no attempt to turn this particular venture into a popular magazine, and so its circulation relied mostly on individual subscription.[127] This was also possibly a lesson learnt from the experience of *The State* which, as we will see below, although began as a political journal, eventually turned into a monthly popular magazine once the proprietorship changed hands.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Essentially, *The Round Table* was a cloned version of *The State*, issued from the imperial center: the new journal aiming to replicate the old journal's mes-sage at the level of Empire; as it did so, *The State* itself effectively became an

organ of the empire in South Africa. From early 1910, it brought to its South African readers the new imperial vision of the Kindergarten. The idea that the British Empire was only artificially separated from South Africa was broadcast forcefully to the country and its citizenry. An Australian author wrote in the journal that all the white constituents of the Empire stood for a collective idea which was underpinned by

> the spirit of civil and religious liberty, of independence and individual effort untrammelled by the Government, and working for the welfare of the whole. [The British Empire] stands for the world language of the future, and the noblest literature of modern civilization, for a system of law the wisest, humanest, and most flexible that has ever kept mankind in the path of order. It stands for the lofty conception of civilised existence, of duty to others, of good government to alien races, for high ideals in conduct, character in public opinion—shortly, for Religion, Justice and Liberty.[128]

Couched within the term, 'New Imperialism', the empire for Kerr was:

> an association of five big countries having the same type of civilization and the same institutions, which are linked by a common sentiment, a common commercial language, a common system of credit and by strong bonds of trade, which together will form [under the leadership of Britain] the strongest and most influential body in the world—standing for peace, liberty and civilization.[129]

For the Kindergarten and for other British liberals, the destiny of South Africa was rooted in the belief that its very nationhood was part of a collective identity of the British Empire. This implied two discursive stratagems: first, negating the perception that South Africa was a nation distinct from the rest of the empire: instead, South Africa, it was argued, could only become a nation when it became fully compatible with the requirements of empire. Although they were in the minority, South Africa's whites, including the Afrikaners, were part of the British 'race' identity. Second, a sense of close affiliation with the empire—immersion in its *zeitgeist*—was to believe that what was foreign to the empire, was foreign to South Africa. The Hobbesian world of international politics was *out there*: anarchic, terrible and fearsome, against which the 'self' (read: empire and, simultaneously, South Africa) had to be preserved. The burden of statehood meant that South Africa will have to take up its responsibility to defend the Empire, since the empire's enemies would be South Africa's too.

The implication of this understanding was that place called South Africa and the empire could never be in contradiction, and the journal lambasted any contrary opinion. In the April 1910 issue, the editor of *The State* criticised Jacobus Sauer, a liberal Cape politician, who called for 'non-interference by

the Downing Street' in South Africa's affairs. Such a view was 'mischievous and unwarranted'[130], an editorial in *The State* declared. Any policy of 'self-centred isolation' was an attempt to draw a difference between the empire and South Africa: this would be 'fatal to real unity, and . . . disastrous to the interests of South Africa'.[131] There was no South Africa without the British Empire and a 'true South African can scarcely avoid being a true imperialist'.[132] So, when South Africa's first prime minister, Louis Botha, rejected the scheme of Imperial Federation which had been advanced by his New Zealand counterpart (who was strongly influenced by Curtis), *The State* launched a stinging criticism on Botha. It was a form of national parochialism that saw the country as separate from empire; the Journal warned that 'wherever local freedom threatens the safety of the whole partnership . . . [of empire].., ..[is where].. liberty degenerates into license and local pride becomes a danger to the existence of all'.[133]

Such positions were rooted in a form of historical amnesia however because they were blind to the deep resentment the Afrikaner community held against the British. When one author, a Ds. (read Rev.) Schoon, questioned the British policy of establishing concentration camps during the Boer War, the then editor, B. K. Long, criticised him for 'being blinded by prejudices and partisanship'. Such questions, he wrote, raised bitter memories which cannot be discussed in 'a proper spirit of detachment'.[134] When viewed in the spirit of 'impartiality', Long quoted from book, *War on Land,* he had reviewed in the same issue, that the concentration camps were 'practically internment camps for non-combatants' who were removed from their homes and land-holdings for military and humanitarian reasons, the latter being more prominent.[135] The journal therefore remembered the past by glossing over any sense of rupture between empire and nation in South Africa.

A narrative of creating a common enemy strengthened the unity between South Africa and empire: this was 'a common funk', as Ian D. Colvin, the foreign correspondent of *The State* called it. In its June 1911 issue, the journal argued that '[w]hile the champions of local patriots are brandishing their ineffectual spears, the ships of the enemies of Greater Britain, if they succeed in defeating the British fleet, can ruin South Africa without coming within thousands of miles of our coasts'.[136]

The rationale for South Africa being a part of the Empire was clear: 'if . . . (you are not with) . . . Britain, then [our common enemy] Germany will conquer you'.[137] Colvin argued in April 1911, 'South Africa with her overseas trade must have a protector until she can take up the work herself. There is then a choice between England and Germany. As England guarantees your local freedom and Germany is not likely to give you any such guarantee, the choice is easily made'.[138] And he went on, '(b)ut . . . [the choice having been

. . .] made, it follows that your policy is to strengthen your protector, so as to carry out her work of protection efficiently'.[139] A month later, he warned:

> [i]f the Union of South Africa is to continue as a self-governing State, it can only be by the protection of the British Navy. That protection withdrawn, you are the mercy of the strongest sea-power. . . South Africa has always been, and will always be, the possession of the strongest power at sea. The tie which will unite the Empire, if anything will, is not the tie of common flag or of a common King, but of a common fear—a common funk.[140]

As a result, South Africa, Kerr argued, needed a new imagination of what it understood as 'self' and what it understood as 'others'. The more Britain was strengthened, the stronger South Africa would become. The country needed to accept the responsibility of its own defence for the sake of itself and of the empire. This was considered important because global affairs were in flux. British naval hegemony appeared to be giving way to a situation where, per-haps, Germany, the United States, Russia and an Asian Empire were able to challenge an overstretched Empire. British expenditure on imperial defence was nearly 80,000,000 pounds each year, an enormous sum for the country. One proposed remedy was that settler-states would have to take a greater part in securing their own sovereignty.[141] Milner formulated the issue this way: the challenge of Imperial Defence was not one 'of shifting burdens, but one of creating fresh centres of strength'.[142] In each volume of *The State,* Kerr (and subsequently Ian D. Colvin) laid stressed on the importance of Imperial defence and the need for white settler-colonies to share the burden.

Let us pause here to reflect on the argument, we are making in this chapter. As Benedict Anderson has it, nationalism, has 'its roots in fear and hatred of the Other, and its affinities with racism'.[143] Aware of this pathological neces-sity, the journal, *The State,* channeled the *fear and hatred* of the whites-only South African nation against two specific Others: Africans and Germany, while at the same time proclaiming that South Africa could only achieve its final—and avowedly most advanced—form in total unity of purpose with the empire.

CONTRARIAN VOICES

Given that many of the articles in *The State* appeared under pseudonyms or even anonymously, it is impossible to say if any person of colour was ever published in its pages. It seems unlikely, though: at least, no contribution to its pages ever made a case for equal rights to people of colour. Nonetheless, a few contrarian voices were published. Amongst one of these was a rejoinder

to Patrick Duncan's article on the Asiatic question which was written by Henry S. Polak, a Jewish-journalist and close associate of the Indian leader Mohandas Gandhi. The argument, in favour of the rights of Indians, was exceptional given—as we have pointed out—the direction of the journal on issue of race.[144]

Another contrary opinion appeared, in the name of Arthur W. Noon, which declared that 'South Africa can never be really and truly "united" save under a Socialist regime!'.[145] In presenting an exposition of what socialism would mean in South Africa, the author made a revolutionary call for 'the land for the people'. However, like many a socialist of those times, Noon was living in a colour-bound world. Although the piece was high on rhetoric, sufficiently critical of capitalism and promised readers that socialism offered 'newer and more beautiful visions opening to their mental vision', it was silent on the issue of race, let alone gender.[146] Indeed, in subsequent issues of the journal, Noon was taken to task on the illiberalism of the position, not on the question of race, but on the issue of women's rights.

One contributor, Katherine Wynbergh, pointed out that in Noon's account, the wife was deemed as a personal property of man, and his use of terms 'humanity' and 'people' referred to the male sex only.[147] While not opposed to socialism *per se*, she argued that socialism should be preceded by the liberation of women, by granting them equal political, economic and labour rights. If this did not happen, socialism—with its tendency of bringing power in the grasp of 'the ignorant and unthinking'—would mean increased oppression for women. Without any rights to defend themselves, socialism would give 'a positive incentive to the unscrupulous' and be suicidal for women and, in turn, the whole human race.[148]

The inclusion of the voices of women—white only, of course—was an important step for the journal. The movement for women's suffrage in South Africa was initiated in 1892 when a motion calling for qualified franchise for women (with property and educational qualifications, which would have excluded black women) was defeated in the Cape House of Assembly.[149] But the success of the women's movement in other settler-colonies—New Zealand (1893) and Australia (1902)—had encouraged South African women to continue to take up the fight. Olive Schreiner, then South Africa's most famous writer and a celebrated feminist, was the inspiration for many women to contribute to the pages of the journal. In fact, Schreiner had written a long tract on 'Closer Union', the very week that the journal first appeared: although this was not published in *The State* it had helped to popularise the cause of the journal—even if she like her brother W. P. Schreiner, was considered to be a 'negrophilist'.[150] In April 1909, another activist, L. Perry made a case for enfranchising women, by refuting men's claims that their greater physical strength justified their claims to the franchise.[151] But, not unexpectedly, his

view clearly bruised the male ego. In a loaded rejoinder, the Afrikaner poet C. J. Langenhoven, who went on to write *'Die Stem'*, the Afrikaans version of the National Anthem of apartheid South Africa, equated the calls for women franchise with voting rights for Africans.[152] The next claimants for franchise, he caustically noted, would be 'infants and aliens, idiots and lunatics'.[153]

Langenhoven believed that political rights were accorded to the strong for the protection of the weak. He argued that women, children and natives could not be given powers to decide their own security, in the same way that passengers of a ship could not be allowed to interfere in the work of the captain. No political claim had 'the right not to be wrecked, not to be taken to the wrong destination, not to be left adrift upon the trackless ocean'.[154] He dreaded '[t]he prophetic vision of a Cabinet composed (entirely) of women with their husbands and favourites as under-secretaries, of courts of law presided over by Zulu chiefs, with their wives in the jury box and white men in the dock. . . a shuddering horror compared with . . . the worst darkness through which the past human civilisation has struggled upwards. . . '.[155]

This diatribe concluded with an analogy drawn between the nation and the human body: European males were the brain of South African society who would 'direct, organise and capitalise industry, secure good government and the efficient protection of the law, and act as general administrators of the vastly complex interests of the modern state'; Africans were the human hands who must carry out the physical labour for 'their sphere is lowlier . . . their obligations will be less and they shall have, in an easy mind free from the harassing worries that madden their masters. . . '. In the body politic of the nation, Langenhoven asserted, the women must take up 'the duties of the hearts'.[156] Their station was '. . . to watch over the cradles of our young, to nurse our aged and sick, to brighten our homes with cheer and lighten our burdens with sympathy, to comfort us in distress and encourage us in adversity, to adorn our lives with sweet influences of affection. . . '.[157] 'Is she', he asked in conclusion, 'prepared to sell this birthright for the mess of pottage of the hustings?'[158]

Langenhoven's contribution was taken as an opportunity, rather than as a rebuke, by another women writer and leader of the Woman's Enfranchisement League, Julia F. Solly. She boldly proclaimed that 'lovers of justice detest injustice wherever they see it, irrespective of sex or colour—a matter naturally incomprehensible to Mr. Langenhoven and others of his way of thinking, who ignore all moral law and equity and see only in the progress of society an imbecile and totally incomprehensible concession of the strong to the weak'.[159] Calling for the introduction of a qualified franchise for women (and also 'the natives'), she pointed out that progress of a society should also be measured on parameters of moral progress.[160] This, her argument ran, would be visible when human values were cherished up and

above considerations of sex and colour. This enlightened call was quite an exceptional contribution in the pages of the journal.

UNION AND AFTER

The Union of South Africa came into being on 31 May 1910—by this time, the journal had been published for less than eighteen months. On the occasion, the editor wrote: 'The Union marks the completion of the first stage in the history of the magazine. The object for which *The State* is published is hence formally achieved'.[161] But this was only the end of the first stage of its work. The task of fashioning a nation required a far more sustained engagement and the editorial ran on, '[mu]ch can be done through the medium of pages of a magazine in the way of giving publicity to the opinions of leading men (sic), collecting information from sources to which the public has very limited opportunities of access and drawing inferences from facts which are meaningless without collection and comparison. All this "The State" will continue to do. . . '[162]

The involvement of the main protagonists for the journal dwindled after the first volume, however. Philip Kerr had already relinquished the editorship with the publication of the July 1909 issue and, along with Lionel Curtis, returned to England, as we have already noted. He continued to contribute to the pages of the journal for another year, writing mostly on matters of international affairs. When he was the editor his reflections on international affairs were part of the editorial review section called 'The Month', but after his departure these were separated into a section titled 'Oversea Affairs'. His involvement with *The State* ended completely by August 1910 and he was replaced by Ian Colvin, for monthly commentaries on international affairs.

The reasons for the withdrawal of Kerr and Curtis, were understandable. With the formation of the Union in South Africa in mid-1909, and its ratification by the British Parliament, the formal task of the Kindergarten in South Africa was complete. The members of the Kindergarten were summoned by the grander imperial project. Confronted with this development, *The State* faced a crisis of energy and purpose. By September 1909, the Closer Union Societies disintegrated—again, their mission was accomplished. From its October 1909 edition, the journal ceased to be the official organ of the Association of Closer Union Societies. Importantly, its Dutch version was incurring severe losses— the first issue alone had lost the proprietors over £1000.[163] The success of the English version of the journal in the previous months however served an incentive to continue publishing and 'dispose once and for all of that theory of the pessimists' that 'South Africa cannot produce and will not support of her own libel in their country'.[164] This was a

very telling statement of how the journal and its ideas were abandoned mid-way: from attempting to inculcate a national spirit, the journal was reduced to a statement of the caliber of South Africa to measure itself against others.

From this point onwards, the journal widened its horizons both in terms of its readership and authorship. Previously it had focussed overtly on political questions, it now began to advertised itself as 'a political and literary review with the attractions of an ordinary illustrated monthly magazine'.[165] New contributions—short stories, serial stories and articles of general, scientific, literary and artistic interest—were published. These came not just from South Africa, but also from Europe and America. In fact, the main attraction of the journal from October 1909 to March 1910 was 'The History of Mr. Polly', a serialised version of H. G. Wells's famous novel that would be released in London in 1910. The journal also began to organise monthly competitions—a Photographic Competition from November 1909 and 'The State Quarterly Competition' from April 1910 which printed contributions to the magazine in prose and poetry. In addition, with a need to develop a feeling of patriotism initiatives such as 'The State Naval Trophy Fund' which was 'introduced to collect funds to present a suitable Challenge Cup to be held from year to year by the best shooting ship of the South African Naval Squadron':[166] a cup presented by the country's citizens to the South African Navy. Given that two of the four colonies had no access to ports and hence never imagined their defences in terms of a navy, this trophy aimed to raise the consciousness about South Africa's as well as the empire's seaward defence. Likewise, a national flag was a symbol of national unity and 'The State National Flag Competition' in the journal solicited contributions on designs for it.

If the content of the magazine changed after the formation of the Union, so did its name: from 'The State' to 'The State of South Africa', possibly in celebration of the formation of a Union, but from July 1911, it reverted to its original form.

After the formation of Union, the publication struggled to survive. There were suggestions that more revenue could be collected through advertisements from England, but Kerr argued that for a 'magazine of the apparently stodgy nature of The State', this would be a fruitless task.[167] Furthermore, Abe Bailey, the main benefactor of the journal, disassociated himself from it in June 1911—it is not clear why this happened but most likely his own interest in the journal also dwindled after *The Round Table* had started to function (which he also funded). The Randlord, Lionel Phillips, saved the journal from total collapse by agreeing to fund it. However, Phillips had invested in the journal to further the interests his wife, Florence, an art patroness who was involved in establishing the Johannesburg Art Gallery and the city's Botanical Gardens. As a result, the journal become more an art and a cultural organ

than a political one.[168] Elsa Maxwell, a young American socialite who would later redefine the twentieth century high-society party culture in America, was appointed as assistant editor at the behest of Florence Phillips. To accommodate Maxwell, an editorial office was opened in Johannesburg.[169] These changes annoyed Long who, sensed that his editorial powers were being undermined. His frustrations grew when Maxwell conducted her office in Johannesburg quite independent of his control, and he wrote to both Lionel and Florence Phillips complaining about her lackluster work ethic and for being 'radically untruthful and unreliable'. She was, he wrote, 'worse than useless' in Johannesburg.[170]

However, Long's capacity to bargain was on the wane even though he was now devoting all his energies to the journal (reading between 50-100 manuscripts, writing a long article and two or three long reviews a month) and had even given up on his legal practice, to work on *The State*. The Journal was incurring severe losses, recovering barely half of its total expenditure, while circulation fell from 2,296 in January 1911 to 1,791 in August 1911.[171]

The increasing influence of Florence Phillips and Elsa Maxwell in the journal's affairs was visible. The political content of the journal was considerably trimmed. The only regular political feature now was a regular review, entitled 'The Month', which appeared in a condensed form from August 1911, and included comments on social, literary and artistic life in South Africa.[172] The name of this feature was later changed from 'The Month' to 'Comments'. In this column, Long wrote that there was a public pressure to reduce the political content of the magazine, but also defended retaining some political content under the pretext that there was not sufficiently large a public in South Africa to run an exclusive literary magazine.[173] This public assertion was perhaps more directed towards his internal detractors than it was towards readers of *The State*.

In January 1912, the editorial encouraged the readers to write for the journal on South African problems of political, social or economic nature by offering prizes for best contributions. But this did not prove helpful. Both the quantity and quality of political pieces received was shoddy. Ian Colvin's monthly review of international politics, 'Oversea Affairs', discontinued after March 1912, while the other regular feature on economics and commerce, 'Finance and Statistics' by J. McGowan had been stopped from August 1911. All pretense of *The State* being a political magazine was eventually dropped as even the monthly editorial feature was discontinued in August 1912. Revealingly, the space left by politics was filled by a long supplement on sports. One agreeable addition to the magazine after October 1909 was introduction to its pages of political cartoons, either as review of a particular caricaturist's work or as part of the monthly editorial review. These, too, stopped appearing from July 1911. By the end of 1912, it seemed that the

steam had run out of this project. The last issue appeared in December 1912 without any indication that it was being discontinued.

Despite a circulation life of only four years, the journal holds a significant place in the political history of South Africa and, as we have argued, in the founding of the discipline of International Relations. It was a product of a time of great flux, and flourished by influencing public opinion in South Africa towards one particular rendition of state and nationhood in the country—its status was enhanced by linking the South African outcome to a specific understanding of the British empire. It was a platform of expression of ideas on race, capital, language: these have long dominated the political history of South Africa and, likewise, its discreet silences suppressed which could have altered its political history.

One of the most remarkable features of the Kindergarten's work in South Africa was the stubborn belief that textual dissemination of ideas in a relatively 'non-partisan' way was the most potent way of fashioning a new reality. To the Kindergarten, the Union of South Africa always remained a vindication of this belief and guided their life-long work. Journals like *The Round Table* and *International Affairs*, specialist chairs in IR, and the institutes devoted to the study of the International which were opened across the Dominions by its members (or through their influence) all manifested their belief in the power of the written word. The very fact that a discipline like IR was created with a strong belief that it would foster peace in the world is a standing testimony to this idea: no other discipline has perhaps begun with so much of moral and methodological (and misplaced?) confidence as IR.

More directly, *The State* is an important milestone for further two reasons. First, as David Long and Brian Schmidt have argued, the founding debate of International Relations was not about idealism or realism, but about empire and race.[174] A history of *The State* confirms this, and a lot more. It tells us that this project was not merely a discursive engagement—of fashioning new ideas about the Global, but also one of material engagement—of creating a state in southern Africa rooted in particular understandings of belonging and exclusion. This leads us to the second, and more important, point. When they reached the metropole, the ideas of empire and race were already tried and tested in the colonies. This suggests that the imperial margins were, in effect, the laboratory where ideas on the world were tested, before they were brought into the metropolitan conversation. The Round Table, the first chair of International Politics at Aberystwyth, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Council on Foreign Relations and a number of other think tanks and IR departments across the world are bound by a thread of ideas that were first thrashed in the margins of southern Africa and in the column inches of *The State*.

NOTES

1. Vitalis, "Birth of the Discipline", 159-181; David Long and Brian Schmidt "Introduction" in *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, eds. David Long and Brian Schmidt (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2005), 1–21.

2. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*; Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa*; Dubow, "Colonial Nationalism".

3. Peter Merrington, "The State and the 'Invention of Heritage' in Edwardian South Africa," In *The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and the British Foreign Policy,* eds. Andrea Bosco and Alex May (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997).

4. Bernard Magubane, *The Round Table Movement: Its influence on the Historiography of Imperialism* (Harare: SAPES Books, 1994), 8.

5. Although Jan Smuts and John X. Merriman, two prominent South African politicians, in their private conversations had also been in favour a closer union.

6. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 108.

7. Race here means the English and Afrikaner. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 108.

8. For a list of these societies, see Anon. "Closer Union Societies," *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909): 357–58.

9. A British enthusiast and former member of South African Vigilance Committee, which during the Anglo-Boer War had produced a series of propagandising pamphlets in favour of the British. At least one of these was authored by Brydone. See, R.R. Brydone, *'Liberty' or Liberty: some remarks on a South African petition* (Cape Town: South African Vigilance Committee (1900).

10. Anon., "Association of Closer Union Societies", *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909), 113–16.

11. F. S. Oliver, *Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1906).

12. Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement*, 129.

13. Lavin, *From Empire*, 88.

14. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*,114; Merrington, "The State".

15. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*,114

16. On Physical Energy and its connection to Rhodes, see Brenda Schmahmann, *Picturing Change: Curating visual culture at post-apartheid universities* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2013), 88–92.

17. Lavin, *From Empire*, 91

18. Curtis, *Government of South Africa*.

19. Long, *The Framework*.

20. Curtis, *Government of South Africa*, x–xi.

21. Editor, "By Way of Introduction", *The State* 1 no. 1 (1909), 1.

22. Editor "By Way of Introduction", 1.

23. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), 171.

24. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised edition (London: Verso, 1991 [1983]). See, particularly, p 135: "…the very idea of 'nation is now nestled firmly in virtually all print languages; and nation-ness is virtually inseparable from political consciousness."

25. Editor "The Closer Union Movement", *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909), 25.

26. Editor, "The Closer Union Movement", 25.

27. Editor, "By Way of Introduction", 2.

28. Editor, "By Way of Introduction", 2.

29. Anderson, *Imagined Communities,* 141.

30. Percy Fitzpatrick, "Jock of the Bushveld, and Those who knew him", *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909), 30

31. Fitzpatrick, "Jock of the Bushveld," 30-1.

32. Interestingly, Fitzpatrick's biography written by A.P. Cartwright in early 1970s was titled 'the First South African'. See, Alan P. Cartwright, *The First South African: The life and times of Sir Percy Fitzpatrick* (Cape Town: Purnell, 1971).

33. Editor "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909), 238.

34. Editor "The Month", *The State* 4, no. 4 (1910), 627.

35. Herbert Baker (1862–1946) was a famous architect who designed government buildings in Pretoria, New Delhi and Nairobi, amongst a host of other buildings. Although not directly included among the Kindergarten, he was often called "Grand-Pa" by its members. Older than Patrick Duncan, the oldest member of this group, by 10 years, Baker was close to Rhodes and for the Kindergarten, its most direct connection to the intellectual legacy of Rhodes (MS. Eng. Hist. c. 855, 10).

36. Francis Masey, "The Beginnings of Our nation", *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909), 55-62. This feature appeared in first nine months.

37. Masey, "The Beginnings," 62.

38. Patrick Duncan, "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal", *The State* 1, no. 2 (1909), 172.

39. It is important here to clarify the different usages of "racial/racialism" and "racist/racism" here. The term racial or racialism refers to ethnic differences and exclusion between Afrikaners and the British. The feelings of ethnic solidarity lead to promotion of one group's interests over another. Racism or racist points more towards the project of white supremacy, which is demands total domination.

40. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 3, (1909), 238.

41. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 1.

42. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 2.

43. In an often-quoted speech, Paul Kruger once said: "Whether we conquer or whether we perish, Freedom will emerge in Africa, as it did in the United States of North America, as surely as the sun rises out of the morning clouds. And then from the Zambesi to Simon's Bay it will be a case of Africa for the Afrikaner." Quoted in, F. A. van Jaarsveld, *The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History* (Cape Town: Simondium Publishers, 1964), 19.

On the development of Afrikaner nationalism, see van Jaarsveld, *The Awakening*; Andre du Toit and Hermann Giliomee, *Afrikaner Political Thought: Documents and Analyses, 1: 1780–1850* (Cape Town and Berkeley: David Philip and University of California Press, 1983); Andre du Toit, "No Chosen People: The Myth

of the Calvinist Origins of Afrikaner Nationalism and Racial Ideology", *American Historical Review* 88, no. 4 (1983), 20–52; Dan O'Meara, *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934–1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Hermann Giliomee, "The Beginnings of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1870–1915", *South African Historical Journal* 19, no. 1 (1987): 115–42; T . Dunbar Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

44. Editor "The Month", *The State* 1, no.3 (1909), 238.
45. Editor "The Month", *The State* 3, no. 1(1910), 7.
46. Editor "The Month", *The State* 3, no. 1(1910), 7–8.
47. Editor "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 1(1909), 11.
48. Editor "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 1(1909), 11.

This was the period when notions of 'psychic unity' of the native (dependent on hereditary approaches) were increasingly challenged by more sociological perspectives. See, Eric Linstrum, *Ruling Minds: Psychology in the British Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016).

49. Philip Kerr, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 9 (1909), 242. From this issue onwards, the editorial article "The Month" has two parts. The first pertains to internal matters and is written by the editor, while the second part is titled "Oversea Affairs". Kerr, who had relinquished the editorship, continued to write "Oversea Affairs".

50. William Schreiner (1857–1919), liberal politician and brother of the famous South African feminist and writer, Olive Schreiner.

51. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909), 610.
52. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909), 610.
53. Anon. "Colour, and a few options on it", *The State* 8, no. 5 (1912), 405.
54. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909), 610–13.
55. For another example of this argument in the Journal, see W. Wybergh, "Native Policy: Assimilation or Segregation", *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909), 292–304.
56. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 1–24.
57. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 15
58. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 16.
59. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 17.
60. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 17.
61. James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World*, 1783–1939 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 382.
62. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 10 (1909), 374.
63. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 10 (1909), 374.
64. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 16–17.
65. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 15.
66. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 18–19.
67. Patrick Duncan, "The Labour Question in the Transvaal", *The State* 3, no. 6 (1910), 912–20.
68. Editor (1909) "The Month", *The State*, 2 (7), p. 21. Ideas on segregation were also advanced by other articles in the journal—for example, see, Anon., "Industrial and Economic Reform in South Africa, *The State* 2, no. 9 (1909), 293–303.

69. He was startled to find:

In 1908 there were fifty-seven negro banks. There are now supposed to be over seventy. I have talked to a typical 'native' bank manager—coal, black, with receding forehead, thick lips, wooly hair, without a trace a white blood if appearances were the proof—who showed me over a large and flourishing establishment started, manned and managed from start to finish by negroes.

See, Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 193.

70. Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 191.

71. Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 191.

72. Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 191.

73. Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 191.

74. Phillip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 190–98.

75. Howard Pim, "Some Considerations Affecting the Question of Native Franchise", part I and II, *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 75–83; and *The State* 2, no 8 (1909), 170–80.

76. William Archer, "Black and White in Southern States of America, The Colour Problem", *The State* 2, no. 12 (1909), 751–760; *The State* 3, no. 1 (1910), 69–75; *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910), 274–81; *The State* 3, no. 3 (1910), 426–30.

77. Archer, "Black and White," *The State*, 2 (12), 759

78. Archer, "Black and White," *The State*, 2 (12), 759.

79. Archer, *Through Afro-America*, 236–37.

80. Archer, *Through Afro-America*, 237–44.

81. Archer, *Through Afro-America*, 240

82. Although the editor noted that Archer had never visited South Africa, so his conclusions could not wholly apply to the country.

83. Archer "Black and White," *The State*, 3 (3), 428.

84. B. K. Long, "Comments", *The State* 7, no. 1 (1912), 174.

85. Ian D. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 4, no. 3 (1912), 485.

86. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 4, no. 3 (1912)*, 486.

87. Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 4, no. 1 (1910), 139.

88. Curtis, "The Place".

89. Editor "The Month", *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909), 611–12.

90. Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line*; Atkinson, *The Burden of White Supremacy*.

91. Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 2, no. 12 (1910), 687.

92. Howard Pim, "The Native Problem, A Suggested Solution: Review of Paper by Mr. F. W. Bell", *The State* 2, no. 12 (1910), 27-32.

93. Trevor Fletcher, "The Native Problem", *The State* 3, no. 5 (1910), 767.

94. Fletcher, "The Native Problem", 777.

95. Fletcher, "The Native Problem", 778.

96. L. E. De Pyre "Should We Civilise the Kafir?" *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910)), 549.

97. G. H. Malan, "The Principles of Native Government, II", *The State* 5, no. 5 (1911), 735–43.

98. Editor, "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 11 (1909), 521

99. The term *uitlander* was first used by Paul Kruger, the Transvaal president before the Boer War, to pejoratively address the English miners in Johannesburg.

100. Editor "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 11 (1909), 521.

101. Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 2, no.12 (1909), 684.

102. Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 2, no.12 (1909), 684.

103. Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 5 (1910), 708. Also see, Kent Fedorowich, "Anglicization and the Politicisation of British immigration to South Africa, 1899–1929," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 19, no. 2 (1991), 222–46.

104. This section draws on Thakur, Davis and Vale, *Imperial Mission*.

105. Alex May, "London Moot: Dominion Nationalism and Imperial Federation", In *The Round Table, the Empire/Commonwealth and the British Foreign Policy*, eds. Andrea Bosco and Alex May (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997), 223–37.

106. Lavin, *From Empire*, 100.

107. Quoted in Lavin 1995, *From Empire,* 109.

108. Quoted in Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 134.

109. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 147–148.

110. "Milner"s Diary, 26 August 1909", Alfred Milner Papers, MS. Milner dep. 80, Bodlean Libraries, Oxford.

111. "Memorandum of conversation which took place between a few English and South African friends at intervals during the summer of 1909", MS Curtis 156/1, Lionel Curtis Papers, Boldlean Libraries, Oxford, f. 6.

112. Memorandum, MS Curtis 156/1, f. 6.

113. Memorandum, MS Curtis 156/1, f. 6.

114. Memorandum, MS Curtis 156/1, f. 6.

115. See MS Curtis 156/5.

116. See MS Curtis 156/2 and MS Curtis 156/3.

117. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 165.

118. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men*, 165.

119. "Curtis to Kerr", 21 July 1910, GD40/17/1, Lothian (Philip Kerr) Papers, Scotland National Archives, Edinburgh, f. 65.

120. "Curtis to Oliver", 15–16 August 1910, GD40/17/12, f. 148.

121. "Curtis to Oliver", f. 149.

122. "Curtis to Oliver", f. 148. This statement also prefigures the increasingly Christian leanings of their academic writings in the 1920s and 30s. See, Curtis, *Civitas Dei*.

123. Joseph Mackay and Christopher D. Laroche, "The Conduct of History in International Relations: Rethinking Philosophy of History in IR theory", *International Theory* 9, no. 2 (2017): 203–36.

124. "Kerr to Curtis", 31 August 1910, GD40/17/2, f. 94.

125. "Curtis to Kerr", 21 July 1910, GD40/17/1, f. 61.

126. For a list of original Moot members and the magazine committee, see, MS Curtis 776, f. 149.

127. For this, see "Curtis to Kerr", 21 July 1910, GD40/17/1, f. 55–81.

128. Hubert Foster, "The Defence of the Empire", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 45–46.

129. Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 3, no. 1 (1910), 10.

130. Editor, "The Month, *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910), 527.

131. Editor, "The Month, *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910), 527.

132. Editor, "The Month, *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910), 528.

133. Editor, "The Month", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 6 (1911), 941

134. Editor, "Comments", *The State* 6, no. 2 (1911), 212.

135. Editor, "Comments", *The State* 6, no. 2 (1911), 213.

136. Editor, "The Month", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 6 (1911), 941.

137. Ian D. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 4 (1911), 622.

138. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 4, 622.

139. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 4, 623.

140. Colvin, "Oversea Affairs", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 5 (1911), 781.

141. Editor "The Month", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 7–10.

142. Quoted in Philip Kerr, "Oversea Affairs", *The State* 2, no. 10 (1909), 382.

143. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 141.

144. Henry S. L. Polak, "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal", *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909), 679–89.

145. Arthur W. Noon, "Socialism and United South Africa", *The State*, 3, 3 (1910), 805.

146. Noon, "Socialism", 806.

147. Katherine Wynbergh, "Socialism and Women", *The State* 4, no. 1 (1910), 83.

148. Wynbergh, "Socialism and Women", 86.

149. Cheryl Walker, *The Women's Suffrage Movement in South Africa* (Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1979).

150. Olive Schreiner, "Closer Union", 1908, accessed from http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/closer-union, 20 July 2015.

151. L. Perry, "The case for the enfranchisement of women in South Africa", *The State* 1, no. 4 (1909), 442–48.

152. C. J. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise and the Native Franchise", *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909), 58-65.

153. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 62.

154. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 62.

155. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 63.

156. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 64.

157. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 62–63.

158. Langenhoven, "The Female Franchise", 63.

159. Julia F. Solly, "Enfranchisement of Women in South Africa", *The State* 2, no. 8 (1909), 190.

160. Solly, "Enfranchisement",193.

161. Editor, "Editorial Announcement", *The State* 3, no. 6 (1910), 984.

162. Editor, "Editorial Announcement", 984.

163. See, Merrington, "The State",129.

164. Editor, "'The State'", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 6 (1911), 811.

165. Editor, "Special Announcement", *The State* 2, no. 9 (1909), 270.

166. Editor, "Special Announcement", 271

167. "Kerr to Duncan", 29 March 1910, GD40/17/1, f. 52.

168. Thelma Gutsche, *No Ordinary Woman: The Life and Times of Florence Phillips* (Cape Town: Howard Timmings, 1966), 269.

169. Editor, "'The State'", *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 6 (1911), 810.

170. "Long to Phillips", 6 November 1911, Lionel Phillips Papers, Johannesburg Public Library, 354–55.

171. "Long to Phillips", p. 354; Gutsche, *No Ordinary Woman*, 355.

172. Editor, "Comments", *The State* 6, no. 2 (1911), 212.

173. Editor, "Comments", *The State* 6, no. 2 (1911), 212–16.

174. Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism.*

Institutionalising the International

THE WEAKEST LINK

In 1922, Lionel Curtis travelled to the United States to deliver a series of lectures on 'international affairs' at Williams College in Williamstown, Massachusetts. As an 'adviser on Irish affairs' to the British Colonial Office, he had recently played an important role in the Anglo-Irish Treaty of December 1921.[1] (Intriguingly, this was the first time after his formative years in South Africa that Curtis had taken on the civil servant mantle.) En route, and indeed in America, he worried that the Irish issue might flare up again, forcing him to rush home for consultations with the government. As a precaution, he had sought the assistance of Philip Kerr, who was also in America at the time, in delivering the lectures.[2] The lecture series was collated in a volume titled *Prevention of War*; this book solidified the two men's joint reputation as leading proponents of 'world government'.[3]

As British prime minister David Lloyd George's private secretary, Kerr had played a not insignificant part in post–World War I negotiations. This experience, and the war itself, persuaded him that the cause of war was structural. As a result, the real cause of war lay beyond the issues of leadership. Foreshadowing a later generation of international relations (IR) scholars, Kerr argued that war resulted from an anarchical (state) system.[4] The formation of the League of Nations was a step in the right direction in fostering understanding between nations, but it did not address the cause of war. As long as there were separate nation-states, war would continue. The only way to prevent it was to fuse nation-states into a world government.[5] As he was to write in the journal *Foreign Affairs* in 1922, 'The real problem today is that of world government. Every month that passes will bring home to people more and more clearly that all political problems—whether of preventing

123

war, of establishing stable conditions for trade and commerce, of ending unemployment and bettering social and economic conditions, of improving constitutional organization—all ultimately come back to the problem of ending lawlessness upon the earth and establishing some method by which world problems can be discussed and settled by constitutional means rather than by force or the threat to use force'.[6]

As was their regular practice, Kerr provided the diagnosis of the issue, but the task of sketching out an alternative future was left to Curtis. And the latter, as was his practice, pointed towards the future by drawing on his South African past.[7] For the Williamstown audience, he again narrated the story of the establishment of the Union of South Africa, placing at its centre the Kindergarten and the role played by it. He used this example to argue how it was possible to create larger federations and eventually a world state.

In his work, South Africa had become a metaphor as well as a method. The Kindergarten's subsequent efforts at building an organic union, founding the British Commonwealth, and later prosletising for a world federation all remained tethered to the vision originally sketched out in South Africa. This is not surprising, because the Union of South Africa was the only lasting success that this epistemic grouping achieved. During his Dominion tours, Curtis always presented himself as a 'South African', much to the annoyance of his many colleagues in London. This misrepresentation was invariably reinforced by another—namely, that '*30–40 men went and planted themselves* in the different colonies in South Africa' and 'accomplished [the South African] union' through research and propaganda.[8] Yet curiously, while the Kindergarten and later the Round Table built their authority and legitimacy on this original act, they not only vastly exaggerated their role in the making of the union but also misrepresented the 'success' of their method. Conventional history suggests that politicians like Jan Smuts, John X. Merriman and Louis Botha played a bigger role in establishing the Union of South Africa than did the Kindergarten.[9] And it is certainly so that these leaders mistrusted the ideas of the Kindergarten and decisively moved to achieve the union with a strong centre, dominated by Afrikaners, rather than the federation favoured by Curtis and his cohort. Indeed, midway through writing the two-volume *The Government of South Africa*, Curtis realised that South Africa would be a union and not a federation and thus had to change the conclusion. Hence, the patina of 'science' that Curtis claimed for the work of the Kindergarten overlay an original lie; it was not scientific method but contingency that had guided the Kindergarten in South Africa. The sharp and unceremonious end to which the journal *The State* came reflected best how little the Kindergarten's ideas on an imperial union had influenced South African public opinion.

The Round Table Societies, which were modelled on the Closer Union Societies, were communities of vibrant debate in the years leading up to the

formation of Chatham House. But, ironically, they had little traction in South Africa—in fact, unlike in other parts of the empire, the Round Table Movement had almost no presence in the country. Curtis had visited South Africa in 1911 during his imperial mission, but instead of a Round Table Society forming, the 'Moot' continued to function. It remains unclear whether Curtis had tried to turn the former Closer Union Societies into Round Table Societies. But if any Round Table Societies did exist in South Africa, they soon ceased to function—despite the fact that influential local individuals, such as Patrick Duncan and Hugh Wyndham, were strongly committed to the Round Table project and contributed to the *Round Table* journal. But by 1918, when the London Round Table Society floated the idea of convening an unofficial conference of the Round Table Societies from across the Dominions, South Africa had no official society left to make a representation.[10] Given this state of affairs, it is not surprising that almost as soon as the Kindergarten split to go to different parts of the empire, South Africa was once again the 'weakest link in the imperial chain'—to use Alfred Milner's 1897 phrase.[11]

Domestic politics reinforced this sense of weakness. Although the Round Table Movement prided itself on its objectivity and party political neutrality, in South Africa most of its remaining members became members of Parliament for the pro-British Union Party.[12] The movement's mouthpiece, the *Round Table*, was seen as anti-Afrikaner, and this may have prompted Richard Feetham in 1914 to write to Curtis that the 'renewal of Round Table activity' in the country was not advisable.[13] The story of the Round Table in South Africa appeared to have run its course—at least until the late 1920s, when efforts were made to revive the organization, as we will explore below.

The history of the Round Table Movement and how its members influenced several ideas and institutions is well chronicled.[14] Several authors have highlighted how they pushed forward the ideas of world government in projects like the organic union of the empire, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and world commonwealth.[15] Even their role in the founding of the Royal Institute of International Affairs and other IR institutes is well established.[16] Given this attention, we propose to skip the Round Table's London years and focus on South Africa. To do so, we must turn to the 1920s, when the Round Table project got a new lease of life in the country, this time through the initiative to establish a local branch of Chatham House.

'THE NATIVE PROBLEM'

On 30 January 1928, the vice chancellor of the University of Cape Town (UCT), John Carruthers Beattie, addressed a letter to the director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. In it, Carruthers Beattie wrote that there was

'a possibility of an attempt being made to form an association for the study of problems of African people'. He queried the 'origins of . . . [the London] . . . institute, how members are elected, how the financial means are provided and what the organisation is generally'.[17]

Carruthers Beattie's questions had been fired by an article titled 'Honolulu', which appeared in the December 1927 issue of the *Round Table*.[18] The article itself was mostly a report on the participation of a fifteen-member delegation of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (which included Lionel Curtis and Hugh Wyndham) to the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR) Conference in 1927. The British group had travelled to Honolulu through Canada, where a local group bound for the same conference joined them. Together, the two groups met leading Canadians in Montreal, Ottawa, Winnipeg and Vancouver, where plans were made for establishing a sister body of Chatham House, to be named the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. In his reading of this account, Carruthers Beattie had seen an opportunity for opening a similar institute in South Africa.

Importantly for our purposes, Carruthers Beattie seemed less interested in an institute for the study of international problems; rather he saw a need for 'knowledge of the work done in different parts of Africa . . . [to find] . . . the solution of native problems'.[19] From the perspective of International Relations as a discipline that is extremely schizophrenic (and selective) about its pre–World War II history and the role 'race' and colonial administration played in it, this interest is revealing. But from the perspective of the concerns of the interwar era, this is understandable.[20] Chatham House replied enthusiastically, emphasizing that it, too, was interested in the racial question. We will return to this issue soon, but first let us tease out the local context of Carruthers Beattie's request.

Anxiety about finding a 'solution of native problems' was the primary academic—and policy—fetish in post–World War I South Africa. As Paul Rich has pointed out, 'The idea for the bureaucratic control over a manipulable area of "race relations" came increasingly to occupy South African political discussion after the First World War: and the pathway which was mapped out acted as an important moment in the prefiguring of the "race relations industry".'[21] While 'the native problem' was central to the formation of the Union of South Africa, its codification had come in the form of the Native Land Act of 1913, memorialized in the haunting opening words of Sol Plaatje's classic *Native Life in South Africa*: 'Awakening on Friday morning, June 20, 1913, the South African Native found himself, not actually a slave, but a pariah in the land of his birth'.[22] However, owing to World War I, its implementation was deferred to an unspecified future date. It was only with the passage of the Native Affairs Act of 1920 that the issue was put back on the policy agenda of successive governments. As

black radicalisation increased in the decade that followed, the issue gained increasing urgency. And so considerable energy was devoted to gaining 'knowledge' about the native races, and this was to find its way into the formulation of policy.

Liberal academics such as Charles T. Loram (1879–1840) and Alexander W. Roberts (1857–1938) gained access—albeit limited—to the policymaking by participating in the Native Affairs Commission. Academic disciplines, like 'applied anthropology', which used analytical skills to make public policy, gradually made their appearance in South Africa's young universities. These aimed to arm administrators with scientific knowledge about the 'mental, moral and social life' of the 'native races' as these related to governing them.[23] Indeed, the first ever chair in social anthropology was inaugurated at the University of Cape Town in 1921. The English anthropologist Alfred Radcliffe-Brown (1881–1955) had been personally invited to head this department by the country's prime minister, Jan Smuts,[24] who believed that 'a knowledge of anthropology' was 'most useful . . . to conserve the native social system, while ridding it of what was barbarous and degrading'.[25] Soon, three other wholly white universities—Pretoria, Stellenbosch and Witwatersrand—opened similar departments. Initially pitched as the science of human relations, anthropology in the post-war era became 'the science of man in the service of the state', concerned with finding the 'human laws of motion'.[26] As the prominent South African liberal intellectual J. D. Rheinallt Jones put it in his 1926 presidential address to the South African Association for the Advancement of Science, 'A definite responsibility rests upon scientific workers in the fields of anthropological and psychological research to collect the data from which general principles may be deduced to guide the country in the adoption of a sound policy in race relationships'.[27]

There is a broader context here, and to this we must briefly turn. The end of World War I led to the rise of what Mark Lamont calls 'a relatively new ideology and faith that social sciences could solve social problems.'[28] This development was encouraged by American philanthropic organisations, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, which were interested in fashioning the social sciences along the lines of the natural sciences. As social scientists turned to 'solving the world's many ills', topping their agenda was solving the 'world race problem'.[29]

As the post-war spirit of scientific enquiry transformed disciplines like anthropology, it also birthed new ones: international relations was one such. During the Paris Peace Conference, thirty-three men from the British and American delegations gathered at the city's Hotel Majestic on 30 May 1919. Called by Curtis, the meeting was summoned to 'prepare a scheme for the creation of an institute of international affairs'.[30] Two further meetings took

place (on 9 and 17 June) during which it was eventually decided that an Institute of International Affairs would be established with two branches— one in the United Kingdom and the other in the United States. This decision was founded on the resolve that 'national policy ought to be shaped by a conception of [international] society at large; for it was in the advancement of that universal interest that the particular interests of the several nations would be found'.[31] Infused with these goals, the institute was tasked to focus on the creation of 'scientific knowledge', which would serve as the midwife of peace.[32] Given the link between the desire for 'peace' and the purported power of 'scientific knowledge', it was no surprise that the first academic chair in International Relations had been inaugurated in the previous month at the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. This agitation of the discipline-in-the-making to establish its scientific credentials was formidable. So the constitution of the British (later Royal) Institute of International Relations stated that its mandate was to 'scientifically study' international affairs, and in the very first decade of its existence, conferences were organized that brought together similar institutions interested in 'the scientific study of international relations'.[33]

The discipline was imagined by its early pioneers as 'the crown, the summit, of general education',[34] as holding not only a 'natural superiority' over other social sciences but also making prior knowledge of other disciplines a condition of mastery of international affairs. In this search for a kind of disciplinary hierarchy, IR was to be the endpoint of the accumulation of knowledge about society. As for what its 'scientific methodology' would look like, Curtis's 'scientific method' adopted in his studies in South Africa in the 1900s and around the empire in the 1910s was to be the standard model.[35]

And here IR was conjoined with anthropology. As the idea of 'science' occupied a central epistemological space in knowledge production, both International Relations and anthropology came to identify closely with the 'science' of colonial administration.[36] In the South Africa of the 1920s, approaches to the 'applied' end of anthropology legitimised, among the liberal scholars, the idea of racial segregation. The urge to become the 'science of man' had driven anthropologists to eschew the often used historical method in favour of the functional method—the former traced the evolution of societies as civilisations; the latter considered societies as autonomous cultures that needed to be studied independently. As Alfred Radcliffe-Brown noted in an article published in the *South African Journal of Science*, the functional approach inductively formulated 'the general laws that underlie the phenomena of culture'.[37] The new approach of considering societies as relative absolutes (influenced strongly by the empiricist approach of Frans Boas[38]), rather than putting them on a single evolutionary civilisational scale, speeded the drift towards the adoption of segregationist policies. Indeed, this

approach was seen as more progressive than the Cape liberal assimilationist arguments that rested on the evolutionist belief in the natural superiority of white civilisation. The segregationist argument, theoretically at least, considered all cultures equal and distinct. As Saul Dubow has argued, in post–World War I South African liberal circles, '"Civilisation" was replaced by "culture", "progress" became synonymous with "differentiation", while individualism was subsumed into the collective interests of "racial groups"'.[39] Hence, conceptually a seemingly horizontal, rather than an outwardly vertical, understanding of 'culture' took hold that theorised segregation as a progressive philosophy. In the event, it was presented as a middle course between the 'repression' on offer by the Boer republics and the 'assimilation' of mid-Victorian Cape liberals.

Broadly speaking, however, there were two competing understandings of 'segregation' in South Africa amongst its leaders-in-waiting. One was a hard-nosed ideology, championed mainly by conservative Afrikaner leaders like J. B. M. Hertzog, the country's prime minister from 1924 to 1939. This advocated the abolition of the Cape Franchise and favoured the introduction of segregationist measures such as the 'white labour' policy and the imposition of an industrial colour bar that aimed to exclude Africans from certain job categories. This liberal position included incorporationist and 'protective' undertones of the ideology of trusteeship and was inclined more towards developing 'parallel institutions' of society and, indeed, government. This position was identified primarily with Jan Smuts, South Africa's most influential international figure in the interwar era.[40]

Smuts's position on trusteeship had a considerable impact on the emerging idea of the international. And, as we suggested in the second chapter, three of the most important people in fashioning the idea of trusteeship and mandates in the League of Nations were Lionel Curtis, Philip Kerr and Jan Smuts. Indeed, Curtis's 1918 article in the *Round Table*, titled 'Windows of Freedom', strongly influenced Smuts, who, in turn, had helped Kerr in drafting Articles 21 and 22 of the league's covenant. However benign they seemed, the ideas both of trusteeship and mandate masked forms of segregation that were hidden by the liberal veneer of evolutionism.

About the time when Curtis was writing 'Windows of Freedom', Kerr had impressed upon Curtis the need to educate Woodrow Wilson about his 'childlike faith in the virtues of democracy and laissez faire' with regard to, as he put it, the 'politically backward peoples'.[41] In Kerr's view 'the inhabitants of Africa and Asia had proved unable to govern themselves, not because they were inherently incapable of maintaining any kind of stable society, but because they are quite unable to withstand the demoralising influences to which they were subjected in some civilised countries'. As a result, the 'intervention of European power is necessary in order to protect them from

these influences and . . . [to ensure] . . . them the time and opportunity to establish a form of self-government which is strong enough to withstand these influences'.[42] Hence, it was important to keep any white influences away from Africans and to allow them to develop their own institutions under the protective eyes of the white man. In 1917, Smuts, too, had argued that the South African model of segregation worked best when dealing with Africans because it allowed them to develop on their own lines while ensuring racial purity of the white race. This was necessary to prevent the submerging of the 'civilising races . . . in the quicksand of African blood': it was, he argued further, 'a noble effort'.[43] Thus it was that the ideas of trusteeship, which would help to shape the course of international affairs, combined remarkably well with both segregationist and evolutionary ideas.

While anthropology saw the world primarily in terms of 'culture', International Relations emphasized two vectors of differentiation, nation and race. In anthropology the historicist approach emphasised the evolution towards an organic polity. Its burden of proof rested on the successful organic union of the United States in the eighteenth century, Canada in the nineteenth century and, importantly for our purposes, South Africa in the early twentieth century. But this approach towards the racial question led to fears about eventual non-European domination of settler societies and, perhaps, the world. Anthropology, with its focus on domestic societies, explored ways of integrating different cultures within these societies. International relations, with its outward eye, turned its application to finding ways to integrate different nations and races into an international society. For both disciplines, South Africa was to provide a model that integrated segregationist and evolutionary thinking.

After the war, Smuts's international standing helped to promote his understandings of paternalist 'segregation' amongst liberal British scholars. Lauded as an international statesman following his performance at the Paris Peace Conference, Smuts had emerged as the most influential voice in drawing the interracial and the international together in his 'holistic' understanding of the world.[44]

Organised under the theme "Some World Problems", Smuts delivered the 1929 Rhodes Memorial Lectures at Oxford University, which were broadcast nationwide by an increasingly influential BBC.[45] One of these lectures was titled 'Native Policy in Africa'. This was, perhaps, the longest exposition of his ideas on segregation. In it Smuts advocated the territorial and institutional separation of Europeans and non-Europeans within the same country, under the supervision of the Europeans. Drawing from the South African example, he positioned segregation as a global template, arguing that 'wherever Europeans and natives live in the same country it will mean separate parallel institutions for the two'.[46]

The African, Smuts patronisingly wrote, 'has largely remained a child type, with a child psychology and outlook',[47] and, he continued, 'no other race is so easily satisfied, so good tempered, so care-free'.[48] Consequently, 'a race so unique, and so different in its mentality and its cultures from those of Europe, requires a policy very unlike that which would suit Europeans'.[49] The native policy therefore ought not 'de-Africanise the African and . . . turn him into a beast of the field or into a pseudo-European'[50]—both these approaches had been tried in the past in South Africa and ended up being supremely harmful to the development of Africans. 'If Africa has to be redeemed, if Africa has to make her own contribution to the world, if Africa is to take her rightful place among the continents, we shall have to proceed on different lines and evolve a policy which will not force her institutions into an alien European mould, but which will preserve her unity with her own past, conserve what is precious in her past, and build her future progress and civilisation on specifically African foundations'.[51] 'Segregation' (or 'parallel development' or the development of 'separate institutions'), Smuts argued, was this policy. Crediting Cecil Rhodes with 'this new orientation of African policy', Smuts elaborated on the two main ideas of Rhodes's policy, which were first enunciated in the Glen Grey Act of 1894: 'white settlement . . . [to supply] . . . the steel framework and the stimulus for an enduring civilisation, and indigenous native institutions to express the specifically African character of the natives in their future development and civilisation'.[52] Through a policy of 'indirect rule'—another of the policy fetishes of the 1920s, which had been championed in Uganda and Nigeria by Lord Lugard[53]—Rhodes and Jan Hofmeyr developed a scheme that ensured territorial and institutional segregation but not economic segregation. The act had also secured for the mining industry its supply of labour, thereby serving the twin purposes of progress and racial separation in South Africa.[54]

After the policy had been practiced in the Cape for close to twenty-five years, Smuts extended it to the whole of South Africa through his native affairs legislation of 1920. But, the moral aspects aside, there was the fact that in South Africa, many Africans had become detribalised and, understandably, desired to participate in the fruits of European civilisation. In an ideal scenario where whites and blacks were totally separated, segregation might well work perfectly. All this meant that the issue of urbanised Africans was a complex one, especially with regard to their political and economic rights. Hence, he added, segregation ought to be the strategy of social engineering to solve not only the 'native problem' in South Africa but also its global corollary, what he called 'the world race problem'.[55]

What Smuts did not mention in the Rhodes Memorial Lectures—but had consistently argued since 1895—was the idea of creating a singular state from the Cape to Kenya, or what he called 'Greater South Africa'.

Primarily associated with Rhodes, the idea itself had obvious implications for wider British interests (and ambitions) in Africa. Indeed, even in *The Government of South Africa*, the Kindergarten had defined 'South Africa' as extending from 'Lake Tanganyika to the Cape of Good Hope', comprising 'eleven colonies and 8,000,000 inhabitants of which 1,100,000 would be white'.[56]

But these ambitions to create an organic union of the African Highlands (defined as the whole of Africa south of the equator except the Congo Basin and a narrow belt on the east coast[57]) received an early setback. In a referendum held in 1924, whites living in Southern Rhodesia voted against incorporation with the Union of South Africa. The *Round Table* noted that the English settlers in Southern Rhodesia were apprehensive about the new anti-British Hertzog government and viewed with concern the centralised nature of the Union's constitution. However, white settlers in Kenya, who had come to the point of rebellion against the imperial government in the early 1920s against the latter's efforts to do away with segregation, looked towards South Africa for support.[58] Smuts was more than sympathetic, supporting their cause at the Imperial Conference of 1923. Despite the Rhodesian setback, the prospect of a Greater South Africa, expanding along the lines of the United States, was not too far-fetched. Indeed, to a great extent Smuts and Hertzog had common views on an expanded union that would incorporate much of Africa south of the Sahara. They favoured 'an inverted Dixie line . . . drawn by international agreement, more or less along the tenth degree of south latitude, separating the Colour-bar States of White Africa to the south of it from the Colour-blind States of Black Africa to the north.'[59] Based on such a division, the 'European Africa', or the islands of whites', as Dane Kennedy calls the African settler states,[60] would comprise 'St. Paul de Loanda [Luanda], the Katanga, . . . Northern Rhodesia's copper belt, and all Mozambique to European Africa [already including South Africa and Southern Rhodesia], while Tanganyika, Kenya and Uganda would . . . presumably be called African Africa, because their capacity to bear a white population [was] so limited.'[61]

Smuts and his supporters continued to hope for a 'new Dominion' as an inevitable outcome of a need for a unified native policy.[62] As Patrick Duncan, now a close Smuts ally after World War I, stated in a note to Abe Bailey, 'In the view that I take of South Africa in the wider sense of the term (that is Africa south of the equator which is capable of European settlement) such a Greater Union is bound to come if the European peoples are able permanently to maintain themselves'.[63]

These ideas, the late historian John Cell argued in a comparative study of racial separation in the United States and South Africa, significantly informed British political thought on the race question, especially on the evolving

situation in southern and eastern Africa.[64] For eastern Africa, the policy of segregation was strongly shaped by Alfred Milner and Leo Amery, when each was colonial secretary, and Edward Grigg, as the governor of Kenya. All three were, of course, dedicated Round Tablers. South African 'expertise' on political rule also found ready takers—Grigg invited Richard Feetham, by now a leading judge in Transvaal, to survey the possibility of local government for Europeans in Kenya. He also wanted Patrick Duncan appointed to the Hilton Young Commission but was thwarted by the British cabinet. The commission was tasked to look into the possibilities of establishing a federation in East Africa. Its majority report, however, did not fully endorse Grigg and Amery's plans for a united white federation in East Africa. It only cautiously endorsed the 'closer union' of the white settler colonies in eastern Africa, importantly for the purposes of coordinating native policy.[65]

A South African union extending up to Kenya, however, continued to find strong support in the deliberations at Chatham House, especially in its Africa Group.[66] These hopes for expansion by colonial trusteeship reflected the Smutsian vision of global segregation and remained (in the opinion of many) as the most viable solution to the problem of the 'global colour line'.[67]

In chapter 3, we noted how at the turn of the twentieth century, deliberations of the Fortnightly Club drew from the American discourse on segregation to consider the local native problem. In the 1920s, South Africa had become an international model to be replicated, so much so that now American scholars visited South Africa to learn lessons.[68] Smuts visited the United States and Canada soon after delivering his Rhodes Memorial Lectures and repeatedly discussed the merits of the South African model.[69] In a grander fashion, Smuts's position on segregation provided ideational solutions to enthusiasts of the world federation movement. Greater South Africa provided a template for integrating larger multicultural regions that otherwise lacked a common national feeling. In the pre-war era, a dominant stream of the Anglo-Saxon political thought on larger political formations emphasised racial homogeneity as a crucial element of political progress. The prospect of heterogeneity was increasingly linked to the idea of 'race suicide' and the eventual domination of a 'mongrel race'.[70] Smuts's segregation presented a way to not only soothe white anxieties about 'race suicide' but to also develop a system that preserved white privilege.

THE MISSION THAT 'VERY NEARLY FAILED'

As Smuts elaborated on these segregation-centred visions for the emerging idea of the international, Chatham House provided analytical and institutional

cushioning for a world in flux. The secretary of the African Study Group was former Kindergarten member Hugh Wyndham, who had permanently left South Africa in 1923, disillusioned and believing that the increasingly Afrikaner-dominated country had been 'lost' for the British Empire.[71] In May 1925, he had presented a paper at Chatham House titled 'Colour Problem in Africa', which had argued that different colonial nations advocated different solutions to the problem. France's model in its North African colonies was, prominently, one of *la politique d'assimilation* (or assimilation of the lower culture into the higher culture); the Portuguese followed a policy of 'miscegenation' with a view towards ensuring a cohesive settlement through interracial marriages. Wyndham contrasted these two approaches with the model of 'co-optation', or *la politique d'association*, practiced in South Africa, which was based on the 'mutual toleration of two populations and co-operation in economic development'.[72] He pointed that this approach was often misrepresented by the term 'segregation'. According to him, co-optation allowed for the development of separate 'native areas' and encouraged 'natives' to work for the Europeans outside these 'areas'.[73]

Beyond this, however, Wyndham was pushing for the Africa-wide implementation of the South African solution to the colour problem. To do so successfully would require a system of public administration, and this would, in turn, require training and education. He recommended the creation of (what was called) a School of African Culture for the training of administrators of an African Civil Service. The 'school' would use anthropological knowledge about African societies to train administrators. The experience and knowledge gained through their fieldwork as part of the training would also be useful for others.[74] Wyndham proposed Cape Town as the most convenient place for such a facility and suggested further that a common African lingua franca 'must be evolved to serve as the medium of African culture'.[75]

A similar establishment, the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, based in London, was formed the same year.[76] However, its particular interest was restricted to 'scientifically' studying African languages and cultures, and it promoted the functional view of anthropology. Wyndham's proposal for the training of a common civil service remained unfulfilled. In his 1926 Rhodes Memorial Lectures, Smuts had proposed something along these lines, too—that is, an institute to study native policy—and he, along with Philip Kerr, had proceeded to the United States soon after to garner funds for such an institute to be set up at Oxford. Ironically, however, Smuts's close ties to this project sabotaged it. The American funders considered it unadvisable to have the South African doctrine of segregation propagated in a school of African studies, even one located in Oxford.[77]

So—to return to Carruthers Beattie's proposal to Chatham House—there was both a sense of excitement and not a little surprise when his letter was read in 10 St James Square. In the mythology of Milner's Kindergarten, which had founded Chatham House and directed its affairs, the Union of South Africa was indeed the group's single greatest achievement. However, as we have seen, as the Kindergarten moved on to planning an imperial union through formation of the Round Table Societies, its bonds with the country had weakened. Considering all this, Carruthers Beattie's letter to Chatham House warmed the hearts of Hugh Wyndham and Lionel Curtis. The former expressed the hope that some degree of cooperation would be found between the association in South Africa and the African Study Group. The latter reported that he had conversations with some South African members of Chatham House about starting a branch in South Africa especially for the study of African problems mainly on the colour question.[78]

Notwithstanding this initial excitement, the resulting conversation reached a dead end. The association with Chatham House that Carruthers Beattie had envisioned never took shape—the reasons for this are not altogether clear, and neither Carruthers Beattie's nor Chatham House's archives tell the full story. What is plain, however, is that Chatham House contacted some other South Africa–based liberal academics, including S. H. Frankel, J. D. Rheinallt Jones, and J. J. Rousseau, hoping that something might develop. Rheinallt Jones and Frankel were initially keen to start a branch of the Chatham House in South Africa, but, again, nothing came to fruition.[79] Meanwhile, under the nominal directorship of Rheinallt Jones, the South African Institute of Race Relations was founded in 1929 in Johannesburg. It was to draw most South African liberals together under the banner of conducting 'scientific' studies of issues related to native policy. This effectively buried the Chatham House initiative to study the same issue.

Nevertheless, the possibility of establishing an organisation along the lines of Chatham House was reignited in 1930, when a London-born historian at the University of Cape Town, Eric A. Walker (1886–1976), visited England. A pioneer of the 'tradition of scientific history',[80] Walker wrote numerous books on South African history, including two fine biographies of John Henry de Villiers and W. P. Schreiner; he was also a proponent of the 'frontier thesis' in South African history.[81] Closely associated with the Chatham House and the Round Table Movement, he had attended meetings of the African Study Group and contributed anonymous articles to the *Round Table*. Importantly for the present purposes, Walker was close to Smuts.[82] During Walker's visit to London, Ivison Macadam, the secretary of Chatham House, had approached Walker with the proposal of opening a branch of Chatham

House in South Africa. Walker, Macadam noted in a letter to the Graham-stown academic J. J. Rousseau, was 'prepared to cooperate'.[83]

Commonwealth-wide concerns also promised to speed things along. Following a suggestion made to the 1929 Kyoto IPR Conference that questions affecting the relations between the members of the British Commonwealth should be studied at an unofficial conference, Chatham House planned to organise such a gathering. One of its aims would be to open affiliates or branches of Chatham House in New Zealand, South Africa and India. Canada (1928) and Australia (1931) had opened their respective Institutes of International Relations, which were both affiliated with Chatham House. To prepare for the Chatham House conference, a preparatory committee was established in London in 1932. Walker was invited but was unable to travel to London. He asked the South African–born Montagu Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics, Charles Manning, to attend for him. The meeting resolved to invite delegations from Dominion countries to Toronto in September 1933. Manning was tasked with organising a South African delegation and travelled to the country for the purpose of identifying suitable candidates.

In the event, the initiative was received with little enthusiasm in South Africa. Manning wrote later that Walker had 'endorsed the universal view that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to interest anybody in anything except the Gold Standard'.[84] He even visited Pretoria to assure the prime minister, General Hertzog, that 'there was nothing sinister in what was projected'. He also met with liberals—like Rheinallt Jones and Frankel—to 'plead for . . . the early creation of a South African Institute of International Affairs; to prepare, in particular, for Toronto 1933'.[85]

In March 1932, Frankel, who headed the Department of Economics at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg, had read a paper at Chatham House. In it he strongly criticised the racial policy in the country, arguing that segregation had created a monopolistic economy in which a few whites enjoyed high standards of living, while poor whites and 'natives' were deprived of any chance of development.[86] In this early exposition of free market principles, Frankel argued that arbitrary restrictions imposed on the market by segregation laws, which were protectionist for white workers and inhibitive for black labour, should be revoked. He concluded that 'South Africa must begin the construction of a State which is at least economically united'.[87] On the proposal of the Toronto conference and the establishment of an institute, Frankel 'was charged', Manning noted. But his enthusiasm alone was not sufficient to ensure that a delegation went to Toronto since there was no funding. Manning returned to Britain 'knowing that my self-imposed mission had totally, or very nearly, failed'.[88] But, as we will now see, all was not lost.

REVIVAL

In July 1933, the New York–based Carnegie Corporation told Chatham House that it would give £400 per delegation to enable them to participate in the Toronto conference. This brightened the chances for South African participation, and on hearing the news Walker quickly formed a South African delegation headed by the Afrikaner Cape liberal politician Senator F. S. Malan. Two other members of the delegation were members of Parliament: L. F. Reynolds (a former private secretary to Smuts) and Colonel S. F. Stallard (later leader of the Dominion Party). A. L. Geyer (editor of *Die Burger*, the official mouthpiece of the National Party led by General Hertzog) was in the delegation too. Eric Walker was to be the final delegate.

During the discussions in Toronto on opening new institutes in the Dominions, Malan asserted that there was 'a lack of people with sufficient leisure to undertake the formation of an African Institute of International Affairs'.[89] Furthermore, he pointed out that the great distance between possible centres of interest in South Africa would cause great difficulty. However, he favoured opening an institute that would be affiliated with Chatham House in South Africa and 'hoped that the better educated young men and women and established university circles would take the matter up'.[90] It is clear that the South African delegation was equivocal about the nature of the institute to be opened. While Walker was more in favour of opening a branch of the Royal Institute, other members were keener for a more autonomous institute on the lines of Australia and Canada rather than one that acted as a subordinate body of Chatham House.[91]

Six months after the Toronto gathering, Chatham House wrote officially to both Malan and Walker telling them of the decision to seek the 'establishment in each Dominion of a scientific and non-political organisation', each of which would serve as a branch of the Royal Institute.[92] In order to be affiliated, the branch would have to abide by two fundamental requirements: memberships must be confined to British subjects, and the institute must not express an opinion on any aspect of international affairs.

Written by Campbell Stuart, chairman of the Imperial Committee at Chatham House, the letter expressed a keen interest in opening a branch in South Africa and noted that previous efforts had not borne much fruit. He hoped, however, that Malan and Walker would consider taking up the issue again, informing them that seventeen members of Chatham House were resident in South Africa—their assistance in the project could be called upon.[93]

Soon thereafter, members of the Toronto delegation invited members of both the houses of Parliament, the staffs of the Universities of Cape Town and Stellenbosch, and the editorial staffs of the leading Cape Town newspapers to a meeting on 12 May 1934 to formally consider the formation of

a South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA). The meeting was held at the Senate House of Parliament and attended by a gathering of more than sixty people. Malan took the chair, with Walker acting as the secretary for the meeting. Interestingly, it was former Kindergarten member and close friend of Curtis Patrick Duncan who moved the resolution for establishment of the South African Institute of International Affairs. Seconded by Reynolds, the resolution was unanimously carried. Soon a provisional executive committee was selected. University of Cape Town vice chancellor John Carruthers Beattie was elected chairman, while Malan and R. W. Wilocks (the Stellenbosch-based professor of logic and psychology who also mentored the architect of apartheid, H. F. Verwoerd[94]) were appointed as the vice presidents. Eric Emmett, who taught international law at UCT, and T. E. Donges, the London-educated lawyer who later became a prominent National Party politician,[95] were appointed joint secretaries. Fourteen more members were elected to the executive council, which included Walker, Geyer, Stallard, Rheinallt Jones, Reynolds, Jan Hofmeyr (former vice chancellor of the University of Witwatersrand and the minister for education, interior and public health), B. K. Long (former editor of *The State* and then serving editor of the prominent liberal paper *Cape Times*), C. R. Swart (who would later serve as the state president from 1961 to 1967), E. F. W. Gey van Pittius (the University of Pretoria professor of public administration and political science), D. F. Malherbe (the Afrikaans novelist), Leif Egeland (later ambassador to Norway and thereafter high commissioner to London and still later the national chairman of SAIIA from 1959 to 1980), Hendrik VerLoren van Themaat (a legal scholar at the University of Stellenbosch), J. N. van der Merwe (the inaugural 'special lecturer in geography' at the Potchefstroom College of Education) and J. Ewing (UNKNOWN). A fortnight later the next meeting was held in the National Mutual Building, Church Square, Cape Town. This meeting discussed the constitution of the institute and approved a draft constitution, which liberally borrowed from the Canadian institute.

The constitution invested in the Executive Council the powers to appoint two qualified persons 'resident in or in the vicinity of any other town or educational centre in South Africa' to establish a branch of the institute—this set the direction of the country-wide structure,[96] not unlike the Canadian institute. However, in consideration of the sparse (white) population of South Africa, a minimum of five affiliated members could set up a fully fledged branch.[97]

However, there were two significant differences from the Canadian institute: first, the South African constitution proposed restricting membership to 'Union nationals and other British subjects'. The Executive Council reserved the power to admit members who were neither union nationals nor British

subjects. Indeed, one such member had already been admitted: the Stellenbosch professor VerLoren van Themaat, who was a Dutch national and indeed a former mayor of two different towns in his home country.[98] The issue of eligibility for membership was to haunt the institute in its early years, as we shall presently discover.

Second, two tiers of membership were proposed—affiliated members, who paid an annual subscription fee equivalent to that of the Canadian and Australian institutes (i.e., £2.2), and ordinary members, who were required to pay an annual fee of £1.1. The difference was that half of the subscription of the affiliated members went to Chatham House, and they enjoyed some benefits, such as receiving Chatham House publications. There was also to be a membership category for students who paid 10 shillings, 6 pence yearly but were not regarded as full members of the institute.[99]

Chatham House faced a quandary, however, with regard to the membership rules of the SAIIA. This was because its own bylaws required that its membership be restricted to British subjects only, and since members of its affiliate institutes also automatically gained the privileges amounting to the membership of Chatham House, there was clearly a conflict with the proposed South African structure. Chatham House's solicitor advised that the affiliation of SAIIA would be within legal bounds only if there was an autonomous institute with which Chatham House 'cooperated' that was not considered a branch.[100] A further complication was that among the publications available to the members was the *Report on Foreign Affairs of the Empire Parliamentary Association*, but this was a confidential document to be circulated only among British subjects.[101] Perhaps the most important consideration, however, was that the Royal Institute had received funding from Abe Bailey's trust on the condition that the institute's membership was limited to British subjects. Ironically, then, it was the conditionality of funding from a South African mining magnate that denied branch status to the South African institute.

There were three possible procedures available to Chatham House on the question of the South African request: to reject affiliation and seek cooperation; to devise some formula for partial affiliation where Chatham House would recognise only British subjects of SAIIA as affiliated; and to ask SAIIA to devise some arrangement. For now, Chatham House decided on the third.[102] The secretary of Chatham House also asked Campbell Stuart, who was embarking on a visit to South Africa, to discuss the matter with the embryonic institute.[103] This he did, but Malan and several others were not available to meet him. On returning to London, Stuart advised that Rodrick Jones and Lionel Curtis—who were scheduled to visit South Africa in February 1935 to participate in the fifth Imperial

Press Conference—should be invited to consult with the South Africans, and until this happened, no further action should be taken with regard to the affiliation with SAIIA.[104]

Campbell Stuart then wrote separate letters to Curtis and Jones apprising them of the situation in South Africa. He acknowledged that it was a considerably difficult matter to settle, especially because 'the offending clause had been written into the Constitution . . . and . . . a foreigner . . . [had been] elected to the Council'. He added, 'I was anxious at all costs to avoid a breach when I was there, particularly as no one wants to see a separate Dutch South African Institute set up'. He informed them that Carruthers Beattie was 'strongly' in support of the affiliation, Malan took 'a like view', Emmett was 'entirely' supportive, Walker was 'more than helpful', and the two other liberals, Jan Hofmeyr and B. K. Long 'will, of course do what they can'. The Afrikaner members, he suggested, were opposed—the biggest opposition, Campbell Stuart felt, would come from T. E. Donges, who was absent from Cape Town during this visit. Campbell Stuart also held long talks and 'made some headway' with A. L. Geyer, the *Die Burger* editor. Campbell Stuart was of the view that Geyer was strongly influenced by Eric Walker and was amenable to changing his opinion after 'a good deal of persuading'.[105]

It is clear, then, that there were two strong factions within the institute's executive: English liberal and Afrikaner nationalist. In a meeting with Escott Reid, the secretary of the Canadian institute, E. F. W. Gey van Pittius, who was on the South African institute's executive committee, said that the Afrikaners were hesitant to seek 'affiliation' with Chatham House since it connoted 'the relationship between an inferior and a superior body'. He told Reid that Afrikaners would secede from the institute if it was aligned with Chatham House on a superior-inferior basis. Suspecting that the South African institute was 'an instrument of imperialist intrigue', he argued that Afrikaner members of the executive 'were never consulted in advance and have been given no opportunity to approve the constitution'. They would only approve a constitution that restricted the membership of the institute to only South Africans (which would also include Germans in former South-West Africa, who were not British subjects but had come to enjoy South African citizenship after World War I). If this demand was not accepted, the Afrikaners would launch a separate institute, which would seek membership in the International Studies Conference.[106]

Curtis asked Walker to arrange a meeting of the executive committee,[107] and with Rodrick Jones, he met eight members of the provisional executive committee on 7 February 1935. Carruthers Beattie, Malan, Walker, Emmet, Stallard, Egeland, and Reynolds gathered in the Senate Hall to discuss these matters with the two British visitors. This was an innocuous gathering

because all of them (except Malan, who was 'diplomatically undecided') supported the idea of keeping the membership restricted to British subjects.

Curtis's position on the South African quandary was overshadowed by his hopes for the discipline-in-the-making, i.e. IR. In 1919, he had argued that 'any attempt to study international affairs at meetings which were open to aliens would end in futility'. Underpinning this was the view that a 'country which committed itself to the policy of admitting foreigners to its discussions from the very outset would not get far with the genuine study of those problems.' This principle, Curtis argued, was central to Chatham House's becoming, and being recognised as, 'a place of genuine research', and SAIIA would be able to emulate Chatham House only if it kept its membership restricted.[108]

After waiting for half an hour for Geyer—one of those supporting admitting 'aliens', Walker went out to get him but instead brought in T. E. Donges, the principal opponent of the 'British subjects' clause. But citing other engagements, Donges left the meeting early before a vote was taken. With the only possible opposition absent, the remaining members of the meeting were sympathetic to keeping the membership of the SAIIA restricted to British subjects. However, in order to reach a middle ground with their opponents, they agreed that it would be better to confine the membership to South African nationals. All South African nationals were ipso facto British subjects; however, newly arrived British immigrants were not South African citizens. Malan, the only Afrikaner and the most reluctant of the assembled, strongly supported this proposition, and it was unanimously agreed to include it in the constitution.[109] The meeting ended on a hopeful note. Two nights later, its first event was organised, a lecture by Jan Smuts, which was read by Patrick Duncan as Smuts had fallen ill.

Soon, however, the problem of membership was eclipsed by one of inactivity. While eight branches were envisioned, only four were practically possible: Cape Town, Pretoria, Johannesburg and Stellenbosch. The thinking behind the branches was that interest could be kindled within the universities, but Pretoria and Stellenbosch, which were Afrikaans-language universities, showed little interest. In Johannesburg, the University of Witwatersrand was more English and liberally inclined. However, its success was uncertain. This is because the liberal academics, such as E. H. Brookes, J. D. Rheinallt Jones and R. F. A. Hoernle, were engaged with the development of the South African Institute of Race Relations. On 18 May 1935, Emmett reported to Campbell Stuart that the Cape Town branch alone had elected its representatives, and other proposed centres had not even completed their organisation. Somewhat dejected, Emmett wrote, 'We are finding it difficult to kindle the necessary enthusiasm and frankly it looks to me as though the very existence of the Institute is hanging in the balance'.[110]

Worried about this situation, Chatham House wrote to Patrick Duncan, then returning home from a tour of England,[111] and Hessel Duncan Hall, the Australian historian of the Commonwealth who was visiting South Africa to explore ways of rejuvenating the institute. Prompted by 'English friends', Jan Smuts enquired about the delay and argued that 'it would be a great pity if the South African Institute should not be affiliated, and all the good work that has been done jeopardised'.[112]

Duncan Hall did meet with members of the groups in Pretoria and Johannesburg but found them to be 'vague and occupied with other things'.[113] 'The Pretoria people were waiting on the Cape and blamed the Cape for not getting on with the job', he wrote. Similarly, at the University of Witwatersrand, 'the Institute group got some fifteen people together', and he talked to them about 'the necessity of getting on with the formation of a group as a matter of national concern', but they too seemed 'absorbed in other things'.[114] While they showed keen interest on matters of foreign policy, 'this interest does not seem to translate itself into a keen desire to have an institute'. He felt that none of these were 'real obstacles' and all that was needed was someone like Emmett to travel through the country to rope these groups together.[115]

The real problem in South Africa, he wrote in another letter to Macadam, was 'limited personnel and the fact that it is far dispersed'. 'The Rand is nearly as far from Cape Town as London from Constantinople! Emmett could probably fix things up if he could travel round to the three other centres but that is not easy for him'.[116] Duncan Hall concurred with Walker and Emmett that 'the only thing is for the Cape to go ahead and form their own branch and adopt a provisional constitution'.[117] Emmett also wrote to Chatham House in the same vein that the 'Cape Town unit is temporarily at any rate the Institute' and there was 'sheer inertia outside Cape Town'.[118] Similarly, Carruthers Beattie found Pretoria, Stellenbosch, and Johannesburg 'difficult and apathetic'.[119]

Given the lack of enthusiasm, the Cape Town branch went ahead and converted itself into the South African Institute of International Affairs on 13 December 1935.[120] For the first few years, it functioned from a temporary room in the offices of the *Cape Argus*, a daily newspaper. Letters that passed between Emmett and Chatham House in early 1936 indicate that the Cape Town members had decided that membership would be restricted to South African nationals. However, the archives at Chatham House are not clear as to what actually happened with regard to the membership issue in the constitution that was adopted on 6 May 1936. We are certain that the emergency powers of the executive committee to appoint non-British subjects were scrapped, but whether the membership was restricted to only 'Union nationals' or 'other British subjects' were also allowed is a matter that still needs

clarity.[121] Unfortunately, we have been unable to access the archives of the SAIIA and have no real information on this issue.

In the first few years, the institute was largely inactive—discussion meetings were organised occasionally. The finances of the institute were also very limited. In June 1936, for example, the institute had only £16 in hand.[122] It did, however, send a delegation to the second unofficial British Commonwealth Relations Conference held in Sydney in 1938. This delegation was led by Pieter V. G. van der Byl, a member of Parliament from Smuts's United Party. Gys Hofmeyr (a former administrator of South-West Africa), C. F. Stallard, A. L. Geyer, R. F. A. Hoernle and S. H. Frankel were the other members. Just as the 1933 conference had stimulated the formation of SAIIA, the 1938 conference galvanised the formation of two more branches of the South African institute—Durban and Johannesburg— in June 1939. During World War II, most of the branches did no work, but towards the conflict's end the institute was reinvigorated, mostly due to a donation from the mining magnet and politician Harry Oppenheimer. In September 1944, an amended constitution was adopted, and the central offices of the institute were moved to Johannesburg with a full-time secretariat. Major Louis Kraft, an intelligence officer in the Union Defence Forces, was released from government service to take up the position of general secretary of the institute.

We have made a long trek in this chapter, from the Kindergarten leaving South Africa in 1909 to the South African Institute of International Affairs finally standing on its own legs in 1944. In between we have touched on several themes that need threading.

First, how does one think about international relations in South Africa, a country that was a global pariah from 1948 until the ending of apartheid? The fact is that there is a pre-1948 history of a segregationist South Africa that was indeed lauded as a model country from which others could learn with regard to the 'native question'.

Second, the institutional history of IR in South Africa is very much symptomatic of the politics of the country. The SAIIA, opened in 1934, was the result of a need to understand how the 'native problem' was understood elsewhere. The prominent international question for the country at the southern tip of the African continent, quite distant from the military rivalries of Europe, was about race, not war.

Third, the failure of the SAIIA to generate much traction in the country in the first few years relates to the fact that its thunder had been stolen by another institute, the South African Institute of Race Relations. It was only during World War II, when the questions of war and peace became important, that the SAIIA was able to muster funds and energy.

And finally, the fact that SAIIA and the rules of its conduct were bitterly opposed by Afrikaners very well demonstrates that there existed two understandings of international relations in the country. The empire project of the SAIIA was bitterly resented by the Afrikaner elite, who were interested in charting out a more autonomous policy footprint for South Africa and the world.

NOTES

1. John McCogan, "Implementing the 1921 Treaty: Lionel Curtis and Constitutional Practice," *Irish Historical Studies* 20, no. 79 (1977): 312–33.

2. Deborah Lavin, *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1995), 159.

3. Philip Kerr and Lionel Curtis, *The Prevention of War* (New Haven, CT: Institute of Politics and Yale University Press, 1923).

4. Kerr and Curtis, *The Prevention of War.*

5. Kerr and Curtis, *The Prevention of War.*

6. Philip Kerr, "From Empire to Commonwealth," *Foreign Affairs* 1, no. 2 (1922): 98.

7. Kerr and Curtis, *The Prevention of War.*

8. "S. A. Atkinson to Lionel Curtis," 10 May 1912, MSS. Eng. Hist. 777, Papers of the Round Table, Bodleian Libraries, Oxford University, f. 68. Emphasis added.

9. Leonard Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa, 1902–1910* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1960).

10. See "Hugh Wyndham to R. Coupland," 7 March 1918, MS. Eng. Hist. c, 802, f. 136–39. Later in 1936, an article was published in the *Round Table* that was curiously credited to the South African Round Table Society. See South African Round Table Group, "Native Policy in South Africa," *Round Table* 26, no. 103 (1936): 528–45.

11. Walter Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men: The "Kindergarten" in Edwardian Imperial Affairs* (London: Hodder and Stoughten, 1968), 18–19.

12. Kent Fedorovich, "The Weak Link in the Imperial Chain: South Africa, the Round Table and World War One," in *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy*, ed. Andrea Bosco and Alex May (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997), 153.

13. See "Feetham to Curtis," 26 March 1914, MS. Eng. Hist. c. 779, f. 15–17.

14. John Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement and Imperial Union* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975); Andrea Bosco, *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire (1909–1919)* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017); Andrea Bosco and Alexander C. May, eds., *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997).

15. Kendle, *The Roundtable Movement*; Bosco, *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire*; May, *The Round Table*; Lavin, *From*

Empire; Andrea Bosco and Alexander C. May, eds., *The Round Table: The Empire/ Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997).

16. Inderjeet Parmar, *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of the Role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939–1945* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2004).

17. "Letter from J. C. Beattie to the Director, RIIA," 30 January 1928, Folder 3/6—SOUa, Chatham House Archives, London.

18. Round Table, "Honolulu," *Round Table* 18, no. 69 (1927): 93.

19. "Letter from J. C. Beattie to the Director, RIIA," 30 January 1928.

20. Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relation*s (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Patricia Owens, "Women and the History of International Thought," *International Studies Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2018): 461–81.

21. Paul Rich, "The South African Institute on Race Relations and the Debate on "Race Relations, 1929–1958," *African Studies* 40, no. 1 (1981): 14.

22. Sol. T. Plaatje, *Native Life in South Africa* (London: P. S. King, 1916).

23. Alfred R. Radcliffe Brown, "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology," *South African Journal of Science* 20 (October 1923): 124–27.

24. Robert Gordon, "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa," *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1990): 16. See also Paul Rich, *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism* (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984); Adam Kuper, "The Academic Frontier," *African Studies* 56, no. 2 (1997): 69–84.

25. Jan Smuts, *Plans for a Better World* (London: Hodder and Stoughtan, 1940), 45.

26. See J. L. Myers, "Presidential Address: The Science of Man in the Service of the State," *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 59 (January–June 1929): 19–52.

27. John D. Rheinallt Jones, "The Need for a Scientific Basis for South African Native Policy," *South African Journal of Science* 23 (1926): 91.

28. Mark Lamont, "Malinowski and the 'Native Question,'" in *Anthropologists and Their Traditions across National Borders*, ed. Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 8:74.

29. Lamont, "Malinowski," 74.

30. "Minute of a Meeting at the Hotel Majestic on Friday, May 30, 1919, to Consider a Project for Forming an Institute of International Affairs," Folder 2 (1)— Foundation of RIIA, Paris 1919, Chatham House Archives, London.

31. "Minute of a Meeting at the Hotel Majestic on Friday, May 30, 1919."

32. Stephen King-Hall, *Chatham House: A Brief Account of the Origins, Purposes and Methods of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1937).

33. The first of these conferences was organised in Berlin in 1928; later generically called the International Studies Conferences, they continued well into the 1950s.

34. Report of RIIA, "The Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations," *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* 8, no. 3 (1929): 185–202. For Zimmern's remarks, see pp. 200–202 in this article.

35. Vineet Thakur, Alexander Davis, and Peter Vale, "Imperial Mission, Scientific Method: An Alternative Account of the Origins of IR," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 46, no. 1 (2017).

36. For a close link between anthropology and IR theories, see A. B. Sampson, "Tropical Anarchy: Waltz, Wendt, and the Way We Imagine International Politics," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27, no. 4 (2002): 429–57.

37. Radcliffe Brown, "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology," 124–27. The need for the study of races was important for a number of both national and international reasons. First, the South African eugenicist J. L. Duerden had highlighted the English eugenicist Karl Pearson's assertion that 'the war was lost [by Germany] because a nation of professed thinkers had studied all sciences, but had omitted to study aptly the science of man'. Application of the science of man in South Africa would mean implementing eugenics-based immigration policies that made sure efficient whites were invited.

38. Franz Boas, *Race, Language, and Culture* (London: Macmillan, 1940).

39. Saul Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology," in *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, ed. William Beinart and Saul Dubow (London: Routledge, 1995), 32.

40. Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology," 43–44.

41. "Kerr to Curtis," 15 October 1918, in *Annals of the Lothian Foundation* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1992), 1:383.

42. "Kerr to Curtis," 15 October 1918, 383.

43. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 15–30.

44. As the 1929 presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Society described the moment, it was 'not for want of will, but of thought'; and the 'remedy was in the application of thought and common sense to affairs; of scientific method and results to administration, as well as products and exchange; and most of all to international and inter-racial affairs'. Smuts weaved the international and interracial as parts of his holistic understanding of the world (Myers, "Presidential Address," 48).

45. Jan Smuts, *Africa and Some World Problems* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1930). See also Helen Tilley, *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870–1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 71.

46. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 48.

47. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 37.

48. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 37.

49. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 38.

50. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 38.

51. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 39.

52. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 40.

53. Frederick Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa.* 5th ed. (London: Frank Cass, 1965).

54. Smuts, *Plans for a Better World*, 40.

55. Lamont, "Malinowski."

56. Lionel Curtis, *The Government of South Africa* (South Africa: Central News Agency, 1908), 1:3.

57. Round Table, "The New Problem of Africa," *Round Table* 17, no. 67 (1927): 447–72.

58. See Robert Gregory, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations within the British Empire, 1890–1939*, (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1971), ch. 7; Christopher P. Youe, "The Threat of Settler Rebellion and the Imperial Predicament: The Denial of Indian Rights in Kenya, 1923," *Canadian Journal of History* 12, no. 3 (1978): 347–60.

59. See Round Table, "Africa from the South," *Round Table* 21, no. 81 (1930): 126.

60. Dane Kennedy, *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Rhodesia, 1890–1939* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987).

61. Round Table, "Africa from the South," 126.

62. Round Table, "The New Problem of Africa," 457.

63. "Note from Patrick Duncan on Various Questions Affecting South Africa," 12 September 1932, BC294–A54.4.1, Patrick Duncan Papers, UCT Libraries, Cape Town.

64. John W. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); John Cell, "Lord Hailey and the Making of African Survey," *African Affairs* 88, no. 353 (1989): 481–505.

65. See J. H. Oldham, "Report of the Commission of the Closer Union of the Eastern and Central African Dependencies," *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* 8, no. 3 (1929): 227–59. Oldham also published a response to Smuts's Rhodes lectures where he argued that the South African precedent was quite incompatible with the British mandate in eastern Africa. See J. H. Oldham, *White and Black in Africa: A Critical Examination of the Rhodes Lectures of General Smuts* (London: Longmans, Green, 1930). See also Cell, "Lord Hailey," 488.

66. Even South African liberals were sceptical of creating a common state but agreed that 'a broad policy of Native development should be a joint policy," and "an unrestricted Customs Union with extension to the North as far as possible should be accepted as a cardinal point in policy.' See W. H. Ramsbottom, "South Africa and the North," in E. H. Brooks et al., *Coming of Age: Studies in South African Citizenship and Politics* (Cape Town: Maskew Miller Ltd., 1930), 110–28.

67. See Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei: The Commonwealth of God* (London: Macmillan, 1938).

68. Raymond Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa* (New York: Macmillan, 1928). For details, see Vitalis, *White World Order*, 56–57.

69. On Smuts's American visit, see Robert Edgar and Myra Ann Houser, "'The Most Patient of Animals, Next to the Ass:' Jan Smuts, Howard University, and African American Leadership, 1930," *Safundi* 18, no. 1 (2017): 29–51.

70. Edward A. Ross, "The Causes of Race Superiority," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 18, no. 1 (1901): 67–89. See also Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

2008); On 'Mongrel Race', see Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race: Or, the Racial Basis of European History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916).

71. Ian Van der Baag, "Hugh Archibald Wyndham: His Life and Times in South Africa, 1901–1923" (PhD diss., University of Cape Town, 2005).

72. Hugh Wyndham, "The Colour Problem in Africa," *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* 4, no. 4 (1925): 182.

73. Wyndham, "The Colour Problem," 183–84.

74. Wyndham, "The Colour Problem," 177.

75. Wyndham, "The Colour Problem," 177.

76. Cell, "Lord Hailey," 482–83.

77. Cell, "Lord Hailey," 486–88.

78. "Ivison Macadam to JC Beattie," 19 March 1928, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

79. "Extract from Letter from S. Herbert Frankel," December 1928, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

80. M. J. Lacey, "Eric Walker (1887–1976)," *Kleio* 8, no. 1 (1976): 8.

81. He argued that segregation in South Africa draws its origins from the conflict between blacks and whites on the frontier regions in the nineteenth century, which was then imported into the interior and institutionalised in the constitutions of the two Boer republics. For critique of the frontier thesis, see Dubow, "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology."

82. Smuts had in fact written the letter of recommendation for Walker when the latter applied for the Beit Chair in Colonial History at Oxford in 1920. See "Smuts to the Electors, Beit Chair of Colonial History, Oxford," 7 July 1920, Eric Walker Papers, University of Cape Town Archives, Cape Town.

83. "Ivison Macadam to J. J. Rousseau," 12 January 1931.

84. During the Great Depression, the South African government abandoned the gold standard in 1932.

85. Charles Manning's letter to Leif Egeland is quoted at length in A. L. Bostock, *A Short History of the South African Institute of International Affairs, 1934–1984* (Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs, 1984).

86. After championing segregation for most of the 1920s, South African liberal academics from the late 1920s had begun to problematise it. Edgar Brooks, James Henderson, R. F. A. Hoernle and Rheinallt Jones had visited the United States by 1930 and been impressed by the Tuskegee model, which had allowed for the creation of a Westernised urban black elite as part of a common industrialised society. See Paul Rich, "Race, Science and the Legitimisation of White Supremacy in South Africa, 1902–1940," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 23, no. 4 (1990): 683. See also S. Herbert Frankel and Edgar H. Brooks, "Problems of Economic Inequality: The Poor White and the Native," in *Coming of Age: Studies in South African Citizenship and Politics*, ed. Edgar H. Brooks et al. (Cape Town: Maskew Miller Ltd., 1930), 129–82. Such views appeared even in the pages of the *Round Table,* albeit through an unknown black writer. See A Native Pen "The South African Native's Point of View," *Round Table* 19, no. 76 (1929): 783–89.

87. S. Herbert Frankel, "Economic and Racial Problems of South Africa," *International Affairs* 11, no. 3 (1932): 386. Frankel later also attended the founding meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947.

88. Charles Manning's letter to Leif Egeland is quoted at length in Bostock, *A Short History*, 15.

89. "Meeting on Institutes of International Affairs, First Meeting, Ref. No. T89/20th/140, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, British Commonwealth Relations Conference Toronto, September 11th–21st, 1933," Folder 7/1/1e, Chatham House Archives, London, 9.

90. "Meeting on Institutes of International Affairs, First Meeting, Ref. No. T89/20th/140," 9.

91. "Memorandum, 11 October 1933."

92. "Campbell Stuart to Eric Walker," 7 March 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

93. "Campbell Stuart to Eric Walker," 7 March 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

94. See Mohamed Seedat and Sarah MacKenzie, "The Triangulated Development of South African Psychology: Race, Scientific Racism and Professionalism," in *Interiors: A History of Psychology in Southern Africa*, ed. Clifford van Ommen and Desmond Painter (Pretoria: UNISA Press, 2008), 83.

95. Donges was the minister of interior from 1948 to 1961 and briefly the acting prime minister after the assassination of Verwoerd in September 1966. In June 1967, he was elected the state president but ironically fell into coma before taking office; he never regained consciousness and died in January 1968.

96. "South African Institute of International Affairs—Constitution, Article 6," Folder 3/6—SOUa.

97. "South African Institute of International Affairs—Constitution, Article 7," Folder 3/6—SOUa. In the event, at least eight branches of the institute were proposed: Bloemfontein, Cape Town, Durban, Grahamstown, Johannesburg, (Pieter) Maritzburg, Pretoria, and Stellenbosch. See "South African Institute of International Affairs: Minutes of the Initial Meeting of the Provisional Executive Council," 26 May 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

98. "Eric Emmett to the Secretary, Chatham House," 22 June 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

99. "Mr. Arnold to Mr. Macadam," 24 July 1934. See also "South African Institute of International Affairs—Constitution, Article 11," Folder 3/6—SOUa.

100. "Report of an interview with Sir Robert Witt," 25 July 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

101. "Ivison Macadam to Campbell Stuart," 1 August 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

102. "Confidential Memorandum—South African Institute of International Affairs," 6 December 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

103. "Ivison Macadam to Campbell Stuart," 1 August 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

104. "Confidential Memorandum—South African Institute of International Affairs," 6 December 1934, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

105. "Copy of a Letter Sent to Mr Lionel Curtis by Sir Campbell Stuart, Enclosing a Confidential Memorandum on the South African Institute of International Affairs," 1 January 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

106. "Escott Reid to Ivison Macadam," 23 February 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

107. "Curtis to Walker," 27 November 1934, Eric Walker Papers.

108. "Copy of Letter Received from Mr. Lionel Curtis," 16 February 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

109. "Copy of Letter Received from Mr. Lionel Curtis," 16 February 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

110. "Eric Emmett to Campbell Stuart," 18 May 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

111. "Ivison Macadam to Patrick Duncan," 12 June 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

112. "Smuts to Walker, 12 July 1935," Eric Walker Papers.

113. "H. Duncan Hall to Ivison Macadam," 25 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

114. "H. Duncan Hall to Ivison Macadam," 25 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

115. "H. Duncan Hall to Ivison Macadam," 25 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

116. "H. Duncan Hall to Ivison Macadam," 9 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

117. "H. Duncan Hall to Ivison Macadam," 9 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

118. "Eric Emmett to Campbell Stuart," 18 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

119. "Extract from a Letter to Sir Roderick Jones from Mr. J. S. Dunn," 6 November 1935, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

120. Bostock, *A Short History*, 15; "Eric Emmett to Campbell Stuart," 16 January 1936, Folder 3/6—SOUa.

121. In 1938, S. H. Frankel said at the second unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conference that the membership had been restricted to 'Union nationals', but, intriguingly, in 1944 the amended constitution of SAIIA allows 'Union nationals and British subjects' to be members. The original emergency powers of the executive council to appoint non-British subjects are scrapped. It is unclear if 'and British subjects' was added in 1944; this seems very unlikely as, during the war, the Afrikaner sentiments against English domination were high, and allowing British subjects to be members of the institute without being Union nationals would have certainly raised many questions. It seems more plausible that the 1934 original phrase 'Union nationals and other British subjects' remained unchanged.

122. Bostock, *A Short History*, 19.

Chapter 6

Into the International

In this South Africa-focussed historical account, our goal has been to show how IR was prefigured in a different space from the now ritual account that celebrates the Aberystwyth moment. Our work, in this book and elsewhere, and several others in a similar vein, have shown that IR's origin-stories are various, varied and, indeed, voluminous. Understanding all these disciplinary pasts and their myriad legacies are essential. Origins stories, as Duncan Bell has argued, perform legitimising functions', where some narratives are classified as 'products of intellectual progress' and others are consigned to 'the proverbial dustbin of history'.[1] Official narratives of the discipline's past continue to circumscribe, shape and determine the realms of its present and future possibilities. Disciplinary narratives shape disciplinary boundaries; they decide what count as legitimate forms of disciplinary inquiry. Self-identifying as a discipline which was born out of the ravages of war and driven by a moral impulse for peace—which is the standard Aberystwyth narrative handed down to us—foundationally precludes any assertions about race, empire, class and gender being the constitutive elements of the international. It retrospectively creates for IR a memory and a locus of existence, which is concocted out of ruminations of an *ahistoric*, *asocial* and—to borrow a term from our friend, David Hornsby—*acolonial* space called the International. Continuing to theorise, analyse and empiricise the 'International' accordingly, as IR scholars, not only distorts the understanding of our primary field, but it also continues to keep us blind to the ever-present inflections of race, class and gender in the everyday operations of International Relations.

In attempting to draw together the threads of arguments that run through the course of this book, we intend to issue a series of provocations around the field of IR which build upon the foregoing chapters in this short conclusion. We propose to focus on three issues which arise in this book and which

151

provide lessons for IR—these are the challenges of re-thinking the International, negotiating the archive and why the issue of race matters for the field.

To consider the first, we turn to the year 1912. This was the year the Scottish dramatist and Hendrik Ibsen-devotee, William Archer, anonymously published a book titled *The Great Analysis: A Plea for a Rational World Order*.[2] It was a both a plea to understand the limits of geographical space and, as the sub-title suggests, a call to exercise 'rationality' in managing world affairs. Archer's main argument in the book was that for the first time in history, the 'international'—as a geopolitical reality—had a sense of finality to it. With no more lands to be discovered and colonized, he suggested that the 'world, in a word, has attained complete, or almost complete, geographical consciousness'.[3]

The realization that (what today we might call) 'global territorial space' was finite, was not a new idea, of course. The English geographer, Halford Mackinder, had argued on similar lines in a speech delivered on the eve of the Russo-Japanese War.[4] In the hallowed chambers of the Royal Geographical Society, Mackinder had declared that '[g]eographical exploration' was almost over. Consequently, he counselled political leaders to shift their attention from colonial adventuring towards 'the struggle for relative efficiency'.[5] But Mackinder's eager eye, even if briefly enamoured by the idea of 'efficiency' from the increasingly popular field of economics, retained its focus on the strategic modalities of this change.[6] In contrast, Archer's interest was squarely focused on the paradigm shift represented by the idea that the 'international' was now a 'closed-space'.[7] If the previous generation of geopolitical thinkers, the great Mackinder included, were conditioned to think about the political and economic aspects of territorial expansion, Archer argued that human-kind was now called upon to do something entirely different: think of the world as a unitary, closed geographical space. A thinking which required, for Archer, the inculcation of a new 'spiritual consciousness' of thinking 'planetarily'.[8]

The fundamental difference was that containment, not conquest, was the new reality. So, the new generation was required to think beyond the logics of disorder and chaos which fueled the imperial era and focus on the innate need for order and management in the international era. But urging this was one thing, finding a way in which 'closed space' could be understood and the resulting 'world order' managed was another matter altogether. Put very loosely in the framing suggested by the theorist, Thomas Kuhn, the 'normal science' of geopolitics had entered a 'crisis'.

As in all struggles over paradigms, past ways of thinking weighed heavily on hopes for the future, and Archer's own was inspired by the American Frontier Thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner.[9] Turner had credited 'the frontier' zone for the success of the American democracy and, indeed, for the

dynamism of the country's character. 'The frontier', he wrote in 1894, 'is the outer edge of the wave – the meeting-point between savagery and civilization . . . the line of the most rapid and effective Americanization. . . .' William Archer agreed: frontiers, he wrote, acted first 'as threats, then as a scourge, more recently as a safety-valve for its superfluous energies and appetites, its discontents, its rebellions' . . . and, consequently, the challenge of the frontier had kept European civilizations vibrant.[10] The idea of placing a limit on expansion was thus a terrifying prospect. The frontier's closing, in Turner's original conception, would certainly end the social dynamism of American society and, in turn, weaken the political and social energy which contested them. Archer imagined something similar replicated on the imperial scale. He wrote, somewhat apocalyptically, if 'history is not to be one long oscillation between struggling progress and engulfing barbarism', a new 'spiritual self-consciousness' was required.[11] The Imperial World was a domain of the knowledge which was best suited for conquest; the 'International World', in contrast, was to be understood, ordered and managed through forms knowledge still-to-be-made that would ensure collaboration, consolidation and stability.

The birth of 'International Relations' as a future-scaping academic discipline is intimately linked to this, the simultaneous 'birth' of the idea of the international. IR as a discipline would use 'scientific method' to provide a language to comprehend the new spatial thinking and offer the methods in which order could be made maintained. Of course, this is not to say that there was no politics between nation-states before the First World War. But it is to say that, the 'International' as a space of thinking about the globe as a singular space, was fundamentally conditional upon colonial expansion reaching its finality. There is a sense of teleological certainly in the same manner as exposed by Lenin's idea of imperialism being the last State of capitalism; for Archer, however, the imperial in its most evolved form is the international. The 'International' only becomes possible *after* Imperialism has managed to bring, in Archer's phrase, a 'geographical and spiritual' consciousness of the world. This required a different order of thinking which reached beyond the limited vocabulary used by politicians and diplomats. So, for example, Bismarckian-style *real-politik* was incapable of comprehending a world in which expansionism was no longer possible.

For Archer, the responsibility for sketching this rational, reasoned and responsible—'international'—approach to re-ordering the world rested with 'professors, or . . . investigators.' It was imperative that they should 'provide the men of action with a scheme, a forecast, a chart of the waters of the future, which should save them from battling with irresistible currents, running on shoals, or drifting hopelessly into whirlpools of blood.'[12] In other words, politicians and diplomats had done great damage to the world, it was time for

the professor—to whit, the rational man, the scientist—to take on the task of future-scaping the international.[13]

Where was this knowledge? Or, to put it in Archer's terms, where were the 'professors' of his new rational order to be found.

Lionel Curtis, Philip Kerr and the other 'South Africans'—as they self-identified for their white settler audiences—were, of course, involved in the very same process of 'great analysis' for which Archer had so passionately called. Indeed, as Archer had, they had made claims their scientific, dispassionate, ('cold, pseudo-scientific' to quote an unsympathetic critic),[14] approach to the idea of the 'international'. Theirs was to be a technique of politics which not only mitigated war, but would provide an elaborate set of policy prescriptions on the management of relations between people—and, as we have been at pains to show, between different races, too. The formulation of this new paradigm by the 'South Africans' was shot-through with the assumptions of class, and race, and gender—and, indeed, language. These assumptions, it was believed, had helped to make Britain 'Great' and their continuity would be a boon to a world in search of the 'international'.

The 'South Africans', moreover, had the distinct advantage of experience over others who were searching for ways to articulate and order 'the international'. They were able to draw their authority—and, so, their 'expertise'—from what they considered was a successful experiment in the politics of closing borders—this was, of course, the record of their approach to the making of the Union of South Africa. Not only was this a harbinger of the nation-building that would follow in Africa and elsewhere but it was building on technologies, like print media, and drew on the increased 'global reach'—to use a modern trope—provided by the increasing ease of travel. It was an approach underpinned by the need to relaunch the imperial project in the light of the geo-politics, by the rise of colonial-settler societies and it was marked paradoxically by the closing of frontiers. It had profound effects on the political geography of southern Africa: so, notwithstanding, a continuous flirtation with the idea of a 'greater South Africa' the region's frontier zone was sealed – certainly formally—by the Act of Union.

The coming of South Africa to statehood had created a sense of finality to both British expansionism and so too an end to 'the British World'—to draw closer a helpful phrase from the Indian-born Anglophile and Milner acolyte, Leo Amery. As we have established, consolidation, rather than expansion, was to be the re-launched mission of the British Empire, and this is the story that runs between these covers.

So it was that the 'success' of South Africa served as the well-spring of one set of ideas for the fashioning of the idea of international. But, as we have emphasised, its point of departure genuflected decidedly towards a British-centered strain of the international.[15] There are many reasons for this

outcome: so, for instance, British cultural legacy was a powerful social force. Even in moments of great political change institutions and conventions from the immediate past persist—often well into the future, and we need to be reminded, too, that the Kindergarten was chosen to serve Lord Alfred Milner, a pro-consul whose goal was to tip the country's 'scales in favour of British predominance'.[16]

The engagement was with the idea of the international was first to come in the shape of the British Commonwealth of Nations and, later, in the idea of a World State. In these particular waters, the international was strongly weighed towards the legacy of Britain and its imperial past. As we have stressed, the international was less concerned with the geographical expansion of Empire, and more with its consolidation; it was less worried about the 'nation', per se, and more preoccupied with the 'international' —not as inter-national, but more as intra-global. It was aimed to fulfil of the destiny of Britain as a nation-state in the world and, paradoxically, it aimed to limit the nationhood of the White Dominions.[17]

In the hands of both Kerr and Curtis, the discipline of International Relations—for which they get much less credit than they deserve—was primarily an instrument to ease the transition from the imperial to the international. As the transmitter of ideas—scientifically sanctioned, of course—IR took on the task of creating vocabulary which enabled the emergence of a new imaginary for British politics and diplomacy beyond the imperial.

We have signposted the contribution of the Kindergarten to the formation of the discipline of International Relations and we have shown the importance to the discipline-in-the-making of ideas, methods and institutions that were first fleshed out in South Africa. We have also suggested that understanding the process of state-making in South Africa offers an optic on the paradigmatic shift which William Archer was seeking.

This brings us to consider the second issue, negotiating the archive.

As we have established, the place of 'Milner's Kindergarten' in the 'making' of the Union of South Africa' has been well traversed by historians. However until this book, its place has been entirely neglected in efforts to explain the origins of IR, or indeed in efforts to understand how the Kindergarten helped to shape the political geography of the southern African region. There is a lesson here for IR: examining or re-examining the archive on the state-formation in other places may offer insights into the many ways that IR emerged in different corners of the world.

In any interpretation, the role of Milner's Kindergarten in, first, the making of the Union of South Africa and, later, in the development of IR, indicates towards the crucial role played by what, Peter Haas has called, Epistemic Communities', or Philip Mirowski and Dieter Plehwe term 'Thought Collectives'.[18] These were ' . . . networks of knowledge-based communities with an

authoritative claim to policy relevance within theory domain of expertise'.[19] So, to understand the manifold origins of IR will certainly require assessing the role and influence of similar closed groupings of intellectuals in other corners of the world.

Furthermore, and drawing again from the archive, we have highlighted the role of one individual, Lionel Curtis, who prefigured the routines and the rote of the discipline-in-the-making first in South Africa but, later, exported these across the world. Other characters who stalk this book are all individuals, like Curtis: late-Victorian, white, upper middle class, men—all were graduates of Oxford and all communicated in the English language. Their group-identity and its political purpose was forged at a moment of victory (over the Boers); it was also a moment of transition in the Empire into which they were born. But if their immediate focus was to unify South Africa in the cause of Empire and, through the journal, *The State*, promoted an ambience which reinforced the idea of Union, their larger role was to make the emerging idea of the international work, not for the good of humankind, but for the glory of Empire.

Engagement with the Archive always calls forth Walter Benjamin's warning—viz, that although the archive speaks about the past, it is always read in the light of the present. This insight from his *Arcades* project, reminds us that the voices in the archive are the products of their own time and their own space. Most of those whose writings we have uncovered between these covers speak in the same crass racist tone that helped to propel South Africa into the notoriously apartheid state it became. There is there is no escaping that race was the single determining fact in the making of the Union of South Africa and that the same grammar—even, perhaps, vocabulary—continued into the codification of International Relations as an academic discipline that followed upon the 'success' of the Kindergarten's role in South Africa. The challenge for contemporary IR is to understand that racial codes continue to coarse through its discourse. This is an issue highlighted throughout the course of this book and, indeed, this book series.

Race however operates in multiple registers and entanglements; and capitalism is always lurking in the shadows. Like any no other part in the British Empire, the rationale for unified South Africa was commercial. The fact that its most ardent champion was the mining magnate, Cecil John Rhodes, suggests how free trade and statehood worked actively in collusion, not against each other as the conventional wisdom invariably suggests. However, this interpretation misses a crucial dimension of the South African story—it was a necropolitical site from the very outset.[20] In a such a place race acts as an almost omnipotent force in determining all social relationships. The institutions and individuals who have surfaced between these covers were primarily concerned with 'poor whites' (despite opposition from the mining class), while consigning the black population into 'native reserves' as the living

dead. Importantly, however, while using 'race' both as a technology of rule—in a Foucauldian sense—and as ontological difference—a *la* Mbembe—other 'racial' fractions are subsumed within master categories. The pre-Boer War racial difference was also understood in terms of the difference between the Boer and the Briton, and indeed these continued to play a big role in South Africa's politics. But as we have seen, in the deliberations of The Fortnightly Club and through the pages of *The State*, assertions about ontological difference—the nature of the 'Kaffir'—and technology of rule—segregation—also help to bring about a form of 'racial peace' between the Boer and the Briton.

As schemes for racial segregation were chalked out in South Africa, Curtis and others are able to draw them onto the emerging internationalist imagination. So, it was that the success of South Africa provided a framework for the broader construction of segregation in the emerging idea of the international where its true purpose was made clear.

On the eve of the First World War, Curtis (together with Edward Grigg—later the Colonial Governor in Kenya and a segregation-enthusiast) argued that 'the most likely causes of War between civilised governments' were the competition for resources and raw material in the non-western world.[21] This meant that '[i]n the lower civilizations lies . . . the chief menace to the peace of the world.'[22] Hence, a World State would not only have to find ways in which the 'higher civilizations' could peacefully distribute worldwide resources among themselves, but also devise ways through which 'lower civilizations' could be pacified, and utilised for optimum exploitation of their resources by these 'higher civilizations'.

These thoughts were the forerunner of Mandates System of the League of Nations, to which Curtis, Kerr and Smuts energetically contributed. Indeed, this system which was segregation under the guise of Darwinism must be seen as 'gift' of the 'South Africans' to the emerging idea of international order. In its century-long history the discipline of International Relations has collaborated with, rather than interrogated, this bifurcation of the world in a rich 'North' and a poor 'South'.

And finally, what are we to make of the role of an individual—in this case, Lionel Curtis?

He was, indeed, 'The Prophet' as his moniker ran, but he could quite readily have been, 'The Professor' for which the dramatist William Archer was searching. The journey from an administrator, briefly to a politician, and eventually to an academic savant was a conscious one. He embodied the contradictions of all these callings—but his search for objectivity in analysis was always in service of his preconceived visions. The 'organic' development of his ideas from City of Johannesburg to the Union of South Africa to the British Commonwealth to the idea of a World State were forged to favour of Britain and its Empire . . . and the anvil he used in this task was racial segregation.

NOTES

1. Duncan Bell, "Writing the World: disciplinary history and beyond," *International Affairs*, 85, no. 1 (2009), 5.

2. William Archer, *The Great Analysis: A Plea for a Rational World Order* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912).

3. Archer, *The Great Analysis*, 57.

4. Halford J. Mackinder, "The Geographical Pivot of History," *The Geographical Journal* 23, no. 4 (1904): 421-37.

5. Mackinder, "Geographical Pivot", 422

6. He used this lecture to advance his famous 'geographical pivot' thesis which argued that the Euro-Asian landmass would drive the course of history. This became the 'heartland' thesis in his 1919 book. See, Halford J. Mackinder, *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction* (Constable: London, 1919).

7. On Closed Space and how this thinking integrated biology and space, see G. Kearns, "Closed Space and Political Practice: Frederick Jackson Turner and Halford Mackinder," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 2*, no. 1 (1984): 23–34.

8. Archer, *The Great Analysis*, 59

9. First advanced by Frederick Turner in 1893, The Frontier Thesis or Turner Thesis, as it was called, argued that the American frontier was crucial to shaping American character and institutions, including democracy. See, Frederick Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association,* 1893): 197-227.

10. Archer, *The Great Analysis*, 56.

11. Archer, *The Great Analysis*, 57

12. He called for creating an 'International College of Systematic Sociology', a conclave of 'World Witenagemot' – a global conclave of investigators and thinkers, drawn from all quarters, who would map the future of the world for the politicians to follow. See, Archer, *The Great Analysis*, 116.

13. Elevating himself to being the professor-in-chief, Archer goes on to provide a preliminary sketch of his 'Great Analysis' which aims, in the words of his friend Gilbert Murray who wrote the book's preface, 'to find out by organised knowledge what is good for society as a whole, not to snatch by strategy what is good for a particular group.' See, Gilbert Murray, "Preface", In Archer, *The Great Analysis*, vii.

14. See, V.S. Srinivasa Sastri, "V.S. Srinivasa Sastri to Hope Simpson, 10 April 1924," In *Letters of V.S. Srinivasa Sastri*, eds. T.N. Jagadishan (Madras: Rochhouse, 1944), 246.

15. The term 'British Empire' indeed became a term of derision in the Raleigh Club at Oxford where Curtis taught as Beit Lecturer of Colonial History. See, Deborah Lavin, "Lionel Curtis and the idea of Commonwealth," in *Oxford and the idea of Commonwealth*, eds. Frederick Madden and D.K. Fieldhouse, London: Croom Helm, 1989), 107-8.

16. C.W. De Kiewiet, *A History of South Africa – Social and Economic* (London. Oxford University Press, 1957), p, 147.

17. Peter Mandler argues that unlike the French or Germans whose national identity was premised on either the state (for the French) or people (*kultur*) (for the Germans), British national identity was weaved around the alleged uniqueness of its political institutions, primarily the rule of law. Consequently, nothing really separated the British nation-state and its Empire, since both were seemingly held together by the same institutions. The British 'state' or 'people' or 'culture' had no specific advantage nor distinguishing feature. The universalism of British liberalism, which aimed towards the telos of human perfection, had little place for nation-state except as an intermediate stage (unlike the French or Germans who regarded nation as the final form). See, Peter Mandler, *The English National Character: The history of an idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair* (New Haven and London, 2006), 1-26. Also see, Charles Carrington, "A New Theory of the Commonwealth," *International Affairs* 31, no. 2 (1955): 137-48.

18. Peter Haas, "Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination," *International Organization*, 46, no. 1 (1992), 1-35; Philip Mirowski and Dieter Plehwe (eds), *The Road from Mount Pelerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

19. Martin Griffiths (ed), *Encyclopaedia of International Relations and Global Politics* (London, Routledge, 2008), 228.

20. Achille Mbembe (with Libby Meintjes), "Necropolitics," *Public Culture*, 15, no. 1 (2003), 11-40.

21. "Whitsdunite Memorandum," July 1914, Ms. Eng. Hist. c. 778, 9.

22. "Whitsdunite Memorandum," 9.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

Archives

Wits University Archives, Johannesburg
Johannesburg Public Library, Johannesburg
University of Cape Town Archives, Cape Town
National Archives, Pretoria
Rhodes University Archives, Grahamstown
Chatham House Archives, London
British Library, London
Bodleian Libraries, Oxford
National Archives of Scotland, Edinburgh

Fortnightly Club Papers Cited

Anderson, C. L. "A Paper on the Defences of South Africa." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 26 September 1907.

Baker, Herbert. "On the Relation of the Government to Art." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 13 December 1906.

Curtis, Lionel. "The Place of Subject People in the Empire." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 9 May 1907.

Feetham, Richard. "Some Problems of South African Federation and Reasons for Facing Them." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 4 October 1906.

Honnold, W. L. "The Negro in America." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 21 May 1908.

Kerr, Philip (1906–1908). *Diary*. Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 1906–1908.

Lyttelton, J. C. "The Military Policy of the Liberal Government." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 24 October 1907.

Malcolm, D. O. "Socialism and the Civil Service." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 17 March 1908.

Malcolm, D. O. "The Relations between Downing Street and the Self-Governing Colonies." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 18 October 1906.

Perry, J. F. (Peter). "On the Objects and the Constitution of the Fortnightly Club." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 25 April 1907.

Perry, J. F. (Peter). "The Transvaal Labour Problem." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 1 November 1906.

Pim, Howard. "The Question of Race." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 15 November 1907.

Stratford, J. "The Policy of Permitting Free Immigration of Asiatics." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 13 September 1907.

Taylor, S. S. "Women's Suffrage." Fortnightly Club Collection, A 146, Wits Historical Papers, Johannesburg, 20 December, 1907.

The State Articles Cited

Anon. "Closer Union Societies." *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909): 113–16.

Anon. "Colour, and a Few Options on It." *The State* 8, no. 5 (1912): 405.

Anon. "Industrial and Economic Reform in South Africa." *The State* 2, no. 9 (1909): 293–303.

Archer, William. "Black and White in Southern States of America, the Colour Problem." *The State* 2, no. 12 (1909): 751–60.

Archer, William. "Black and White in Southern States of America, the Colour Problem." *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910): 274–81.

Archer, William. "Black and White in Southern States of America, the Colour Problem." *The State* 3, no. 3 (1910): 69–75.

Colvin, Ian D. "Oversea Affairs." *The State of South Africa* 5, no. 4 (1911): 615–27.

Colvin, Ian D. "Oversea Affairs." *The State of South Africa* 4, no. 3 (1912): 472–82.

De Pyre, L. E. "Should We Civilise the Kafir?" *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910): 542–49.

Duncan, Patrick. "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal." *The State* 1, no. 2 (1909): 159–74.

Duncan, Patrick. "The Labour Question in the Transvaal." *The State* 3, no. 6 (1910): 912–20.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909): 19–29.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909): 235–55.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 1, no. 4 (1909): 292–304.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909): 610–13.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909): 1–24.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 2, no. 11 (1909): 510–26.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 3, no. 1 (1910): 1–14.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 3, no. 4 (1910): 523–40.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 4, no. 4 (1910): 613–27.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 5, no. 6 (1911): 932–43.

Editor. "The Month." *The State* 6, no. 2 (1911): 212–16.

Fitzpatrick, Percy. "Jock of the Bushveld, and Those Who Knew Him." *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909): 30–31.

Fletcher, Trevor. "The Native Problem." *The State* 3, no. 5 (1910): 766–78.

Foster, Hubert. "The Defence of the Empire." *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909): 40–51.

Kerr, Philip. "The Month." *The State* 2, no. 9 (1909): 242.

Kerr, Philip. "Oversea Affairs." *The State* 2, no. 10 (1909): 377–82.

Kerr, Philip. "Oversea Affairs." *The State* 2, no. 12 (1909): 680–88.

Kerr, Philip. "Oversea Affairs." *The State* 3, no. 1 (1910): 14–22.

Kerr, Philip. "Oversea Affairs." *The State* 3, no. 2 (1910): 190–98.

Kerr, Philip. "Oversea Affairs." *The State* 4, no. 1 (1910): 132–42.

Langenhoven, C. J. "The Female Franchise and the Native Franchise." *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909): 58–65.

Long, B. K. "Comments." *The State* 7, no. 1 (1912): 173–78.

Malan, G. H. "The Principles of Native Government, II." *The State* 5, no. 5 (1911): 735–43.

Masey, Francis. "The Beginnings of Our nation." *The State* 1, no. 1 (1909): 55–62.

Noon, Arthur W. "Socialism and United South Africa." *The State* 3, no. 3 (1910): 805–16.

Perry, L. "The Case for the Enfranchisement of Women in South Africa." *The State* 1, no. 4 (1909): 442–48.

Pim, Howard. "The Native Problem, a Suggested Solution: Review of Paper by Mr. F. W. Bell." *The State* 2, no. 12 (1909): 27–32.

Pim, Howard. "Some Considerations Affecting the Question of Native Franchise [part 1]." *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909): 75–83.

Pim, Howard. "Some Considerations Affecting the Question of Native Franchise [part 2]." *The State* 2, no. 7 (1909): 170–80.

Polak, H. S. L. "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal." *The State* 1, no. 6 (1909): 679–89.

Solly, Julia F. "Enfranchisement of Women in South Africa." *The State* 2, no. 8 (1909): 189–93.

Wybergh, W. "Native Policy: Assimilation or Segregation." *The State* 1, no. 3 (1909): 292–304.

Wynbergh, Katherine. "Socialism and Women." *The State* 4, no. 1 (1910): 83–89.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Anghie, Antony. *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Archer, William. *The Great Analysis: A Plea for a Rational World Order*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Archer, William. *Through Afro-America: An English Reading of the Race Problem.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1910.

Ashworth, Lucian. "Where Are the Idealists in Inter-war International Relations?" *Review of International Studies* 32, no. 2 (2006): 291–308.

Association for the Advancement of Science. *Report of the Seventy-Fifth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, South Africa, August and September 1905.* London: John Murray, 1906.

Atkinson, David C. *The Burden of White Supremacy: Containing Asian Immigration in the British Empire and the United States.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.

Banerjee, Sukanya. *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in Late-Victorian Empire.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Beinart, William, and Saul Dubow, eds. *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Bell, Duncan. *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Bell, Duncan. "Writing the World: Disciplinary History and Beyond." *International Affairs* 85, no. 1 (2009): 3–22.

Boas, Franz. *Race, Language, and Culture.* London: Macmillan, 1940.

Bosco, Andrea. *The Round Table Movement and the Fall of the "Second" British Empire (1909–1919).* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.

Bosco, Andrea, and Alex May, eds. *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy.* London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997.

Bostock, A. Leslie. *A Short History of the South African Institute of International Affairs, 1934–1984.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of International Affairs, 1984.

Boucher, David, and Andrew Vincent. *British Idealism: A Guide for the Perplexed.* London: Continuum, 2012.

Boyer, R. J. F. "Foreword." *Australian Outlook* 1, no. 1 (1947): 3–5.

Brand, Robert H. *The Union of South Africa.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1909.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Dark Vanishings: Discourse on the Extinction of Primitive Races, 1800–1930.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Brebner, J. B. "Laissez-Faire and State Intervention in Nineteenth-Century Britain.*" Journal of Economic History*, supplement 8 (1948): 59–70.

Bright, R. K. *Chinese Labour in South Africa, 1902–10.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Brookes, E. H. *The History of Native Policy in South Africa from 1830 to the Present Day.* Cape Town: Nasionale Pers, 1924.

Browne, J. S. *Through South Africa with the British Association.* London: Speir, 1906.

Bruce, Patrick A. *The Rise of the New South.* Philadelphia: G. Barrie and Sons, 1905.

Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth.* 3 vols. London: Macmillan, 1905.

Bryce, James. *Impressions of South Africa.* London: Macmillan, 1898.

Brydone, R. R. "*Liberty" or Liberty: Some Remarks on a South African Petition*. Cape Town: South African Vigilance Committee, 1900.

Buell, Raymond. *The Native Problem in Africa*. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

Bull, Hedley. "The Theory of International Politics,1919–1969." In *The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919–1969*, edited by Brian Porter, 33–36. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butler, J. R. M. *Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr), 1882–1940*. London: Macmillan, 1960.

Cain, Peter J. *Hobson and Imperialism Radicalism, New Liberalism, and Finance, 1887–1938*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Carr, Edward Hallet. *Conditions of Peace*. London: Macmillan, 1942.

Carr, Edward Hallet. *Nationalism and After*. London: Macmillan, 1945.

Carr, Edward Hallet. *The Soviet Impact on the Western World*. London: Macmillan, 1946.

Carr, Edward Hallet. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1946.

Carr, Edward. Hallet. *What Is History?* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1961.

Carrington, Charles. "A New Theory of the Commonwealth." *International Affairs* 31, no. 2 (1955): 137–48.

Cartwright, Alan P. *The First South African: The Life and Times of Sir Percy Fitzpatrick*. Cape Town: Purnell, 1971.

Cell, John W. *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Cell, John. "Lord Hailey and the Making of African Survey." *African Affairs* 88, no. 353 (1989): 481–505.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Churchill, Winston. *Ian Hamilton's March.* New York: Longmans Green, 1900.

Cotton, James. "Chatham House and Africa c1920–1960: The Limitations of the Curtis Vision." *South African Historical Journal* 68, no. 2 (2016): 147–62.

Curtis, Lionel. *Civitas Dei: The Commonwealth of God*. London: Macmillan, 1938.

Curtis, Lionel. *The Commonwealth of Nations: An Inquiry into the Nature of Citizenship in the British Empire, and into the Mutual Relations of the Several Communities Thereof, Part I*. London: Macmillan, 1916.

Curtis, Lionel. *Dyarchy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Curtis, Lionel. *The Government of South Africa*. Vols. 1 and 2. South Africa: Central News Agency, 1908.

Curtis, Lionel. *The Problem of the Commonwealth.* London: Macmillan, 1915.

Curtis, Lionel. "Windows of Freedom." *The Round Table* 8, no. 3 (1918): 1–47.

Curtis, Lionel. *World War: Its Cause and Cure: The Problem Reconsidered in View of the Release of Atomic Energy*. 2nd ed. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1946.

Davies, David. *The Problem of the Twentieth Century*. London: Ernest Benn, 1930.

de Carvalho, Benjamin, Halvard Leira, and John M. Hobson. "The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39, no. 3 (2011): 735–58.

Dedering, Tilman. "The Ferreira Raid of 1906: Boers, Britons and Germans in Southern Africa in the Aftermath of the South African War." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 26, no. 1 (2000): 43–60.

De Kiewiet, C. W. *A History of South Africa – Social and Economic*. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

Dicey, A. V. *Lectures on the Relationship between Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century*. London: Macmillan, 1905.

Dilke, Charles. *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries during 1866–7*. Vol. 1. London: Macmillan, 1869.

Donnely, M. S. "J. W. Dafoe and Lionel Curtis: Two Concepts of Commonwealth." The Round Table Papers MS. Eng. Hist. c.853, Bodleian Library, Oxford, 1959.

Du Bois, W. E. B. "My Impressions of Woodrow Wilson." W. E. B. Du Bois Papers, Series 1A. General Correspondence. Credo, Library, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b088-i264 (accessed 1 August 2018).

Du Toit, Andre. "No Chosen People: The Myth of the Calvinist Origins of Afrikaner Nationalism and Racial Ideology." *American Historical Review* 88, no. 4 (1983): 20–52.

Du Toit, Andre, and Hermann Giliomee. *Afrikaner Political Thought: Documents and Analyses, 1: 1780–1850*. Cape Town and Berkeley: David Philip and University of California Press, 1983.

Dubow, Saul. *A Commonwealth of Knowledge: Science, Sensibility and White South Africa, 1820–2000*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Dubow, Saul. "Colonial Nationalism, the Milner Kindergarten and the Rise of 'South Africanism,' 1902–10." *History Workshop Journal* 43, no. 1 (1997): 53–85.

Dubow, Saul. "The Elaboration of Segregationist Ideology." In *Segregation and Apartheid in Twentieth-Century South Africa*, edited by William Beinart and Saul Dubow, 145–75. London: Routledge, 1995.

Edgar, Robert, and Myra Ann Houser. "'The Most Patient of Animals Next to the Ass': Jan Smuts, Howard University, and African American Leadership, 1930." *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Studies* 18, no. 1 (2016): 29–51.

Ellis, John. "'The Methods of Barbarism' and the 'Rights of Small Nations': war Propaganda and British Pluralism." *Albion* 30, no. 1 (1998): 49–75.

Fair, John. "F. S. Oliver, Alexander Hamilton and the 'American Plan' for Resolving Britain's Constitutional Crisis, 1903–1921." *Twentieth Century British History* 10, no. 1 (1999): 1–26.

Fedorowich, Kent. "Anglicization and the Politicization of British Immigration to South Africa, 1899–1929." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 19, no. 2 (1991): 222–46.

Fedorowich, Kent. "The Weak Link in the Imperial Chain: South Africa, the Round Table and World War One." In *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy*, edited by Andrea Bosco and Alex May, 137–58. London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997.

Foucault, Michel. "3 March 1976." In *Society Must Be Defended*, edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana. Translated by David Macey, 189–214. New York: Picador, 1997.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow. London: Penguin, 1984.

Fowler, R. M. "Foreword: To First Issue of International Journal." *International Journal* 1, no. 1 (1946): 5–6.

Frankel, S. Herbert. "Economic and Racial Problems of South Africa." *International Affairs* 11, no. 3 (1932): 370–90.

Frankel, S. Herbert, and Edgar H. Brooks. "Problems of Economic Inequality: The Poor White and the Native." In *Coming of Age: Studies in South African Citizenship and Politics*, edited by Edgar H. Brooks, Jan H. Hofmeyr, R. F. Currey, J. D. Rheinallt Jones, S. Herbert Frankel, W. H. Ramsbottom, T. J. Haarhoff, and O. D. Schreiner, 129–82. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Ltd., 1930.

Freeden, Michael. *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Galton, Francis. *Inquiries into Human Faculty and Its Development*. London: Macmillan, 1883.

Giliomee, Hermann. "The Beginnings of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1870–1915." *South African Historical Journal* 19, no. 1 (1987): 115–42.

Goddard, John G. *Racial Supremacy, Being Studies in Imperialism*. London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1905.

Gooch, G. P. "Imperialism." In *The Heart of Empire: Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England. With an Essay on Imperialism*, edited by C. F. G. Masterman, 308–400. 2nd ed. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907 (1901).

Gordon, Robert. "Early Social Anthropology in South Africa." *African Studies* 49, no. 1 (1900): 15–48.

Gorman, Daniel. *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2006.

Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race: Or, the Racial Basis of European History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Gregory, Robert G. *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations within the British Empire, 1890–1939*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Griffiths, Martin (ed). *Encyclopaedia of International Relations and Global Politics*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Grovogui, Siba. *Beyond Eurocentrism and Anarchy: Memories of International Order and Institutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Guelen, Christian. "The Common Grounds of Conflict: Racial Visions of World Order 1880–1940." In *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s–1930s*, edited by S. Conrad and D. Sachsenmeirer, 69–96. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Guilhot, Nicolas. "American Katechon: When Political Theology Became IR Theory." *Constellations* 17, no. 2 (2010): 224–53.

Guilhot, Nicolas. "The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory." *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (2008): 281–304.

Gutsche, Thelma. *No Ordinary Woman: The Life and Times of Florence Phillips*. Cape Town: Howard Timmings, 1966.

Haas, Peter. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46, no. 1 (1992): 1–35.

Hancock, Keith W. *Smuts: The Fields of Force, 1919–1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Hancock, Keith W. *Smuts: The Sanguine Years, 1870–1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Hancock, Keith, and Jean van der Poel, eds. *Selections from the Smuts Papers.* Vols. 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Haslam, Jonathan. *Vices of Integrity: E. H. Carr, 1892–1982*. London: Verso, 2000.

Hathaway, Oona A., and Scott J. Shapiro. *The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade the World*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2017.

Hobson, J. A. *Imperialism: A Study*. London: J. Nisbet, 1902.

Hobson, John. *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760–1910*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Hodson, V. Harry. "The Round Table's Early Life." *Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 264 (1976): 415–20.

Hughes, A. B. "Lionel Curtis: Young Man Who Helped to Draft the Union Constitution." *Rand Daily Mail* (Johannesburg), 26 November 1955.

Huttenback, Robert A. *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-Governing Colonies, 1830–1910*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Jebb, Richard. *Studies in Colonial Nationalism*. London: Edward Arnold, 1905.

Jones, Greta. *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction between Biological and Social Theory*. Sussex, UK: Harvester Press, 1980.

Jones, Heather. "WW1: Was It Really the First World War?" *BBC News*. 29 June 2014. https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-28057198.

Kearney, Reginald. *African American Views of the Japanese: Solidarity or Sedition*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Kearns, G. "Closed Space and Political Practice: Frederick Jackson Turner and Halford Mackinder." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2, no. 1 (1984): 23–34.

Kegley, Charles W., Jr., and Eugene R. Wittkopf. *World Politics: Trends and Transformation*. New York: St. Martins, 1989.

Kendle, John. *The Roundtable Movement and Imperial Union*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Kennedy, Dane. *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Rhodesia, 1890–1939*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1989.

Kerr, Philip. "From Empire to Commonwealth." *Foreign Affairs* 1, no. 2 (1922): 83–98.

Kerr, Philip, and Lionel Curtis. *The Prevention of War*. New Haven, CT: The Institute of Politics and Yale University Press, 1923.

King-Hall, Stephen. *Chatham House: A Brief Account of the Origins, Purposes and Methods of the Royal Institute of International Affairs*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1937.

Knutsen, Torbjörn L. *A History of International Relations Theory: An Introduction*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Knutsen, Torbjörn L. "A Lost Generation? IR Scholarship before World War I." *International Politics* 45, no. 6 (2008): 650–74.

Koebner, Richard, and Helmut Dan Schmidt. *Imperialism: The Story and Significance of a Political Word, 1840–1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Koskenniemi, Martti. *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870–1960.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kroger, Martin. "Imperial Germany and the Boer War: From Colonial Fantasies to the Reality of Anglo-German Estrangement." In *The International Impact of the Boer War*, edited by Keith Wilson, 25–42. London: Routledge, 2001.

Kuper, Adam. "The Academic Frontier." *African Studies* 56, no. 2 (1997): 69–84.

Lacey, M. J. "Eric Walker (1887–1976)." *Kleio* 8, no. 1 (1976): 4–8.

Lake, Marilyn. "The White Man under Siege: New Histories of Race in the Nineteenth Century and the Advent of White Australia." *History Workshop Journal* 58, no. 1 (2004): 41–62.

Lake, Marilyn, and Henry Reynolds. *Drawing the Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Lamont, Mark. "Malinowski and the 'Native Question.'" In *Anthropologists and Their Traditions across National Borders*, edited by Regna Darnell and Frederic W. Gleach, 8:69–110. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014.

Lavin, Deborah. *From Empire to International Commonwealth: A Biography of Lionel Curtis*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Lavin, Deborah. "Lionel Curtis and the Idea of Commonwealth." In *Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth*, edited by Frederick Madden and D. K. Fieldhouse, 97–121. London: Croom Helm, 1982.

Lekon, Aysen Dilek. "The Interplay of Realism and Idealism in the Thought of Lionel Curtis: A Critique of the Conception of 'First Debate' in International Relations." PhD diss., London School of Economics and Political Science, 2003.

Lewis, David Levering. *W. E. B. Du Bois: Biography of a Race, 1868–1919*. Vol. 1. New York: Henry Holt and Co, 1993.

Leyds, G. A. *A History of Johannesburg: The Early Years*. Cape Town: Nasionale Boekhandel, 1964.

Lincoln, C. H. "Reviewed Work(s): National Life and Character: A Forecast by Charles H. Pearson." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 5, no. 4 (1895): 140–43.

Lindqvist, Sven. *Exterminate All the Brutes: One Man's Odyssey into the Heart of Darkness and the Origins of the European Genocide*. New York: New Press, 2002.

Link, Arthur Stanley. *Woodrow Wilson: The Road to the White House*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947.

Linstrum, Eric. *Ruling Minds: Psychology in the British Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016.

"The Lionel Curtis–Philip Kerr Correspondence." *Annals of the Lothian Foundation*. London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1991.

Logan, Rayford W. "The Operation of the Mandate System in Africa." *Journal of Negro History* 13, no. 4 (1928): 423–77.

Long, B. K. *The Framework of the Union: A Comparison of Some Union Constitutions*. South Africa: Central News Agency, 1908.

Long, David. "Paternalism and the Internationalization of Imperialism: J. A. Hobson on the International Government of the 'Lower Races.'" In *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, edited by David Long and Brian C. Schmidt, 71–93. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Long, David, and Brian C. Schmidt, eds. *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Love, Eric T. L. *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865–1900*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Lugard, Frederick D. *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*. 5th ed. London: Frank Cass, 1965.

MacDonagh, Oliver. "The Nineteenth-Century Revolution in Government: A Reappraisal." *Historical Journal* 1, no. 1 (1958): 52–67.

Mackay, Joseph, and Christopher D. Laroche. "The Conduct of History in International Relations: Rethinking Philosophy of History in IR Theory." *International Theory* 9, no. 2 (2017): 203–36.

Mackinder, Halford J. *Democratic Ideals and Reality: A Study in the Politics of Reconstruction*. London: Constable, 1919.

Mackinder, Halford J. "The Geographical Pivot of History." *Geographical Journal* 23, no. 4 (1904): 421–37.

Magubane, Bernard. *The Round Table Movement: Its Influence on the Historiography of Imperialism*. Harare: SAPES Books, 1994.

Mandler, Peter. *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006.

Marks, Shula, and Stanley Trapido. "The Politics of Race, Class and Nationalism." In *The Politics of Race, Class and Nationalism in Twentieth Century South Africa*, edited by Shula Marks and Stanley Trapido, 1–70. London: Longman, 1987.

Masterman, C. F. G. "Realities at Home." In *The Heart of Empire: Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England. With an Essay on Imperialism*, edited by C. F. G. Masterman, 1–52. 2nd ed. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907 (1901).

May, Alex. *The Round Table, 1910–1966*. PhD diss., University of Oxford, 1995.

May, Alex C. "London Moot: Dominion Nationalism and Imperial Federation." In *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy*, edited by Andrea Bosco and Alex May. London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997.

Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. London: Allen Lane, 2012.

Mazower, Mark. *No Enchanted palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Mbembe, Achille (with Libby Meintjes). "Necropolitics." *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40.

McBriar, A. M. *Fabian Socialism and English Politics, 1884–1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

McCogan, John. "Implementing the 1921 Treaty: Lionel Curtis and Constitutional Practice." *Irish Historical Studies* 20, no. 79 (1977): 312–33.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Merriman, John. "The Closer Union of the Empire." *Nineteenth Century* 21 (1887): 507–16.

Merrington, Peter. "The State and the 'Invention of Heritage,' in Edwardian South Africa." In *The Round Table: The Empire/Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy*, edited by Andrea Bosco and Alex May, 127–35. London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997.

Mirowski, Philip and Dieter Plehwe (eds). *The Road from Mont Pelerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Molloy, Seán. "E. H. Carr and the Complexity of Power Politics." In *The Hidden History of Realism*, 51–74. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Moodie, T. Dunbar. *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Morefield, Jeanne. *Covenants without Swords: Idealist Liberalism and the Spirit of Empire.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Morefield, Jeanne. *Empires without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Morgenthau, Hans. "Review: The Political Science of E. H. Carr." *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (1948): 127–34.

Morris, Alan G. "The British Association Meeting of 1905 and the Rise of Physical Anthropology in South Africa." *South African Journal of Science* 98 (July–August 2002): 336–40.

Morrison, Toni. "Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-America Presence in American Literature." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 28, no. 1 (1989): 1–34.

Moyn, Samuel. *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World*. London: Belknap Press, 2018.

Murray, Gilbert. "Preface." In *The Great Analysis: A Plea for a Rational World Order*, by William Archer, v–viii. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Myers, J. L. "Presidential Address: The Science of Man in the Service of the State." *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 59, no. 1 (1929): 19–52.

Native Pen, A. "The South African Native's Point of View." *Round Table* 19, no. 76 (1929): 783–89.

Nimocks, Walter. *Milner's Young Men: The "Kindergarten" in Edwardian Imperial Affairs*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1968.

O'Meara, Dan. *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934–1948*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Oldham, Joseph Houldsworth. "Report of the Commission of the Closer Union of the Eastern and Central African Dependencies." *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* 8, no. 3 (1929): 227–59.

Oldham, Joseph Houldsworth. *White and Black in Africa: A Critical Examination of the Rhodes Lectures of General Smuts*. London: Longmans Green, 1930.

Oliver, F. S. *Alexander Hamilton: An Essay on American Union*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1906.

Olson, William, and A. J. R. Groom. *International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation.* London: HarperCollins, 1991.

Olusoga, David, and Casper W. Erichsen. *Kaiser's Holocaust: Germany's Forgotten Genocide and the Colonial Roots of Nazism*. London: Faber and Faber, 2010.

Orwell, George. "Not Counting Niggers." *The Adelphi* (July 1939).

Osiander, Andreas. "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited." *International Studies Quarterly* 42 no. 3 (1998): 409–32.

Owen, Frank. *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George, His Life and Times*. London: Hutchinson, 1954.

Owens, Patricia. "Women and the History of International Thought." *International Studies Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2018): 461–81.

Palan, Ronen, and Blair Brook. "On the Idealist Origins of the Realist Theory of International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 19, no. 4 (1993): 385–99.

Parmar, Inderjeet. *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Parmar, Inderjeet. *Think Tanks and Power in Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of the Role and Influence of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1939–1945*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave, 2004.

Pearson, Charles. *National Life and Character: A Forecast*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1913 (1893).

Peatling, G. K. "Globalism, Hegemonism and British Power: J. A. Hobson and Alfred Zimmern Reconsidered." *History* 89, no. 3 (2004): 381–98.

Peet, Richard. "The Social Origins of Environmental Determinism." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 75, no. 3 (1985): 309–33.

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation.* New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944.

Porter, Andrew. "The South African War and the Historians." *African Affairs* 99, no. 397 (2000): 633–48.

Porter, Bernard. *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: What the British Really Thought about Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Porter, Brian, ed. *The Aberystwyth Papers: International Politics, 1919–1969.* London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Porter, Brian. "Lord Davies, E. H. Carr and the Spirit Ironic: A Comedy of Errors." *International Relations* 16, no. 1 (2002): 77–96.

Price, Charles. *The Great White Walls Are Built: Restrictive Immigration to North America and Australiasia, 1836–1888*. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1974.

Quigley, Carroll. *Anglo-American Establishment*. New York: Books in Focus, 1981.

Quigley, Carroll. "The Round Table Groups in Canada, 1908–1938." *Canadian Historical Review* 43, no. 3 (1962): 204–22.

Quirk, Joel, and Darshan Vigneswaran. "The Construction of an Edifice: The Story of a First Great Debate." *Review of International Studies* 31, no. 1 (2005): 89–107.

Radcliffe-Brown, Alfred R. "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology." *South African Journal of Science* 20, no. 1 (1923): 124–47.

Ramsbottom, W. H. "South Africa and the North." In *Coming of Age: Studies in South African Citizenship and Politics*, edited by E. H. Brookes et al., 110–28. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Ltd., 1930.

Report of the RIIA. "The Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations." *Journal of the Royal Institute of International Affairs* 8, no. 3 (1929): 185–202.

Rheinallt Jones, J. D. "The Need for a Scientific Basis for South African Native Policy." *South African Journal of Science* 23, no. 12 (1926): 79–91.

Rich, Paul. *Race and Empire in British Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Rich, Paul. "Race, Science and the Legitimisation of White Supremacy in South Africa, 1902–1940." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 23, no. 4 (1990): 665–86.

Rich, Paul. "The South African Institute on Race Relations and the Debate on 'Race Relations,' 1929–1958." *African Studies* 40, no. 1 (1981): 13–22.

Rich, Paul. *White Power and the Liberal Conscience: Racial Segregation and South African Liberalism.* Johannesburg: Ravan, 1984.

Robin, Corey. "We Have the Woodrow Wilson/P.C. Debate All Backwards: Protestors Are Forcing a Debate Princeton Has Whitewashed for Debates." *Salon.* 21 November 2015. https://www.salon.com/2015/11/21/we_have_the_woodrow_wilsonp_c_debate_all_backwards_protesters_are_forcing_a_debate_princeton_has_whitewashed_for_decades.

Robinson, Ronald E., John Gallaghar, and Alice Denny. *Africa and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism*. London: Macmillan, 1961.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "National Life and Character." *Sewanee Review* 2, no. 3 (1894): 353–76.

Ross, Edward A. "The Causes of Race Superiority." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 18, no. 1 (1901): 67–89.

Round Table. "Africa from the South." *Round Table* 21, no. 81 (1930): 125–34.

Round Table. "Honolulu." *Round Table* 18, no. 69 (1927): 90–104.

Round Table. "The New Problem of Africa." *Round Table* 17, no. 67 (1927): 447–72.

Sampson, Aaron Beers. "Tropical Anarchy: Waltz, Wendt, and the Way We Imagine International Politics." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27, no. 4 (2002): 429–57.

Sastri, V. S. Srinivasa. "V. S. Srinivasa Sastri to Hope Simpson, 10 April 1924." In *Letters of V. S. Srinivasa Sastri*, edited by T. N. Jagadishan. Madras: Rochhouse, 1944.

Scheuerman, William E. *Morgenthau: Realism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Polity, 2009.

Schmahmann, Brenda. *Picturing Change: Curating Visual Culture at Post-apartheid Universities*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2013.

Schmidt, Brian. "Lessons from the Past: Reassessing the Interwar Disciplinary History of International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (1998): 433–59.

Schwartz, Bill. *Memories of Empire*, vol. 1: *The White Man's World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Seedat, Mohamed, and Sarah MacKenzie. "The Triangulated Development of South African Psychology: Race, Scientific Racism and Professionalism." In *Interiors: A History of Psychology in Southern Africa*, edited by Clifford van Ommen and Desmond Painter, 61–89. Pretoria: UNISA Press, 2008.

Seeley, John R. *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures*. London: Macmillan, 1890.

Semmel, Bernard. *The Liberal Idea and the Demons of Empire: Theories of Imperialism from Adam Smith to Lenin*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Shaw, Timothy M., and Lucian M. Ashworth. "Commonwealth Perspectives on International Relations." *International Affairs* 86, no. 5 (2010): 1149–65.

Smith, Michael Joseph. *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1986.

Smith, Steve, ed. *International Relations: British and American Approaches.* London: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Smuts, Jan. *Africa and Some World Problems*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press. 1930.

Smuts, Jan. *Plans for a Better World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940.

South African Round Table Group. "Native Policy in South Africa." *Round Table* 26, no. 103 (1936): 528–45.

Spencer, Herbert. *The Man versus the State*. Caldwell, ID: Caxton Publishers, 1965.

Stoddard, Lothrop. *The Rising Tide of Colour: Against White World Supremacy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Stray, Christopher, ed. *Gilbert Murray Reassessed: Hellenism, Theatre and International Politics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Streit, Clarence K. *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic*. London: Harper & Brothers, 1939.

Studdert-Kennedy, Gerald. "Political Science and Political Theology: Lionel Curtis, Federalism and India." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 24, no. 2 (1996): 197–217.

Symonds, Richard. *Oxford and Empire*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Taylor, Trevor. "Utopianism." In *International Relations: British and American Approaches*, edited by Steve Smith, 92–107. London: Basil Blackwell, 1985.

Thakur, Vineet, Alexander Davis, and Peter Vale. "Imperial Mission, Scientific Method: An Alternative Account of the Origins of IR." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 46, no. 1 (2017): 3–23.

Thies, Cameron. "Progress, History, and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist-Realist Debate." *European Journal of International Relations* 8, no. 2 (2002): 147–85.

Thompson, Leonard. *The Unification of South Africa, 1902–1910.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Thompson, Richard A. *The Yellow Peril, 1890–1923*. New York: Arno Press, 1978.

Tilley, Helen. *Africa as a Living Laboratory: Empire, Development, and the Problem of Scientific Knowledge, 1870–1950*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Toynbee, Arnold. *Acquaintances*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Vale, Peter. "If International Relations Lives on the Street, What Is It Doing in the Classroom?" *International Relations* 28, no. 2 (2014): 141–58.

Vale, Peter. "Unlocking Social Puzzles: Colony, Crime and Chronical. An Interview with Charles van Onselen." *Thesis Eleven* 36, no. 1 (2016): 35–48.

van der Waag, Ian. "Hugh Archibald Wyndham: His Life and Times in South Africa, 1901–1923." Unpublished PhD diss., University of Cape Town, 2005.

van der Waag, Ian. "Hugh Wyndham, Transvaal Politics and the Attempt to Create an English Country Seat in South Africa, 1901–1914." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 31, no. 2 (2003): 136–57.

van Jaarsveld, Floris Albertus. *The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History*. Cape Town: Simondium Publishers, 1964.

van Jaarsveld, Floris Albertus. *The Awakening of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1868–1881*. Cape Town: Human and Rousseau, 1961.

van Onselen, Charles. *The Cowboy Capitalist: John Hays Hammond, the American West and the Jameson Raid*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 2017.

van Onselen, Charles. *New Babylon, New Nineveh: Everyday Life on the Witwatersrand, 1886–1914*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 1982.

van Onselen, Charles. *The Seed Is Mine: The Life of Kas Maine, a South African Sharecropper, 1894–1985*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1996.

Vasquez, John. *The Power of Power Politics*: *A Critique*. London: Francis Pinter, 1983.

Vitalis, Robert. "Birth of the Discipline." In *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, edited by David Long and Brian Schmidt, 159–81. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Vitalis, Robert. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 2015.

Vucetic, Srdjan. *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialised Identity in International Relations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Walker, Cheryl. *The Women's Suffrage Movement in South Africa*. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1979.

Williams, Basil, ed. *The Selborne Memorandum: A Review of the Mutual Relations of the British South African Colonies in 1907*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Williams, Michael. "In the Beginning: The International Relations Enlightenment and the Ends of International Relations Theory." *European Journal of International Relations* 19, no. 3 (2013): 647–65.

Wilson, Peter. "E. H. Carr's The Twenty Years' Crisis: Appearance and Reality in World Politics." *Politik* 12, no. 4 (2009): 21–25.

Wilson, Peter. "Gilbert Murray and International Relations: Reassessed: Hellenism, Theatre and International Politics." *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 2 (2011): 881–909.

Wilson, Peter. *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth Century Idealism*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Wilson, Peter. "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate.'" *Review of International Studies* 24, no. 5 (1998): 1–16.

Wyndham, Hugh. "The Colour Problem in Africa." *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs* 4, no. 4 (1925): 174–90.

Youe, Christopher P. "The Threat of Settler Rebellion and the Imperial Predicament: The Denial of Indian Rights in Kenya, 1923." *Canadian Journal of History* 12, no. 3 (1978): 347–60.

Index

About the Authors

Vineet Thakur is University Lecturer in International Relations at the Institute for History, Leiden University and, currently Smuts Visiting Fellow at the University of Cambridge. He has held fellowships at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study and the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study, and taught at Ambedkar University (Delhi) and SOAS (UK). He is the author of *Postscripts on Independence: Foreign Policy Discourses in India and South Africa* (2018) and *Jan Smuts and the Indian Question* (2017). His ongoing project is a biography of the Indian liberal leader V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.

Peter Vale is Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for the Advancement of Scholarship at the University of Pretoria. He was the founding Director of the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study (JIAS), and holds the title of Nelson Mandela Professor of Politics Emeritus, Rhodes University. He is an Honorary Professor in the Africa Earth Observatory Network (AEON) of which he was a founding member. Professor Vale's current research interests include social thought, intellectual traditions in South Africa and the politics of Higher Education. In a recent chapter, he explored the role of cartoons in the development of Afrikaner Nationalism. Vale is the recipient of the International Medal of the University of Utrecht, and Rhodes University's Distinguished Senior Research Award, where he also received the Vice-Chancellor's Book Award. In 2013, he delivered the E. H. Carr Memorial Lecture at Aberystwyth University, Wales.