Abstract

In the wake of recent national independence movements, renewed interest in the complex phenomenon of the nation has emerged; highly negative conceptions have been challenged by voices that seek to understand rather than dismiss expressions of nationalism and national identity in fields as diverse as sport, architecture, fashion, film, engineering, advertising, and currency design. The South African publications Lantern and Panorama were competing projects in a rhetorical exercise that grappled with constructed national identities in a pre-1994 South African community and, as such, these artefacts deserve interrogation. To this purpose I examine the cover designs of the journals – both to a greater or lesser degree state supported – between 1949 and 1961 in order to demonstrate how a consideration of rhetorical content not only reveals embedded ideologies, but also demonstrates the agency of graphic design in the strategies of propaganda and education as utilised by Lantern and Panorama, respectively. I problematise these concepts, and propose more nuanced readings than may be conventionally attributed to government-sanctioned visual culture from this period in South Africa’s history.
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Introduction

OUR COVER: Under a cloudless sky, the South African painter, JH Pierneef, brings the panoramic glory of the Golden Gate … to his canvas (description on inside cover of Panorama, May 1956) (Figure 1).

THE COVER: The composition, while abstract in mood, is symbolic of the complexity of advertising. It suggests a crescendo in art … (description on inside cover of Lantern, Oct/Dec 1958) (Figure 2).

OUR COVER: Under a cloudless sky, the South African painter, JH Pierneef, brings the panoramic glory of the Golden Gate … to his canvas (description on inside cover of Panorama, May 1956) (Figure 1). The girl has no images in her report: her parents don’t hold with cutting pictures out of anything except newspapers. While Panorama’s cheap, glossy pages easily pass muster as ‘newsprint’, the magazine is banned from the Groenewald household. Complaining to her mother, she is told: Panorama is Nationalist Party propaganda.
and it will not darken our door. Instead, the ball-and-claw bookcase in the *sitkamer* boasts issues of *Lantern*, a journal that is deemed apolitical, erudite and educational. Unfortunately, this elevated status precludes defacement, but *Lantern* is a dull publication and devoid of colourful vistas of the Durban seafront: no great loss, thinks the girl – bitterly.

Nonetheless, it is the 1958 October/December issue of *Lantern* (Figure 2) that sparked my interest in design. Preserved from scissors for more than a decade, an article co-written by the South African designer Ernst de Jong and his wife, Gwen, was still compelling enough in the early 1970s to prompt me to choose graphic design as career. In the late 1990s, I once again encountered Ernst de Jong, this time as a key figure in the design of South African paper currency, and consequently revisited his 1958 article in *Lantern* – still pristine on its ball-and-claw shelf. A quixotic impulse to break the taboo of my childhood led to an investigation of the rhetoric of both *Lantern* and *Panorama*, perhaps as an excuse to sample the forbidden fruit of the latter, but primarily to determine whether *Lantern* was as saintly – and *Panorama* as wicked – as I had been led to believe as a child.

Few studies of visual culture have ventured into the arena of mainstream and state supported South African publication design prior to 1994, the year of South Africa’s first democratic election and the consequent unseating of the Afrikaans-dominated Nationalist Party. The analysis of 1950s cover designs for *Die Huisgenoot* by Stella Viljoen (2006) is a rare example. Although
the developing field of whiteness studies legitimises the urge to ‘rethink, renegotiate and analyse all investments in whiteness’ (Van der Watt in Faber 2011:31), analyses tend to scrutinise constructions of whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. Consequently, artefacts of popular white culture prior to 1994 are often relegated to the arena of the anecdotal or the stereotype. Moreover, nationalism in South Africa, as a field of intellectual enquiry, arguably labours under the influence of writers such as John Breuilly (1993:69-70), who claims that:

Nationalist ideology is a pseudo-solution to the problem of the relationship between state and society ... It was ... combined in a powerful but illogical way with purely political values ... The net result was to transform certain important ways of understanding human affairs into a type of political ideology which is beyond critical examination [emphasis added].

A tendency exists, therefore, to draw a veil over the phenomenon, especially in Africa (Chipkin 2007:1). Adding to the difficulty, writers such as Anthony Smith (2003:121), who hold positive views of nationalism, might argue against the condition of nationalism in South Africa prior to 1994. Breuilly (1993:1, 7), for his part, refutes the argument that ‘nationalism arises ultimately from some sort of national identity or that it is a search for such an identity’; he understands the idea of the nation as an ‘artificial ... project’. Since Lantern and Panorama were undoubtedly competing projects in a rhetorical exercise that grappled with
constructed nationalist aspirations in a South African community, the publications deserve interrogation in order to address what Ivor Chipkin (2007:1) refers to as ‘a gap in contemporary studies of nationalism’.

In this article I examine the cover designs of Lantern and Panorama – both to a greater or lesser degree state supported – between 1949 and 1961. To this purpose, I present a brief review of rhetoric as a function of communication design, followed by a background to Lantern and Panorama, and then proceed with ‘measuring the rhetorical content’ (Bonsiepe 1999:170) of the cover designs, where rhetoric is ‘utilized for the purposes of revealing embedded ideologies … as well as link[ing] design practice to theoretical reflection’ (Sauthoff 1999:112).

The new rhetoric: A commitment to the visual

In 1958 Chaim Perelman and Lucie Ohlbrechts-Tyteca published La nouvelle rhétorique: Traité de l’argumentation (reprinted in 1971 as The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation). The authors present a hefty theory of argumentation where the object is the study of discursive techniques that allow authors ‘… to increase the mind’s adherence to the theses presented for its assent’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:3-4, emphasis in original). Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:4) make it clear at the outset that ‘it is good practice not to confuse … the aspects of reasoning relative to the truth and those relative to adherence’. Their treatise is a rapprochement of the theory of argumentation as conceived by Aristotle, in particular
Antiquity's concern with 'that which is probable instead of dealing with propositions which are necessary'. The authors wish to address this premise by emphasising that '... it is in terms of an audience that an argumentation develops'; their work, therefore, 'is presented as a new rhetoric' (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971: 4-5, emphasis in original).

Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca's idea of a new rhetoric is taken up (although not always acknowledged) by writers in the design field. Gü Bonsiepe was one of the initial design theorists to demonstrate that verbal rhetoric could form the basis for visual rhetoric (Sauthoff 1999:129), but, notably, Bonsiepe (1999) does not consider the role of the audience in his celebrated paper. In 1995, Richard Buchanan – again – posits a 'new rhetoric ... where the effort is ... to overcome the separation between words and things' (Buchanan 1995:44-45, emphasis added). Buchanan's 'encompassing view of design as rhetoric' (Sauthoff 1999:127) serves to inform, amongst others, Anne Tyler's (1996) analysis that resurrects the importance of audience in 'shaping belief', Marian Sauthoff's (1999) investigation of rhetoric as an interpretative strategy in graphic design and, most recently, Victoria Gallagher, Kelly Norris Martin and Magdy Ma's (2011:30) examination of two 'ancient' rhetorical concepts – vividness and flourishment – in public sculpture. What emerges from this discourse is, firstly, that the disinterest in rhetoric observed by Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:5) in the 1950s had been reversed by the turn of the century; secondly, that persuasion is not necessarily
Despite the enlarged discourse, Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca’s (1971) comprehensive overview of the process of argumentation remains an invaluable text. While Bonsiepe (1999:168) and Buchanan (1995:45) narrow their focus to one aspect of rhetoric – the expressive styling of visual material – Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca allow both designers, and critics of design, access to a detailed reflection upon the effectiveness of over 100 rhetorical techniques. The authors divide the argumentative process into the three traditional stages of rhetoric, namely, the framework (planning the argument), the starting point (choosing the appropriate vehicle for presenting an argument), and the techniques of argumentation (choosing an appropriate style of presentation) – divisions that are acknowledged by Buchanan (1995:44), although his concern is mainly with the latter. The greater complexity of Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca’s treatise, including their interrogation of concepts such as ‘propaganda’ and ‘education’, offers an analytical lens (set out in more detail later) that enables a nuanced and arguably unorthodox reading of rhetorical forms. In order, therefore, to bring fresh insights to the subject, I utilise this approach to interrogate Lantern and Panorama covers.

Figure 9: George Duby [art director], 1957, cover of Lantern (63). The cover illustration depicts the South African-born dancer Nadia Nerina in the role of The Dying Swan.

Figure 10: George Duby [art director] and Ernst de Jong [designer], 1958, cover of Lantern (73). This is the first issue of Lantern where the designer of the cover is acknowledged, and also the first cover designed by De Jong. A new tagline appears, identical in Afrikaans and English.
Limiting the view

*Lantern* and *Panorama* started regular publication in the decade following the ascendancy to power, in 1948, of the Herenigde Nasionale Party in South Africa (*Lantern* in 1951, *Panorama* in 1956) and both journals received – *Lantern* reluctantly – state support. *Lantern* and *Panorama* continued to appear until the 1990s (the former ceasing publication in 1994, the latter in 1992) with the result that the two series provide insights into a national landscape for over more than 40 years.7

Since an analysis of more than 500 publications is beyond the scope of this article, I have selected for consideration only the cover designs of *Lantern* and *Panorama* that appeared from 1948 up to and including 1961, when the Union of South Africa became an independent republic and left the British Commonwealth.

This timeframe represents an important period of *becoming* for South Africans, of the construction and elaboration (as well as contestation) of an official national identity. Isolating the covers from the contents of the magazines serves two purposes. Firstly, magazine covers are tasked with encapsulating a magazine’s identity, point of view and contents, but also with heightening the desire to acquire the product: they are, according to the editor of *Newsweek*, a ‘unique seduction point for readers’ (Brown cited in Haughney 2012:2). Within the context of this singular imperative, *Lantern* and *Panorama* covers, in themselves, call for scrutiny. From a practical point of view, the choice of covers provides a discrete and manageable sample that nevertheless allows for some reflection on editorial content, as is evident in the background that follows.
Lantern and Panorama: A background

*Lantern* launched its first trial issue in August 1949 (Figure 3); from its inception, the editor, Vivian Wood, employed professional designers to art direct its covers. The successive approaches of Wynand Smit (Figures 3, 4 and 5), Kobus Esterhuysen (Figures 6 and 7), George Duby (Figures 8 and 9) and Ernst de Jong (Figures 2, 10, 11) reflect design trends in Europe and the United States of America (USA), but despite these individual contributions, *Lantern* covers – with three exceptions (Figures 3, 12, 13) – invariably utilise illustration.8

*Panorama*, on the other hand, consistently – with eight exceptions (Figures 14 to 21) in a sample of 64 – uses full-bleed photography on its covers (for example, Figures 22 to 32). Although *Panorama* had a resident art director, Alan Cox, it is clear that the editor Otto Adendorff, founding editor and ‘father’ of *Panorama* (Maree 1981:sp), imprinted his personal vision upon the design of the journal. During a conversation with the author, Adendorff (2001) confirmed that the large format photo-essays of the North American publication *Life* had been the template for *Panorama*. When asked why he regarded photography as such a powerful medium, Adendorff (2001) replied: ‘It is more trustworthy. You believe it. You see the thing with your own eyes’.

While both publications chose for their mastheads signifiers that were identical in meaning in English and Afrikaans, *Lantern* alone is bilingual, featuring both official languages in one issue. *Panorama* was published separately in English and in Afrikaans (Adendorff 2001). *Lantern* has a modest, squarish format of 215 mm x 280 mm – printed on matte paper that, with its flat stitched binding, conveys a bookish appearance. *Panorama* – printed on glossy paper – utilises a generous portrait format of 260 mm x 340 mm. *Panorama* is stapled, not stitched, lending it an informal air and aligning it with newspapers rather than books.

The first experimental issue of *Lantern* was published by the Union Education Department (Van Zyl 1994:4), but subsequent issues were published by the independent Association for Adult Education – currently known as the South African Agency for Science and Technology Advancement (SAASTA)9 – founded with the sole purpose of producing the journal. Although the state was again to become a patron in 1957 (Van Zyl 1994:13), *Lantern*’s early existence was an independent one; as such, it needed to charge a cover price (five shillings) and carried advertising. The Association obtained permission from the Treasury to have civil servants subscribe by stop order and, initially, free copies were sent to school-leavers (Van Zyl 1994:22). By 1954
there were 21,000 subscribers, who were (it might fairly be assumed) white, predominantly Afrikaans and probably exclusively South African. **Lantern** appeared only four times per year. Conversely, **Panorama** was published and entirely funded by the State Information Office in Pretoria and never featured advertising (Adendorff 2001). Despite this subsidy, **Panorama** was not distributed free of charge. Although initially appearing once every two months, it soon increased its output to twelve issues per year. **Panorama**’s letters pages reveal an audience with cameras, leisure time, money to travel and, in many cases, a tertiary education. In 1991, the South African Communication Service (the successor to the State Information Office) conducted a survey (Profiel en behoeftes van die leser van Suid-Afrikaanse Panorama: ‘n Kernopsomming 1991) as to **Panorama**’s South African readership. Notably, many of the respondents had been subscribers since 1956. In 1991, the majority (58.1 per cent) of the respondents were (older) white males, predominantly English speaking with tertiary qualifications, and 41.9 per cent were (younger) white females, predominantly Afrikaans, without tertiary training. Despite the overwhelmingly positive response recorded in...
the survey, Panorama ceased publication in December 1992.

The situation outlined above adumbrates the objectives of the two journals. According to Dr AJ van Zyl (1994:4) '[t]he name Lantern was chosen because ... [the journal] was conceived as throwing light on the subject of “adult education” ...'. PJ Theron (1949:7), Director of Adult Education in the Union Education Department, writing in the first issue of Lantern, states:

Amidst directionlessness, superficiality and social disruption, so typical of our time ... there exists ... [a] thirst for knowledge to withstand the hard battle for survival, but also a desire for cultural enrichment to bring about a greater spiritual equilibrium ... In my opinion, there is no better time for the appearance of this journal.

Several special editions are dedicated entirely to a foreign culture: Belgium (Figure 6), the Netherlands (Figure 11), Israel (Figure 33), the USA (Figure 34) and Japan (Figure 35). Two editions provide dense texts on the tenets of Western civilisation, and the classical heritage of Rome and Greece (Figures 36 and 37). *Lantern* thus offered an outward-looking and eclectic ‘cultural enrichment’, constructing overt links with a European culture.

*Panorama*, on the other hand, emerged because of the need for promotional material at South African information offices overseas (Adendorff 2001). In the opening article of *Panorama*’s first issue, the editorial (Information please! 1956:2) outlines the aim of the magazine:

> When the atomic bomb overtook the sword, the camera took over from the pen … The spreading of information is one of the most important activities of the State in the modern age. By common consent, it is the picture rather than the printed word that tells the story … [Panorama’s] purpose is to tell South Africans – and others – about South Africa, about its peoples, their
way of life, their achievements, their country’s place in the world.

Panorama is inward-looking and self-valorising. Its purpose, according to Adendorff (2001), was to prove to the outside world that ‘we were not a backward African country’. This is made clear in an article, on the back cover of the first issue, that warns: ‘In case of war, the Union will have its own nuclear physicists’. In support of this claim, two full colour photographs display South Africa’s very own cyclotron. Another goal was to be positive: everybody was writing South Africa ‘down’; Panorama was ‘writing it up’ (Adendorff 2001). Summarising this approach, Adendorff (2001) referred pointedly to the metaphor employed on the cover of the first issue (Figure 1): As the artist JH Pierneef paints the ‘panorama of the countryside’, Panorama presents the country to its audience.

The difficulty here is that an artist’s canvas crops the panoramic view. The new Penguin English dictionary (Allen 2000:1007) defines the word panorama as ‘an unobstructed or complete view of a landscape … [or] a comprehensive presentation or survey of a series of events’. The views on Panorama covers are neither unobstructed, nor complete; they fail to contextualise
their relentlessly positive reportage, and are selective in their portrayal of cultural experiences within South Africa despite Panorama’s claim to tell the story of South Africa’s ‘place in the world’.

Attention from a wondering world

Although the first printed record of the term apartheid appeared in 1929 (Giliomee 2003:454), the coming to power of the Herenigde Nasionale Party under the leadership of DF Malan signalled the consolidation of this ideology in the then Union of South Africa.17 In 1949, the prohibition of the Mixed Marriages Act became the first major piece of apartheid legislation, and in 1950, an amendment to the Immorality Act was passed to ban ‘sexual relations between blacks and whites’. This was followed by the Population Registration Act, designed to provide definitions of race, and the Group Areas Act, intended to restrict groups to their own sections of towns.

In 1952, parliament introduced a system of reference books for black Africans. Rioting led to the Public Safety Act, while membership of the African National
Congress (ANC) increased from 7,000 to 100,000. In 1953, the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act was introduced and in 1956, coloured persons were removed from the general voters’ role. On 21 March 1960, a non-violent action by the Pan-African Congress erupted into a bloodbath at Sharpeville. A state of emergency was declared and South Africa was plunged into an economic crisis. However, by the end of 1960, Prime Minister HF Verwoerd had managed to secure a 52 per cent majority in a referendum to establish South Africa as an independent republic; in May 1961, this became a reality. In the same year, Nelson Mandela proposed the adoption of armed struggle to achieve black African aims.

In considering the events following 1948, Willem de Klerk (1975:241) remarks: ‘[N]ever have so few drawn such sharp critical attention from a wondering world’. De Klerk (1975:241, emphasis in original) regards the oppressive policies of the Nationalist Party government as a ‘... passionate, most radical will to restructure the world according to a vision of justice’; others regarded it more simply as an attempt to secure the future of white South Africans (Scholtz 1954:136).
It is the uncertain future of the ‘artificial project’ of this white nation that underpins the arguments of both Lantern and Panorama. For many, this future was predicated upon a national character that, in the 1950s, appears as a troubling question, hence Theron’s (1949:7) anxiety about the sedelike verval [moral decay] ‘so typical of our time’. Given the context, it is likely that Theron’s diatribe refers to the volk, or the white Afrikaner, as opposed to the South African population as a whole. The writings of GD Scholtz echo Theron’s misgivings and encapsulate the urgent need amongst Afrikaner intellectuals to secure cultural as well economic survival after 1948.19 Scholtz (1954:172), who finds no virtue in his fellow Afrikaners apart from their ‘brainpower’, sets out to demonstrate the shortcomings of his people in order to provoke a turnaround. Most pressing is the obsessive isolationist nature of the Afrikaner (Scholtz 1954:17). Scholtz (1954:28-31) decries the rancour with which the Afrikaner regards European culture, claiming that a severance of its ‘umbilical cord’ would be ‘fatal’ and pleads with some force that spiritual links with Western Europe should be retained by means of the study of foreign languages, European literature and ‘real’ art.
Scholtz (1954:63) also condemns the Afrikaner’s exploitation of agricultural land [roofbou] with the exclusive purpose of generating wealth. He paints a dire picture of the sub-continent of Africa as ‘The Great Uninhabitable South African Desert’ and calls for large-scale rehabilitation (Scholtz 1954:69). Scholtz (1954:78-80) slates the Afrikaner’s spiritual and cultural mores, declaring that the ‘strength of a nation [volk] cannot in the first place be measured in terms of its weaponry’. The time when respect for morals was a characteristic of the volk is past; this shift, according to Scholtz (1954:83), can be attributed to urbanisation and manifests itself in a loosening from the church, in materialism, a love of dancing, the cinema and rugby, too much sunshine and a weakness for titillating novels and popular magazines.

An overarching problem for Scholtz (1954:92) is the self-satisfied nature of the Afrikaners, most tellingly revealed in their belief that boeremusiek is high art (Scholtz 1954:96).20 Scholtz, in proposing a solution, demands considerable sacrifice: apart from relinquishing the cinema and rugby in order to study Latin, whites also have to wash their own dishes.21 As commendable as Scholtz’s ideals may appear, it should be noted that their purpose was to ensure white supremacy, ‘total segregation’ (Scholtz 1954:169) and
the eventual removal of all black Africans from South African soil.

Within the context of these conditions, both material and ideological in South Africa of the 1950s, it is of interest to study the letters pages of *Panorama* during this period. Mrs FW Hickling (1958:1), for example, writes from Sussex, in England: ‘The excellent articles and splendid pictures make for a greater understanding of your wonderful country’. A cursory glance at the covers of *Panorama* raises doubts as to whether ‘understanding’ is the aim of the publication, yet it has convinced its readers that the story it is telling is an accurate one. *Lantern* has no letters page, but its trial issue in August 1949 draws on the support of eminent citizens such as Advocate AA Roberts (1949:7) who distinguishes between the ‘masses of food’, provided by books and newspapers, and ‘the vitamins of the mind’ delivered by *Lantern*. Unlike *Panorama* – that seeks to demonstrate that South Africans uphold a ‘superlatively high standard’ (Information please! 1956:2) – *Lantern* aims to address the ‘urgent need’ (Roberts 1949:7) in South Africa for ‘mental pabulum’.22 A glance at *Lantern’s* covers suggests that this might, indeed, be what the publication achieves.
The medium as message

How did the covers of Lantern and Panorama set about gaining adherence to their arguments?

By utilising photography as a medium, Panorama urges its audience to believe in its ‘story’. Katherine McCoy (1990:11) points out that representational photography colludes in an ordered process based on ‘semi-scientific’ problem solving, where the goal is factual accuracy – a ‘precise record’, in the words of the constructivist designer Gustav Klutsis (in Roberts 1998:26). This notion of an ‘unobstructed’ view is enhanced on Panorama covers by the large format and the amount of space allocated to the South African sky (albeit not necessarily a cloudless one). South Africa exists as a sophisticated industrial entity with an abundance of nature and natural resources (Figures 22 to 32). There is no end of friendly fertile women, wealth, leisure, and good weather (Figures 38 to 41) – Adendorff (2001) confirms that Panorama offers sunshine as a unique selling proposition. Most importantly for Mrs Hickling’s understanding of South Africa when she gazes upon the covers of Panorama: black, coloured and Asian peoples are not in the picture.

Lantern’s decision, in turn, to feature illustration on its covers at first appears to contradict its claim to be ‘a scientifically planned journal’ (Roberts 1949:7). As
McCoy (1990:11) indicates, illustration was rejected by the ‘dead serious’ modernist designers who subscribed to the view that ‘photography would serve democracy, helping to construct a modernist polis’ (Bolton 1992:xii, emphasis in original). The medium offered ‘transparency and obviousness’ (Bolton 1992:xii) and transformed spectatorship from the realm of the spiritual to the non-elitist collective (Roberts 1998:22). This ‘illusion of neutrality’ (Bolton 1992: xiii, emphasis in original) reaches its apogee in the work of 1950s Swiss designer Josef Müller-Brockmann, who treats the photographic image as ‘an objective symbol’ (Meggs & Purvis 2006:365). Conversely, the potential for illustration as a subjective and coercive device is demonstrated in the work of the German designer Ludwig Hohlwein, whose posters concretised Adolf Hitler’s passionate radio addresses about the ‘German “master race”’ (Meggs & Purvis 2006:278).

The illustrations on the covers of Lantern, however, remain ambiguous and open to interpretation, suggesting concepts rather than dictating their reality (for example, Figures 42 and 43). By depicting the human figure in a non-specific way, Esterhuysen, for example, does not exclude any specific group of people from the pursuits explored inside the journal (for example, Figure 44). Notably, in the opening message in its first issue, the Honourable Minister Dr AJ Stals (1949:6) states that Lantern’s target audience is ‘iedere landsburger’ [each and every citizen]. De Jong Studios, tasked with responding to the somewhat controversial event of South Africa becoming a republic, depicts symbols of South Africa’s European heritage as ideological iconography diluted by its stylised treatment (Figure 46). It is of interest to compare Figure 46 to the Panorama cover celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Union of South Africa (Figure 47) where the signifiers...
of a big sky and youthful, all-white nation dominate the argument. As Richard Bolton (1992:xii) observes, for every claim postulating its objectivity, ‘there can be found an opposing claim emphasizing the difficult language introduced by the photograph, a language based in the realities of framing, juxtaposition, and surreality’. In this instance, it is the Lantern cover that occupies a position of neutrality with regard to current events and arguably facilitates an agreement amongst citizens that terminates in ‘reciprocal understanding, shared knowledge, mutual trust, and accord with one another’ (Habermas 1979:3).

A cursory examination of Lantern and Panorama covers thus supports my parents’ judgment, namely that the former responds to the paradigm of visual communication design in which ‘information is noble’, while the latter falls foul of the condition in which ‘persuasion is distasteful’ (McCoy 2000:80). However, if ‘[d]esign can never be neutral’ (Sauthoff 1999:123), it must be conceded that Lantern, too, sets out to persuade, but it appears to engage with what Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:51) refer to as ‘epdctic oratory … [in which] the speaker turns educator’. Panorama covers, on the other hand, appear aligned with the practice of propaganda that is typically taken to encompass the dissemination of information of a ‘biased or misleading nature’ (Propaganda 2011).

Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:513), however, are critical of the distinction between judgements of
reality (that is, truth) and value judgements (subjective versions of the truth). If truth is to provide understanding, the criteria of truth must be free of all ambiguity and therefore be ‘beyond discussion’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:513). Panorama can only be condemned as ‘untruthful’ if every person in its potential audience has agreed to the exact terms of truth. But, if this were possible, then ‘critical argumentation becomes entirely incomprehensible’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:512). If Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca’s premise is applied to the arguments on the covers of Lantern and Panorama, the question that must be asked is not whether these arguments are ‘noble’ or ‘distasteful’, but whether they do what is necessary to increase the mind’s adherence (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:4). In order to reflect upon this question, the three stages of argumentation, as proposed by Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca and realised on the covers of Lantern and Panorama, is considered below.

The framework of the argument

All argumentation aims at gaining the adherence of minds; to gain maximum advantage in argumentation, consideration must be given to the framework
within which any attempt at persuasion takes place – in this case education and propaganda. Since it ‘is indeed the audience which has the major role in determining the quality of argument and the behaviour of orators’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:14–16), Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:51) argue that a clear distinction should be made between these concepts. The educator is commissioned by a community to be the spokesperson for the values the community recognises. Educators are those who, in a society, defend the traditional and accepted, not the new and revolutionary, values. Education does not always express truths; rather, it defends values that are not a matter of controversy in the group. Propaganda, on the other hand, ‘profits from the spectacular aspect of the visible changes it seeks to … bring about’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:54): notably, the original Congregatio de propaganda fide was an organisation that had as its objective the conversion of non-believers to Roman Catholicism (Allen 2000:1116) – a ‘spectacular’ change.

Following from this understanding of the terms, it becomes clear that Lantern, for all its aspirations to educate, should be recognised for its propagandistic nature. Although eventually part-sponsored by the state (it
Lantern was initially an independent undertaking by a small group of people who only relinquished their independence when the alternative would have been the termination of the journal. As such, the volk had not commissioned Lantern to be a spokesperson for the values the community recognised – values which, following from Scholtz’s observations, were diametrically opposed to those propagated by Lantern.

Lantern laboured to reverse Afrikaner isolationism by regularly featuring articles, artworks and literature from Europe as well as dedicating several issues to overviews of foreign countries; its bilingual format, rather than accommodate an English audience, encouraged white Afrikaners to acquire a ‘foreign’ language. The covers echo the intellectual, often abstract, nature of a content that eschewed any reference to what the volk – according to Scholtz – really found compelling. Lantern, therefore, sought to bring about spectacular change.

From this realisation, it is but a short step to understanding that Panorama served to educate its audience, not to convert them. As a state publication, the journal had been given a mandate by South African voters to defend the traditional and accepted values of the community. Panorama covers may not accurately reflect conditions in South Africa in the 1950s and 1960s, but they accurately communicate existing

---

Figure 42: Kobus Esterhuysen (designer), Kobus Esterhuysen (art director), Wynand Smit (assistant to art director), 1954, cover of Lantern (3)4 – an issue that reviews the industrial and craft applications of ceramics.

Figure 43: Designer not credited (but probably Esterhuysen), Kobus Esterhuysen (art director), 1955, cover of Lantern (5)1. Articles consider, inter alia, the influence of noise on human beings, African music and the translation of Oedipus Rex into Afrikaans.
beliefs about these conditions. In this regard, Panorama, almost by design, counters every concern that Scholtz raises; the very first issue of Panorama calls upon ‘weaponry’ – Scholtz’s (1954:78-80) bête noire – to verify the strength of the nation.26 Scholtz, and Lantern, were fighting the more difficult battle in that they were attempting to convert, not reaffirm. How did Lantern rise to this challenge?

The starting point of the argument

In planning an argument, the speaker chooses an ‘appropriate vehicle’ (Buchanan 1995:44) for presenting propositions to a specific audience, which devices may include the use of facts, existing values, frequency, inertia, providing evidence of support for the speaker, generating presence, and presenting data in great detail.

The starting point of argumentation presupposes a form of prior agreement between speaker and audience (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:67). Thus, whether an audience accepts something as a fact is determined by the speaker’s perception of the audience. Panorama confidently presents its ‘unobstructed’ views as facts on its covers, because it presupposes that its audience will accept these views as facts. By utilising illustration, Lantern avoids, for the most part, any claim to factual information on its covers, challenging its readers to interpret data rather than be passive receptors of beliefs, attitudes and values.
A persuasive speaker, on the other hand, appeals to existing values in order to induce the audience to make certain choices (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:75; Tyler 1996:105). Rather than proposing new values, Panorama emphasises beliefs already existing in the audience. The argument of white supremacy was not a revolutionary idea in 1956, neither was the notion of South Africa as a country with unlimited resources. Lantern, however, is attempting to instil new values; from the earliest issues it pointedly acknowledges a flourishing human culture in Southern Africa prior to European settlement, and voices concerns over the region’s ecology. As such, it has chosen a hazardous starting point for argumentation, a condition amplified by Lantern’s rarity.

According to Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:88), frequency is used to facilitate a passage from the normal to the norm, from what is done to what should be done. This condition is implemented by Panorama when it increases its publications to 12 issues a year. By inundating its audience with reaffirming images, Panorama effectively drowns out opposition. Lantern appears only four times a year, and consequently runs the risk of being regarded as an exceptional phenomenon – ‘an argument against th[e] situation’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:89).

All audiences are opposed to new proposals; however, the disinclination to change can be to the speaker’s advantage and in many cases ‘a speaker has no firmer support than psychical and social inertia’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:105). Inertia operates in favour of the existing state of affairs and Panorama exploits this condition. Not only does Panorama argue against change, but its covers also seldom depict white South Africans at work; activity, when depicted, is for the most part recreational (for example, Figure 48). Lantern, on the other hand, wishes to exhort its audience to action – to study, to lose weight, to travel, – and relinquishes another discursive advantage.

Panorama’s appeal to inertia on its covers is supported by its letters page. Chad Atkins in Surrey writes: ‘The impression gained from Panorama articles of progress in all parts of the Union is almost overwhelming’; Leslie Krajcsovics from Vancouver: Panorama is ‘doing a wonderful job’; a South African abroad: ‘As I read through Panorama … all I can think about … is going home’. Acclaim for the covers themselves comes from Roy Rudden in Durban: ‘Congratulations on the latest Panorama. The cover alone must have sold thousands of copies’ (Figure 51) and Piet Pessimis in Pretoria: ‘Congratulations on your Golden Cover Girl in the January issue’ (Figure 52). Panorama provides evidence that countless members of the audience are in agreement with the speaker, thereby further increasing
adherence to its propositions (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:104).

*Lantern* has no letters page, and it also avoids presence. Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:116) posit that ‘[b]y the very fact of selecting certain elements … their importance and pertinency to the discussion are implied. Indeed, such a choice endows these elements with a presence, which is an essential factor in argumentation’. However, the authors point out that presence must not be confused with fidelity to reality. The presence of the cloudless sky on *Panorama*’s covers does not have to be true to act upon the audience’s sensibilities. However, suppression of presence is an equally noteworthy phenomenon (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:118). By lessening the presence of one’s opponents, for example, one ensures that the opposition becomes an abstraction, and, therefore, unnecessary. This is a crucial starting point for *Panorama*’s argumentation: only white persons have presence on their covers.

A close connection exists between presence and emotion (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:147): in order to create emotion, it is essential to be specific. General notions and abstract schemes have hardly any effect on the imagination. Roland Barthes (1982:91) postulates that ‘photography has a power to convert … [because] it constitutes an anti-intellectual weapon’. By avoiding intellectual hurdles, by being specific, *Panorama* is
able to evoke emotion. Conversely, Lantern covers avoid concrete presence. The emotive experience of attending (or participating in) an orchestral performance is absent from in De Jong's January/March 1958 cover design (Figure 10), which reduces a complex phenomenon full of human drama to a whimsical line-drawing. As such, the cover does not act directly upon the sensibilities of the viewer; by lessening presence on its covers, Lantern itself becomes something of an abstraction.

An impression of reality is, furthermore, conveyed by ‘piling up all the conditions’ of an act; Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:145-146) point out that utopias are always described in great detail. In constructing its utopian vision, Panorama employs large scale, full-colour photography that provides the most accurate detail possible. In contrast, Lantern chooses to reduce detail by using illustration. The examples in Figures 53 and 54 both refer to articles on South Africa's game parks, but while the elephant (on the Panorama cover) is experienced as if through the eyes of an awe-struck tourist, the lion (on the Lantern cover) remains someone else's pretty drawing – a second-hand experience.

In summary, Panorama proceeds by arguing from apparent facts, regularly reinforced, while Lantern retreats into absence and ambiguity; Panorama exploits inertia, calling on its readers to validate their own values in a
letters page, while Lantern strives to shatter inertia without any support from converts in its audience; Panorama manipulates the data on its covers in order to evoke emotion, but Lantern covers elicit a deferred intellectual response compounded by the lack of detail on its covers.

Having thus established their frameworks and the starting point of the argument, the journals proceed to implement ‘the appropriate stylistic embodiment of [their] arguments’ (Buchanan 1995:44) on the covers.

Techniques of argumentation

In the third, and final, stage of argumentation, persuasive speakers employ a variety of techniques; those considered here are use of contrast, threats of loss and waste, hyperbole and litotes, and the perfect being as model.

According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1971:247):

The idea that something is good, especially if this something exists and if inertia is at work, is easily expressed by the idea that it is the best, that better could not be found.
To this purpose, Panorama presents an enthusiastic description of present circumstances in comparison to some other, less attractive, alternative – a typical utopian model. This argument lessens the effort to modify circumstances since, clearly, the loss of happiness would be considerable. By drawing on utopian tropes the highly detailed, apparently factual, narratives on the covers of Panorama stimulate imaginative thought, a quintessential ingredient in the emergence of nations (Wegner 2002:xvii). Lantern, on the other hand, offers no enthusiastic description of the present. It locates its argument in the realm of the timeless and the universal (for example, Figures 2, 10, 34, 44 and 45), abstract concepts that, perversely, ‘have hardly any effect on the imagination’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:147) at all.

Linked to the idea of a desirable present is its binary condition: the threat of waste (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:279). The optimism of the Panorama covers exhorts the audience to keep going, to fall into step and carry forward a condition that already exists. A feeling of potential loss is suggested: all this, literally the sum of the covers, will be wasted if the enterprise is given up. Lantern occasionally utilises this rhetorical technique by visualising that which may be forfeited if no education occurs (for example, Figures 3, 7, 36), ignorance being an important instance of loss. The argument of waste is thus also ‘an encouragement to knowledge, to study’ (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:280) – a central tenet of Lantern’s vision.
Hyperbole, in particular, serves the purposes of unlimited development by drawing the mind beyond that which is possible; hyperbole, according to Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:29), is ‘fired with brutality’. *Panorama*’s audience is aware that not all women in South Africa are beautiful (and white) and that not every day in South Africa is a sunny one, but the perfection presented by the relentless full-colour imagery persuades the audience to believe that maybe the majority of women and days are thus. Similarly, the audience is aware of poverty, soil erosion and drought as a reality of the South African experience, but *Panorama*’s larger-than-life agrarian idylls (Figures 23 and 55) persuade the observer that misfortune is the exception, abundance the rule.  

Litotes, on the other hand, when it seeks to establish a value, relies on something that falls short of that value. It can be argued that Lantern chooses litotes as a deliberate rejection of hyperbole and its associations of brutality (e.g., Figures 7, 34, 44 and 46). Perelman and Ohlbrechts-Tyteca (1971:292) suspect that litotes carries more power than is generally admitted; its usefulness, however, depends on a situation where the audience is aware of the hyperbole that is being rejected and
that the audience rejects the brutality of the hyperbole in turn – as did my parents.

Particular behaviour may serve to establish a general rule; it may also inspire an audience to action (Perelman & Ohlbrechts-Tyteca 1971:362). Panorama, somewhat unexpectedly, uses relatively few persons whose prestige confers added value on the arguments of the magazine (e.g., Figures 1, 40 and 58), but this forbearance is seen as a rhetorical device in itself: in order to increase its credibility, Panorama avoids both the use of what may be perceived as an artificial technique, and the negative impact of a fall from grace of the perfect being.

Lantern, in its avoidance of presence, might be expected to completely eschew perfect beings, but some do appear. The January/March 1960 cover is Lantern’s tribute to the fiftieth anniversary of the South African Union (Figure 57), while Panorama’s July 1961 cover pays homage to the establishment of a South African republic (Figure 58). Both covers feature photographic portraits. The portrait of CR Swart – South Africa’s first state president – is a calculated risk for Panorama. It embodies all the trappings of political coercion, pushing itself upon the audience in terrible, paternalistic detail. Barthes (1982:93) refers to this type of photography as ‘the tyranny of an ideal’. Here argument by model intersects with argument of waste: had the 1960 referendum swung the other way, this splendid symbol of sovereignty would have been lost. On the Lantern
cover, however, the faces of the founding fathers of the Union have been reduced to a decorative texture within a grid redolent of mathematical forms and architectural schemas, perhaps signifying the impotence of human agency in the face of universal laws.

In summary, Lantern rejects conventional techniques of persuasion, such as Panorama’s seductive references to utopia and its use of hyperbole, turning instead to litotes as a means to differentiate its voice, even when utilising more compelling techniques such as argument by a perfect being.

Conclusion

In the pursuit of their goals, did Panorama and Lantern do what was necessary to increase the mind’s adherence? Arguably, yes. Panorama was immensely popular and undoubtedly contributed to positive, albeit blinkered, perceptions of South Africa. Lantern, by rejecting hyperbole, forfeited popularity but gained adherence from a select audience that identified with its reductionism. Both publications appeared for the best part of 40 years; Panorama was removed from the South African cultural landscape for ideological reasons; Lantern merely faded away, a doomed victim of its inverted rhetoric.

Was Panorama as wicked and Lantern as saintly as I was led to believe? The answer with regard to Lantern is fairly straightforward; conclusions about Panorama are more complex. Panorama, between 1956 and 1961, regularly featured essays on coloured, Indian, and, especially, black African cultures. However, because of the latter’s absence (with two interesting exceptions, January and March 1960) from the covers, the material inside the publication operates as a picturesque and/or valorising backdrop to the ‘superlatively high standard’ of South Africa’s white community. Nevertheless, despite its commitment to sell apartheid as ‘separate development’ (Adendorff 2001), Panorama’s role in documenting a broader African culture should not be dismissed out of hand. For example, in October 1961, this state-funded publication ran a prominent article on the Mapungubwe find, belying more recent accusations that the apartheid regime suppressed information about the Stone Age site (Maree 2000:12). It is also of interest that Panorama’s English-speaking devotees – rather unexpectedly – outnumbered its Afrikaans readers.

For its part, Lantern, in the cover designs of Ernst de Jong, exposed South Africans to graphic design of an international standard. The vision of the journal lives on in SAASTA, whose aim remains the advancement of ‘public awareness, appreciation and engagement of science, engineering and technology in South Africa’ (Overview [sa]). Ironically, 60 years after the launch of its assault on the ‘directionlessness, superficiality and social disruption’ of the nation, SAASTA’s adversaries remain much the same – although Facebook™ may conceivably have replaced boeremusiek as national icon of high art.

Notes

1 Although the full title of the magazine is South African Panorama, it was generally referred to as Panorama and for the purposes of this article the latter signifier is, therefore, used.

2 Notably, the article by the de Jongs is entitled Design in advertising. Although the term ‘graphic design’ was first used in the 1920s, the profession was still referred to as ‘commercial art’ well into the 1970s. The Lantern article legitimises the field as
a profession, both by using the term ‘design’ and situating itself in a culturally elevated editorial environment.

3 Stella Viljoen (2009), for example, subsequent to her work on *Die Huisgenoot*, examines male identities in men’s glossy magazines in the ‘new’ South Africa.

4 Smith (2003:12) separates the notions of *nation* and *ethnic community*; whites in South Africa arguably fall into the latter category. Smith also denies that German National Socialism is a form of nationalism ‘because its creed of racial inequality is incompatible with the nationalist vision of a plurality of unique and free nations’ (Breuilly 1993:3).


6 Bonsiepe (1999:167) declares that ‘[i]nformation without rhetoric … is a pipe-dream … [and] the notion of impartial objectivity … a myth’; Sauthoff (1999:123) concurs that ‘[d]esign can never be neutral’.

7 Information regarding publication dates, contents, formats, names of designers and editors was gleaned from the journals themselves.

8 For the purposes of this study, the descriptor *illustration* includes photomontage. Where an existing illustration or artwork has been photographed (for example, Figure 21), the covers are also regarded as *illustrative*.

9 In 2001, when this research was initiated, the Association was known as the Foundation for Education, Science and Technology (FEST). FEST changed its name after being incorporated into the National Research Foundation (NRF) in 2002 (Overview [sa]).

10 According to Adendorff (2001), this was a deliberate strategy to increase the credibility of the publication; however, prominent persons in South Africa, as well as South Africans living overseas, received complementary copies.

11 The survey received 6,825 responses, of which 6,247 were analysed. Criticism, such as it was, mainly targeted distribution. Seven per cent of respondents complained that the publication was too luxurious and glossy; 5.1 per cent objected to the English version of *Panorama* being a literal translation from the Afrikaans; 13.3 per cent disapproved of the ‘onverbloemde [undisguised] propaganda’. Conversely, a positive comment reads: ‘Excellent propaganda for South Africa …!’ The survey was distributed in June 1991, 15 months after the release of Nelson Mandela from the Victor Verster Prison.

12 Van Zyl was director of the Pretoria College for Advanced Technical Education in the 1940s (Khuswayo 2005:312), and chairman of the Association of Colleges for Advanced Technical Education in the 1970s (A survey of race relations in South Africa 1972). He had a particular interest in adult education.

13 ‘How to iron a shirt’; ‘Petrol from coal’; ‘Come travel to Holland’.

14 It was eventually translated into ten languages, including Italian, German, Spanish, French and Chinese (Adendorff 2001).

15 A cyclotron is a particle accelerator used to produce radio-active isotopes.
It is ironic, given its commitment to the photograph, that Panorama draws on the metaphor of painting and illustration, the preferred medium of its counterpart, Lantern, as a framework for its argument.

For the purposes of this article, the factual account of the political events in South Africa 1948-1961 is drawn from the Reader’s Digest Illustrated history of South Africa (1994), edited by Dougie Oakes.

The term coloured, in a South African context, is somewhat problematic; usually taken to mean ‘people of mixed descent’ (Oakes 1994:531), it was, and remains at the time of writing, an official racial classification distinct from ‘white’, ‘black’, or ‘Asian’.

For a comprehensive overview of writings on Afrikaner identity during this period, see Van Jaarsveld (1981:1-72). Scholtz occupied an eminent position within the Afrikaner intellectual sphere and his publication Het die Afrikaner ‘n toekoms? (Does the Afrikaner have a future?) (1954) reflects National Party leadership’s opinion in the early 1950s.

Boeremusiek is informal folk music that is primarily intended as an accompaniment at social dancing (What is Boer Music? [sa]).

The notion that whites had to reduce their dependence on black labour was a tenet of what Giliomee (2003:482) refers to as ‘the apartheid theorists’.

Roberts liberally sprinkles his message with Latin quotations. Conversely, the opening message in the same issue of Lantern, from the Honourable Minister Dr AJ Stals, reflects an Afrikaans idiom redolent of its humble rural origins. The disparity probably exasperated Scholtz (who no doubt read this issue of Lantern).

This ideal of mutual trust and accord is reinforced by the fact that throughout its existence Lantern retained both the Prime Minister as well as the Leader of the Parliamentary Opposition as patrons.

Informal research suggests that few, if any, English South Africans were aware of, let alone read, Lantern.

Viljoen (2006:26) reports that by the 1950s readers of another South African magazine, Huisgenoot, were judging the publication to be too removed, too set upon good taste and intellectual pursuits; consequently, ‘standards had to be lowered to cater for popular tastes’.

Panorama, despite its inward-looking content, evokes American self-aggrandisement. Adendorff had been South African Director of Information in the USA and the influence of this country’s media culture on the editorial content of Panorama arguably played a major role in the popularity of the publication amongst South Africans.

Of the six covers (during the period 1951-1961) that reflect productive activity, two (January 1960; June 1961) depict South Africans of colour – coincidentally the only covers to depict persons of colour. The January 1960 cover (Figure 47) depicts a young coloured girl painting at an easel; it is a singular image, even in terms of the entire (1956-1990) series of Panorama covers, and was the second to last issue of Panorama before Sharpeville. The June 1961 cover (Figure 48) depicts mining headgear with two small figures, one white, one black, in the foreground. This would be the last
depiction of a non-white South African on Panorama covers for several years.

28 As, ironically, it does in Smith’s cover of South African Panorama 4(9), 1959, which is arguably the reason that Adendorff and Cox never employed this highly stylised approach again.

29 Also compare Figures 9 and 52.

30 This having been said, Panorama covers in this sample display few images of farms and crops, the latter arguably being too suggestive of labour. Two covers depict deserts (for example, Figure 55), but as picturesque tourist destinations, not drought-ridden wastelands.
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