

[1952-53]

Part I. The Theory and Practice of Apartheid

The Union of South Africa is one of the three sovereign States in Africa, south of the Sahara, the other two being Liberia and Ethiopia. Within the British Commonwealth of Nations it ranks as a Dominion which means that it is self-governing in regard to both its internal and external affairs. Admittedly no recognised public authority, not even the United Nations, has yet succeeded in laying down undisputed criteria for determining the circumstances under which any territory can be said to be self-governing in the proper sense of the term. Thus in some quarters it may be questioned whether a country in which the majority of the inhabitants are denied any effective share in its government can justifiably be classified as self-governing. In all probability if this criterion were to be strictly applied, ~~many~~ a number of so-called sovereign states, including the Union of South Africa, might not be able to emerge successfully from the test. At all events, in international circles at the present time, rightly or wrongly, it is generally accepted that the Union of South Africa is a self-governing country belonging to the Western group of democratic countries.

Situated at the shank end of what has been a neglected if not a forgotten continent, the affairs of the Union of South Africa have until recently not attracted much attention outside its borders. The country has largely been unaffected by the dynamic forces and factors which have shaped the course of history in the modern world. Even in usually well informed circles in Europe, America and elsewhere, the Union of South Africa has hitherto spelt no more than gold, diamonds, the Kruger National Park and Field-Marshall Smuts. Under the influence and leadership of this Boer War veteran the Union has played its part in two World Wars, and even to the present conflict in Korea, it has made a token contribution which has no doubt earned golden opinions in certain United Nations' circles. But apart from the notice she has received owing to the appearances of her military forces in various war theatres, South Africa has in the main been left to go her own sweet way without the spotlight of world publicity being directed on her internal affairs. Here we have a country whose isolationism is not only a matter of deliberate, conscious policy on the part of its rulers, but also the result of what practically amounts to studied indifference on the part of the outside world. Their relative remoteness from the main thoroughfares and cross-roads of the modern world has permitted South Africans to enjoy the doubtful luxury of isolationism and to develop a hard crust of insensitiveness to contemporary currents of thought and action combined with a somewhat juvenile propensity for paroxysms of rage when confronted with criticism from any quarter.

within or without her borders. To be left alone to do as they please is the dearest, if anachronistic, wish of those who wield power in South Africa. Hence their rather violent reaction to the increased attention which that country's affairs have received in recent years. South Africa's continued refusal to place the territory of South-West Africa under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, the debates in the Assembly of the United Nations regarding her treatment of Indians in South Africa, her expressed intention to demand from the United Kingdom Government the transfer to her of the High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland, her indirect influence on the decision of the British Government in the affairs of Seretse Khama, the exiled Chief of the Bamangwato tribe--these and other questions have caused many people to rub their eyes and to look around for information about this country which has the effrontery to defy world opinion as represented by the United Nations--and to get away with it. Turning the spotlight of world publicity on South Africa has revealed that this is likely to be one ~~one~~ of the trouble spots of the world in the years that lie ahead. Practically for the first time serious-minded observers and representatives of the world Press are beginning to inform the world about the policies that are being propagated and put into practice ~~these~~, and in view of the interdependence of the modern world questions are naturally being asked as to whether the interests of international peace and security are not being endangered by the world tolerance of the situation which is developing in that area.

In order to appreciate the basic issues involved in the South African situation it is well to bear in mind the multi-racial character of the population, and in particular the relative proportions of the racial groups represented there. The population of the Union is generally classified into four main racial categories, namely, European, (white), Africans, Asiatics and Mixed or Coloured. The Europeans number approximately 2½ millions, the Africans 8½ millions, the Asiatics (mainly Indians but including Chinese) 300,000 and the Mixed or Coloured 1 million. The Europeans, though obviously an immigrant group, have been established in this area since 1652; the Asians originally came into the country as indentured labourers about 1860 on the invitation of the Natal Government; the Africans are indigenous to the country, although the ~~European~~ Europeans claim that they are not;

3

the Mixed or Coloured are the result of miscegenation between black and white, although they include a group of Malays who were originally brought into the country as slaves from the East. The crux of the South African problem lies in the fact that these groups are all determined to make South Africa their permanent home, but have not yet discovered a satisfactory basis on which they can be welded into a united nation. The European section which at present holds the reins of power "governs itself according to the familiar democratic procedures of the Western world, with adult suffrage for men and women and a parliamentary system derived from the British Parliament and modelled closely upon it". The belief of the South African European in democracy is, however, coupled with a conviction that to extend its benefits to the non-white groups in the country would for him be suicidal, and therefore successive South African governments have striven to devise a political, economic and social system for the country that would ensure the permanent supremacy of the European in national, provincial(state) or local life. This process has culminated in the adoption of what is known as the policy of apartheid(separation) espoused by the present government. This policy makes no pretence at being based on so-called democratic principles; it is frankly and openly designed by its proponents to preserve the baasskap(boss-ship) of the white man on a permanent basis. "Apartheid rests on the recognition that there are differences which are not man-made". In other words the policy is of set purpose linked with factors which are beyond the control of the groups involved-- their race or colour. The white by virtue of his white skin shall forever and under all circumstances remain a master to all non-whites; the non-white, whatever the circumstances, shall on ground of his race or colour, remain permanently an inferior to all whites.

HOW APARTHEID WORKS. In order to give effect to this policy South Africa has adopted various legislative and administrative ~~measures~~ measures in different spheres of life. Thus in the political sphere legislative steps have been taken to deprive all non-whites of the political rights normally enjoyed by whites, namely, the right to vote for or to become members of governing bodies whether national, provincial(state) or local. As a sop to the non-white groups who previously enjoyed these rights under British rule in the Cape Colony(new the Cape Province), they are permitted, under stringent property and educational qualifications not applicable to whites, to elect a limited number of whites

4.

to represent them on a separate basis in the national legislature and in the Cape Provincial(state) Council. Africans have since 1936 been <sup>granted</sup> three such white representatives in the Union House of Assembly, while Coloureds(Mixed) under a law passed in 1951 have been allowed four such representatives, as against the white group which has 156 representatives in the same House. The non-whites are constantly reminded that this limited representation accorded to them is a privilege of which they may be deprived if they show any lack of a sense of responsibility in the exercise of it, as e.g. electing persons with 'communistic' views to represent them. A sword of Damocles continually hangs over these socalled "native representatives" who must take <sup>CAYE</sup> not to advocate measures which are incompatible with the basic ~~pink~~ policy of white supremacy. In keeping with the policy of white domination the Government takes care not to countenance the establishment for non-whites of public bodies likely to lead to the crystallisation of, say, African opinion and the development of a national consciousness among the African people. Hence the abolition in 1950 of the Native Representative Council established in 1937 under the Representation of Natives Act of 1936, a body which, consisting ~~pinkly~~ of partly elected and partly nominated African members, committed the unpardonable sin of being too consistently unanimous in its condemnation of the policy of racial discrimination. The relevant sections of the Act of 1936 have been replaced by the <sup>Bantu</sup> Bantu Authorities Act in terms of which special local advisory bodies are to be established for the Bantu on a tribal or "ethnic" basis. This is the old imperialist device of "divide and rule" to be applied with twentieth century technical efficiency. The Africans have, of course, made it clear that it is not their intention to turn back the clock of history. The idea of African nationalism has in fact been strengthened rather weakened by the appearance of the Bantu Authorities Act.

Not satisfied with this the South African Government under the pretext of dealing with the 'menace' of communism has taken unto itself powers which can be used to silence all critics of the status quo. Under the Suppression of Communism Act ~~is~~ which is made retrospective and in which the term 'communism' is vaguely and loosely defined, individuals and organisations, white or non-white, which advocate a departure from a policy based on racial discrimination run the risk of being 'listed' as communistic and being made to suffer the heavy penalties provided for in the Act without having the right of recourse to the Courts. Thus it may be said that in the policy of racial discrimination the

Government has armed itself with adequate safeguards against any possible invasion ~~by~~  
non-whites of the citadel of white supremacy.

In the economic sphere white political supremacy has inexorably led to white economic supremacy. The European has used his political power to get for his exclusive benefit the lion's share of the land. Under the land laws of the country, principally the Natives Land of 1913 read together with the Native Land and Trust Act of 1936 African land rights have been restricted to an area covering a possible  $17\frac{1}{2}$  million morgen of land (a morgen equals 2 acres) out of a total area of 143 million morgen. Various arguments are of course employed to justify this inequitable distribution of land between black and white. One is that in view of the backward state of African agriculture it is right that more land should be placed at the disposal of the white man who can make better use of it. Another argument is that the Native Reserves, i.e. the areas set aside for African occupation lie within the best rainfall areas of the Union. Thus Dr van Biljon in his book, "Grensgebakens tussen Blank en Swart in Suid-Afrika" ("Border Landmarks between White and Black in South Africa") says: "Almost all the areas set aside for Natives lie within the productive regions of the Union. Figures for the productive land set aside for Europeans and Natives show the following:-

Area of the Union.....	143,128,954 morgen
Productive Area.....	60,000,000
Productive part set aside for Natives.....	17,672,935
Percentage of Productive part of Union set aside for Natives.....	30%".

The learned author is, of course not worried by the fact that on his own figures which in any case are of doubtful validity only 30% of the "productive area" is set aside for Natives who are nearly four times as many as the Europeans for whom 70% of the "productive area" is set aside plus 100% of the socalled "unproductive" area of the Union from which in fact much of the Union's wealth is derived.

A further argument is that in any case the Native does not need as much land as the European. Thus Dr von Biljon continues:- "It is further calculated that the needs of the European compared to those of the Native are in a ratio of ten to one. Of the productive regions of the Union, allocations per head of a family of five persons are approximately:

To Europeans.....	105 morgen
To Natives.....	16 morgen

The actual ratio compared to the area that has been allocated to each race to provide

for its subsistence, therefore is about six and a half to one. If it is borne in mind that the Native is in a position to supplement his income by his labour in the areas ~~reserved~~ reserved for the European, while the European may not do so, the ratio would become even smaller. The true ratio can only be ascertained if the supplementation which the Native can bring about with his labour in the European area is added to the productivity of his territory. Still another factor of importance is that the Native's land may not be expropriated. His land are held in custody by a Trust. The European is the trustee. The Native really isn't badly off". The African, in other words, doesn't really need more land because ~~as~~ in any case he can make a living by working for the white man and making the white man's land more "productive", whereas the white man couldn't of course work for him. Moreover he(the African) is in the fortunate position of ~~not~~ having to bother about the ownership of land. The white man is the trustee for his land. It is the white man who has the trouble to decide what is to be done with the land set aside for Natives! Comment on this is needless.

Finally it is argued that the land set aside for African is more than adequate because the vast majority of Africans live outside the Reserves. Thus according to the 1946 census the population of the Union was as follows:-

Europeans.....	2,372,690	(20.8%)
Coloureds.....	928,484	(8.1%)
Asiatics.....	285,260	(2.5%)
Natives.....	7,831,915	(68.6%)
TOtal.....	11,418,349	

Thus it is "approximately correct to say that the Natives are about 70% of the population, but it must be remembered that they are distributed as follows:-

In Native areas.....	3,267,185	(or about 42%)
In other Rural Areas.....	2,875,677	(" " 37%)
In urban areas.....	1,689,053	(" " 21%)

"Hence only 3,267,185 Natives out of a total Union population of 11,418,349 live in the Native areas, which reduces the original figure of 70% to less than 29%. The other Natives live either in the towns or as long established "squatters" on European-owned farms"(Statement issued by the Union Native Affairs Department, Statistics 1, dated November 1950). The statement naturally makes no mention of the fact that large numbers of Natives are compelled to live outside the Native areas because of the limited amount of land available there, nor does it disclose the fact that the people concerned have no land rights outside

7.

the Native Reserves. The only right the African has ~~now~~ in the towns or on European-owned farms is the privilege to work for the European, generally under conditions which ~~exist~~ can only be tolerated by individuals or groups which have no alternative but to accept. No amount of special pleading or juggling with statistics can explain away the inequitable distribution of land between white and black in South Africa.

70

Government has armed itself with adequate safeguards against any possible invasion by non-whites of the citadel of white supremacy.

In the economic sphere white political supremacy has inexorably led to white economic supremacy. The European has used his political power to get for his exclusive benefit the lion's share of the land. Under the ~~land~~ laws of the country, principally the Natives Land Act of 1913 read together with the Natives Land and Trust Act of 1936 African land rights have been restricted to an area covering ~~xx~~ a possible 17½ million morgen (a morgen equals 2 acres) out of a total area of 143 million morgen. This inequitable distribution is usually justified in white circles by saying that owing to the backward state of African agriculture it is right that more land should be placed at the disposal of the white man who can make better use of it. In the field of employment

non-whites, especially Africans are discriminated against in terms of what is known as the "civilised labor" policy. "Though not strictly legal this policy has ~~therefore~~ had a profound effect on non-European employment". Adopted in 1924 in order to protect those Europeans who found themselves excluded from the ranks of skilled labor, the Government <sup>under this policy</sup> has adopted various methods of extending their employment in less skilled work. Thus in Government undertakings where cost is not the decisive factor in policy, the direct substitution of white labor for non-white, especially African labor, at higher rates of pay, has taken place. In non-Government undertakings through the influence of the Department of Labor special grades of employment intermediate between the skilled and unskilled grades have been created at intermediate ~~wage~~ wage rates on the understanding that such posts would be reserved for Europeans. The Customs Act has also been used to compel protected industries to employ a higher ratio of white workers. The Government Tender and Supply Board has also been used to force tenderers for government contracts to employ a reasonable proportion of "civilised" (white) workers. Although this policy was relaxed to a certain extent during World War II owing to the demand for labor to meet war needs, the present Government has re-imposed it with greater stringency.

Under the industrial laws of the country, in particular the Industrial Conciliation Act of 1937 Africans do not fall within the category of 'employee' as defined in the Act and are therefore not allowed to form recognised trade unions. Organisations of African workers are not illegal but their lack of official recognition is obviously a handicap to them

8

in any projected collective bargaining with their employers. The rates of pay of unskilled African workers have, however, been improved to a certain extent as a result of the operations of the Wage Board established under the Wage Act of 1937 passed to deal with industries in which employers and employees are not adequately organised for the purposes of the Industrial Conciliation Act previously mentioned. Even under the Wage Act, however, the wages of the white skilled worker are generally fixed at between six and ten times the wage of the unskilled worker. Moreover, some of the largest groups of African laborers such as Mine laborers and Agricultural workers are specifically excluded from the operations of the Wage Board. The relatively highly developed economy of South Africa rests upon the exploitation of its mineral resources in gold, diamonds, coal, manganese and other base metals as well as upon farming. The Mining Industry relies principally upon cheap migrant workers for its African labor force. Under this system thousands of indigenous Africans from widely separated tribal areas are recruited for labor on the Mines and are housed in Compounds in which an attempt is made to insulate them from the "detribalising" influences of the urban and industrial centres surrounding the Mines. On the termination of their contracts which generally run for approximately eleven months, they are repatriated at their own expense to the tribal areas from which they came. As they are housed, fed and medically cared for by their employers, their cash wages are fixed at a low level. In 1945 the average cash earnings of white workers on the mines amounted to £540, while the cash earnings of African workers were £42.6. (the housing, feeding and other benefits given to African workers were valued at approximately 50% of their cash earnings.) Since 1945 European wages have risen considerably in keeping with the rising cost of living; African wages on the Mines have remained practically unchanged. It goes without saying that the static wage policy of the Mining Industry has a depressing effect on wage standards for Africans in the other (secondary) industries to which they are turning for employment in increasing numbers in preference to Mining. Already more than 50% of the African labor of the Mines is drawn by means of the ~~new~~ recruiting system from beyond the borders of the Union. In 1944 out of a total African labor force of 352,829, only 160,444 came from the Union, the rest being from the British High Commission Territories, from Portuguese East Africa and other tropical areas.

In Farming the working conditions and wages of African workers are so unsatisfactory that it is becoming more and more difficult for white farmers to obtain or retain free

1.

African labour. Hence the practice of the use of convict labor and ~~thence~~ legislative measures to compel ~~is~~African laborers and their families,directly or indirectly,to remain on the farms. That Farming Industry has lost its holding power as far as African labor is shown by the practices occasionally exposed by the Press such as the frequent use of the sjambok(whip) by farm foremen and the locking up of laborers at night ~~with~~ with their clothing taken away from them,in order to prevent their escape. There are,of course, white farmers who have a good reputation for justice and fairplay ~~with~~ and who as a result ~~xxxxxx~~ do not have to rely on compulsion to keep their labor.

Probably the most burdensome and the most vexatious aspect of the policy of apartheid is presented by the notorious Pass System which is designed to ~~xxxxxx~~ to restrict the freedom of movement of African workers. Under the Pass system the African is required to carry on his person various documents. Thus an African travelling from one of the Reserves to an urban centre must be in possession of a travelling pass; on arrival in the urban area he must within 72 hours report his presence to an appropriate official who may or may not provide him with another document--a permit to seek work--valid for a certain number of days; if he fails to find work within the prescribed period, the permit may either be extended or he may be required to leave the area within a specified period, <sup>Pass</sup> which fact is endorsed on his permit so that any policeman who calls for his ~~pass~~ can see at once that he is not authorised to remain in the area; if he finds employment he must report the fact when he is provided with another document--a service contract which he must renew monthly for a fee; if he lives in the location or township set aside for Africans he may be required to have another document--a lodger's permit. If he desires to be abroad outside the location after 9p.m. he must be provided by his employer or some other authorised person with another document--a special pass. In addition he must of course always have on his person another document--his tax receipt to show that he has paid his taxes for the current year. Failure to produce any of these documents on demand by a police officer is a criminal offence irrespective of whether the individual concerned has in fact otherwise complied with the law,e.g.failure to produce a tax receipt on demand is a criminal offence whether the accused has in fact paid his tax. Certain categories of Africans are exempted from the requirement to be in possession of some of these documents but such individuals must be in possession of a document known as an exemption certificate,failure to produce which on demand is similarly a criminal offence.

Various government commissions have reported adversely on this system under which thousands of Africans are annually sent to prison for what are purely technical offences, but only one Committee of Inquiry has had the courage to advocate a total ~~abolition~~<sup>abolition</sup> of the system, namely, the Smit Committee of 1942. Others have contented themselves with recommending some simplification of it, mainly in the direction of reducing the numbers of documents required. Far from heeding the advice of commissions of inquiry or the demands of Africans for its abolition, the present government has decided to entrench the pass system by means of a law known as the Natives(Abolition of Passes and Co-Ordination of Documents)Act. In future instead of the African being required to carry separate documents, he will have to carry a "reference book", "in which shall be recorded the appropriate prescribed particulars relating to such native". It is obvious that the use of the ~~wukwuk~~ word "abolition" in the title of this Act is entirely misleading, and Africans have not hesitated to express their uncompromising opposition to the new form which the Pass system is going to assume in South Africa, especially as the "reference book" era is also going to bring African women within the scope of the system to a greater extent than ever before.

In the sphere of social services apartheid takes the form of separate services for the different racial groups. There are thus separate school systems for white, African, Indian and Coloured in the primary and secondary field; there are eight universities for the small white population, and one university college for non-whites, although three of the white universities admitted limited numbers of non-white students. In Post offices, railroad offices and other public places separate entrances and separate counters are provided for Europeans and non-Europeans; separate accommodation in public vehicles such as trains, trams and buses and separate facilities, where they exist, in places of entertainment and recreation such as cinemas, theatres, playgrounds, etc. In the case of Africans there is a separate Court system existing side by side with the ordinary court system for the settlement of disputes between Africans "arising out ~~of~~ customs followed by Natives", but although the South African Supreme Court has a high reputation for impartiality in the administration of justice, the scales are heavily loaded against the African in the inferior courts presided over by white Magistrates or white Native Commissioners. Owing to the expense of appeal to the superior courts the vast majority of cases naturally end in the inferior courts.

11.  
Part II. Reactions to Apartheid

Sufficient has been said to give the reader some idea of the theory and practice of the traditional policy of racial discrimination followed by the Union of South Africa. The question arises as to the nature of the reaction of various sections of the population to this policy. For many years segregation or apartheid--a distinction without a difference--has been largely unchallenged, because it appeared to affect adversely only the interests of the voteless and defenceless non-whites, particularly the Africans. Many whites such as the missionaries, the members of the United Party led by Smuts and of the ~~black~~ white Labor Party and other persons of a more liberal outlook than that of the Nationalists, while they deplored the trend of events in South Africa, were not prepared to take any active steps against the government's policy. They contented themselves with appeals to the Africans to be patient and to make the best of the limited opportunities available to them within the framework of the accepted system. Movements such as the Joint Councils of European and Africans in different cities which had the support of the Churches and other "friends" of the Africans did what they could to ameliorate the lot of the underprivileged groups without challenging the status quo in any fundamental manner. For the Africans it was largely a lone battle. Efforts at forming a united front with Coloureds and Indians time and again proved abortive, because the latter groups enjoyed in some aspects of their life slightly better privileges than those accorded to Africans, which they were loth to jeopardise by making common cause with the true underdog of the country.

With the passage of time, however, it is becoming increasingly clearer to all groups that freedom like peace is indivisible, that a country cannot be half-free and half-slave or half-democratic and half-totalitarian without that situation reacting unfavourably upon the interests and the welfare of all groups. Continued disregard by public authority of the fundamental human rights of any section of the population, with impunity, lulls other sections of the population into a false sense of security and makes them insensitive to the gradual assumption by governmental authority of wide discretionary powers resulting ultimately in a threat to the civil liberties of all groups. The crisis in South Africa today lies in the fact that the Africans are not alone in fearing that the South African Government has embarked upon a course which, if uninterrupted, might easily develop into totalitarianism for all and not for Africans only.

Insecurity for all those who do not subscribe to the ideology of the present government--that is the factor which characterises present-day South African society. "What are they going to do next?" is the question commonly asked in private conversations.

The reasons underlying this feeling of ~~max~~ insecurity vary, of course, from group to group. Thus the English have been alarmed by the adoption of measures such as the Citizenship Act which makes it more difficult than hitherto for English immigrants to qualify as citizens of this member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Even more concern has been caused by the government's refusal to accept a recent decision of the highest Division of the South African Supreme Court that the Entrenched Clauses of the South African Constitution, including the equality of English and Afrikaans as official languages, still form part of the law of the country. To override the decisions of the Supreme Court the Government has used its small majority to pass the High Court of Parliament Act under which a Court consisting of members of Parliament may review decisions of the Supreme Court on constitutional issues. This threat to the independence of the Judiciary has aggravated the feeling of insecurity of all groups, including some government supporters.

Large sections of the white workers are suspicious that the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 which purports to be designed to 'liquidate' communism in the country has put into the hands of the Executive an instrument which can easily be converted into machinery for the suppression of freedom of speech and of association, a ~~maximif~~ suspicion which has not been allayed by the fact that the first victims of the Act have included some of the leading <sup>white</sup> trade unionists in the country. The same effect has been produced on the white workers by a recently published report of a Commission on Industrial Legislation appointed by the government.

The Mixed or Coloured People have suffered the same fate as the Africans in that in the terms of the Separate Representation of Voters' Act of 1951 they are to be removed from the common voters' <sup>roll</sup> and place on a separate Coloured Voters' Roll to elect a limited number of whites to represent them in Parliament, thus rendering innocuous the Coloured <sup>the elections</sup> Vote which formerly influenced in a number of parliamentary constituencies in the Cape.

The Group Areas Act in terms of which towns and cities are being divided ~~into~~ racial zones, and under which people will only be allowed, save with the permission of the

Minister concerned, to own or occupy property in the zone assigned to the group to which they belong has thrown the property market in some parts of the country into confusion, and is likely to cause sever hardship in many case, especially among the Indians who have invested much of wealth in property in areas<sup>from</sup> which they are likely to be required to remove. Under the same law thousands of urban Africans, especially on the Witwatersrand, have already been informed that they are going to be removed from areas in which they have held property rights for many years to areas in which they are promised even less security than they enjoy now.

The Missions which for the best part of a century have enjoyed government support for their educational work among Africans have also seen the writing on the wall in the recently published report of a Government Commission on Native Education. Not only does the Report give somewhat grudging recognition to the efforts of the Missions which have thus borne the burden of African education, but there are implicit but thinly veiled threats of withdrawal of financial support for their work. To the average reader this might suggest that the Commission has recommended the conversion of the Mission School system for Africans into a public school system financed and administered by the State, a scheme which has been advocated by those engaged in African education for many years. Far from it. What actually is suggested is ~~that~~ the gradual transfer of African schools to the management and financing of the African people themselves. In other words that the poorest section of the community should be made responsible for the financing of the education of its own children, a policy of fiscal apartheid which in the opinion of competent observers will ~~not~~ in the last analysis prove detrimental to the development of African education.

OPPOSITION TO PRESENT POLICY. Sufficient has been said to indicate that the policy followed by successive governments in the Union and particularly since the assumption of office by the present government has turned this fair ~~democracy~~ into a house divided against itself. Opposition to the present trend of government policy has taken various forms. In Parliament the Opposition parties, consisting of the United Party formerly led by Field-Marshall Smuts and now by Advocate G. Strauss, the Labor Party representing the white workers and the three "Native Representatives" (now reduced to two as the result of the expulsion of one member--Mr Sam Kahn, M.P.--in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act) have become more vocal in their condemnation of government policy. They have employed

every constitutional device open to them to oppose the legislative programme based on the policy of apartheid--delaying tactics, all-night sittings, ~~submitting~~<sup>moving</sup> amendments and calling for divisions on every clause in Bills put forward, refusal to participate in some stages through Bills must pass, no-confidence motions, motions for the adjournment of the House on matters of urgent public importance, etc. But the government has used its slender majority to defeat every move on the part of the Opposition.

But the ineffectiveness of the Opposition parties has been due, I think, not so much to the size of the majority with which they have to contend but to the fact that to the public mind, especially to the white electorate, they have no alternative policy to that of the ruling party, especially on the colour question. The Nationalists stand for white supremacy, the Opposition parties for white leadership--a distinction without any substantial difference. In order to expose the bankruptcy of the Opposition parties all the Nationalists have to do is to accuse them of being in favour of equality between black and white. Their invariable reaction is to protest with all ~~vehemence~~<sup>the</sup> ~~no one~~ command that they yield to none is being wedded to the traditional South African policy of white supremacy. If they are accused of being 'communally-inclined', they protest that ~~they~~ are in favour of communism being made a capital offence. This attempt to out-Nationalist the Nationalists has lost them many supporters. It is this shadow-boxing in Parliament which has led to the formation of the extra-parliamentary movement known as the TORCH COMMANDO. This is an organisation formed by white ex-soldiers--their leader Group-Captain A.G. Malan was an ace fighter-pilot in the Battle of Britain--who having fought against totalitarianism in World War II have set themselves the task of rousing white public opinion against a government which they believe is dragging the country along the road to Fascism. Their main plank is the defence of the South African Constitution by getting rid of the present government which has shown little regard for the solemn undertakings in respect of the rights of various groups, especially the white groups, contained in that document. ~~Now~~ The Movement has gained appreciable support throughout the country in the rural as well as the urban areas. Against it the Government has used the tactics which invariably produce results, namely, to accuse them of being "communistic", or of working hand in hand with the non-whites against white supremacy. The Torch Commando has hastened to assure all and sundry that it has no communists in

its ranks, that its membership is not open to non-whites and that in any case it is not a political party but merely a pressure group concerned purely and simply with the preservation of the South African Constitution (in which, of course, the principle of white supremacy is enshrined). That even the Torch Commando has not yet succeeded in convincing the white electorate about the dangers of Malanism was shown in a recent by-election at Wakkerstroom in the Transvaal where the Nationalists scored a resounding victory increasing their previous majority <sup>of 1200</sup> by 850 votes!

THE CHURCH. Reference must now be made to the role of the Christian Church in the present situation in South Africa. The Union of South Africa claims to be a Christian nation ~~markedly~~ as the first article in the South African constitution. Indeed apart from the State, the Church can rightly claim to be the most ~~powerful~~ <sup>influential</sup> ~~influence~~ <sup>which</sup> in contemporary South African society. The Bible has played an important part in the history of both the Dutch (Afrikaners) and the English who constitute the main elements in the white population. The question may therefore rightly be asked as to the extent to which the Church is exercising a liberalising ~~influence~~ or a moderating influence on the deteriorating relations between the racial groups in South Africa. For a variety of reasons the Church is not at present exerting the wholesome influence on race relations which might be expected. Firstly, the Church in South Africa, ~~owing~~ to her unhappy divisions here as elsewhere is not in a position to speak with one voice on matters of national importance. Although there exists in the country a Christian Council to which various protestant churches are affiliated, some of the most influential denominations stand outside this forum in which ~~an effort might~~ be made to crystallise the Christian viewpoint on important national issues. Among the officially denominations outside the Christian Council are the Dutch Reformed Churches and the Roman Catholic Church.

The Dutch Reformed Churches to which the majority of the Afrikaans-speaking whites belong are, rightly or wrongly, regarded as politically the most influential churches in the country. All branches of this Church support the apartheid policy, although in certain important respects they government does not see eye to eye with them on this matter. To the Dutch Reformed Churches apartheid taken to its logical conclusion implies the division of the country into two States, one in which white interests shall be paramount, and another in which African interests shall be predominant. As they put it

in a Church Conference held in Bloemfontein in 1950,

"It must be remembered that no nation in the world worthy of the name(nations) could always be satisfied with no say or only an indirect say in the political and socio-economic organisation of the country in which decisions are taken on that nation's interest and future. To expect the Bantu to be satisfied with such a state of affairs is not only to be unfair to him, but will also eventually lead to the greatest disillusionment and strife".

Hence the Bantu must be given a separate State in which they can become full citizens without any limitations to their rights and responsibilities. But this suggestion of a kind of "Eurostan" and "Bantustan" for South Africa was immediately ~~rejection~~ repudiated by the leaders of the present government, and especially by Dr D.F.Malan, the Prime Minister, who declared emphatically that "total segregation was impracticable under present conditions in South Africa". The great advantage of apartheid as a vote-catching slogan is that it does not necessarily mean the same thing to those who preach it and to those who accept it. No doubt many of the ordinary members of the Dutch Reformed Churches who helped to put the present government into power in 1948 thought that apartheid meant total separation whereas the politicians who are never unduly perturbed by any discrepancy between theory and practice had quite other views on the matter. It is this divergence between apartheid as an article of political faith and its acknowledged impracticability <sup>makes</sup> which <sup>it</sup> many people view it with distrust and regard as a poorly disguised attempt to give the white man the best and the black man the worst of both worlds.

The Christian Council of South Africa is in theory opposed to the policy of apartheid and has endeavoured to get the Prime Minister, Dr D.F.Malan, to discuss with its representatives "conditions prevailing in South African social life which make it difficult for many of our brethren to develop fullness of personality". Dr Malan turned down the request of the Churches for an interview on the ground, among others, that the Churches themselves practise apartheid in their own sphere. This is of course another of the great weaknesses of the Church in South Africa. All the Churches are organised on a segregationist basis with separate churches for white, African, Coloured and Indian, and with the possible exception of the Roman Catholic Church, <sup>or when</sup> churches for whites are not normally open to non-white worshippers. Where <sup>they</sup> are, non-whites are generally expected to occupy seats specially set aside for them. The same applies to church schools and to any other institutions for which the Churches are responsible. Even in some of the most important Mission Stations where the few resident whites and the blacks worship together under the same

roof it is not unusual to find ~~separate~~ separate accommodation for whites and blacks. In the organisation of the Churches as in the machinery of the State the most important posts are held by whites, and any attempt to break through this tradition, where circumstances justify it, causes widespread comment. This lack of unity and equality even within the Church has been one of the causes of the independent (or separatist) church movement among Africans in Southern Africa. In addition it is causing many Africans even among those who have remained within the white-controlled Churches to lose confidence in the Church as the champion of the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God and to identify it with the policy of the State. It is, of course, unquestionable that some of the most constructive work for the benefit of the non-white groups in education, health and social welfare is sponsored by the Church. Church leaders have in the past been great and fearless champions of the cause of the underprivileged in South Africa. stand  
 The names of Moffat, Phillip, Livingstone, Celenso, Mabille, Lindley and others ~~have~~ stand high in the list of those who have striven for higher moral standards in attitudes towards and treatment of non-whites. But there can be no doubt that Michael Scotts and Father Huddlestons are few and far between in church circles today. The price which such persons might be called upon to pay for being "Kafferboeties" (the Afrikaans term for negrophilist) is greater than most would be willing to pay.

The Christian Council at its latest Conference has appealed for a National Convention truly representative of all races at which joint consultation might take place on the best means of promoting peace and harmonious living, and has set itself the task of working towards a Convention of the Churches to be held not later than January, 1954. In the meantime the views of the Council on fundamental truths in regard to race relations have been summarised as follows:-

- "1. God has created all men in His image. Consequently beyond all differences remains an essential unity.
2. Individuals who have progressed from a primitive social structure to one more advanced should share in the responsibilities of their new status.
3. The real need of South Africa is not "apartheid" but "eendrag" (unity through teamwork)
4. Citizenship involves participation in responsible government. The Franchise should be accorded to all capable of exercising it.
5. Every child should have the opportunity of receiving the best education that the community can give, and for which the child has the capacity.
6. Every man has the right to work in that sphere in which he can make the best use of his abilities for the common good."

in South Africa

This idea of "equal rights for civilised men" generally associated with the name of the

arch-imperialist, Cecil Rhodes, and the gradualist approach which it implies has also been espoused by the Roman Catholic Church. In a recent statement by the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops published in the Catholic journal, "Southern Cross", it was declared that justice demanded that the non-Europeans should be permitted to evolve gradually towards full participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the country. Discrimination based exclusively on grounds of colour was described in the statement as "an offence against the right of non-Europeans to their natural dignity as human persons". The statement goes on to say, "Were the attitude of Europeans the sole reason for South Africa's racial problem it would be ~~so~~ simple enough to condemn it as unjust and un-Christian and, by a determined process of education, endeavour to modify it. However the problem is far more complex than that; its complexity arises out of the fact that the great majority of the non-Europeans and particularly the Africans, have not yet reached a stage of development that would justify their integration into a homogeneous society with the European. A sudden and violent attempt to force them into the mould of European manners and customs would be disastrous. There must be gradual development and prudent adaptation. Nor must they be required to conform in every respect to European ways for their own distinctive qualities are capable of rich development... Though the majority of non-Europeans are still undeveloped, there are many of them well qualified to participate fully in the social, political and economic life of the country".

This is a fair statement of what is generally regarded as the liberal point of view which finds justification for the policy adopted by South Africa in certain alterable conditions in non-European, and particularly African, social life and inclines to the view that once these conditions are ~~altered~~, a change of policy would be inevitable. The apartheid policy, on the other hand, is clearly based on what are regarded as conditions which the non-whites either as individuals or as groups are powerless to vary. The many non-whites regarded by the Catholic bishops as "well qualified to participate fully in the social, political and economic life of the country" are regarded as the most serious menace to white supremacy. Dr W.M. Eiselen, Union Secretary for Native Affairs, one of the most persuasive advocates of apartheid has expressed the view that the differences

between European and non-European are not removable. "Apartheid", he says, "rests on the recognition that there are differences which are not man-made. These differences between the races are not only individual but characteristic of the race and no one can fathom how deep or superficial they are. Even if we should think that the spiritual difference are of no significant import, the external differences remain and no policy of civilization can remove them. "Apartheid is necessary not because the Native is of lesser potential value than the white, but because he is "anderssoortig" (of another kind or sort) and because under a co-operative system neither the one nor the other can follow his own nature and fully enjoy (or live out the wealth of his own culture".

It is the failure of the liberals in South Africa to distinguish between a policy based

on removable factors and one based on factors beyond the control of the individual which is responsible for the ever widening gulf between them and the non-white groups. In non-white circles the term 'liberal' has become a term of abuse synonymous with political imbecile, and consequently co-operation between recognised liberal organisations such as the Institute of Race Relations and non-whites is becoming more and more difficult. The Institute of Race Relations is a body which was founded over 20 years ago with the object of fostering peace, goodwill and practical co-operation between the various sections of the population. To it are affiliated the principal municipalities of the country, churches, universities, missionary and other organisations. In addition it has an individual membership of several thousands of people from the different racial groups. The Institute publishes a journal devoted to the problems of race relations in South Africa. By giving evidence before all important Government Commissions, by conducting or sponsoring research and making available the results of such investigations, by holding Conferences at which people with varying points of view can be brought together for mutual exchange of views, the Institute is endeavouring to bring light rather than heat to bear on the controversial issues involved in the South African situation. "Throughout its history, the Institute has been able to command the voluntary services in many fields and today it holds a position in the field of race relations recognised both in the Union and overseas as authoritative. It has always adopted an objective attitude towards our racial problems and it endeavours to base its conclusions on ascertained fact and objective inquiry". (R.R.185/49). That the Institute has not been altogether successful in gaining the confidence of all sections gathered of the population may be gauged from the fact that the Afrikaners have established an institute of their own known as the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs with headquarters at Stellenbosch. This body is committed to search for a solution of the race problem in South Africa on the basis of apartheid. The non-white groups have also indicated their lack of confidence in the Institute through their non-membership of it and this by the fact that they are usually conspicuous by their absence from its conferences. Quite naturally they are less interested in deliberative than in action bodies, and they tend to look upon the Institute, rightly or wrongly, as not really interested in taking any active steps to bring about a radical change in the status quo as far as they are concerned.

Now falls to be considered the attitude of the non-white groups, especially the Africans, to the present trend of Union Native policy. It is obviously not without a certain amount of diffidence that one essayes to summarize the point of view of such a large number of people, with diverse backgrounds, and without proper organs for the expression of their points of view. There are in existence, however, a number of organisations, some officially established by the Government such as the Local and General Councils found in the Reserves ~~and the Native Advisory Boards found in the urban areas~~ set aside for Africans, and others unofficially established by the people themselves through voluntary organisation. However diverse may be the views of these bodies on other matters, they are unanimous in their opposition to the policy of apartheid or segregation or white supremacy or white leadership or trusteeship.<sup>mf</sup> It is now common knowledge that the non-white groups have since June 26, 1952 embarked upon a campaign of non-violent civil disobedience which they describe as a Campaign of Defiance of Unjust Laws. The Campaign is sponsored by the African National Congress, the premier African political organisation established in 1912 to weld the different Bantu tribes into one nation for the protection of their common rights and the promotion of their welfare in the then newly established Union of South Africa. The South African Indian Congress has also identified itself with this movement, on the invitation of the African National Congress. The Campaign was decided upon in a resolution passed at a national conference of the African Congress held in Bloemfontein in December, 1951. This decision called upon the African people to do two things, namely,

- (a) To ~~not~~ organise mass meetings and demonstrations on April 6, 1952 as a protest against the oppression to which the African people had been subjected under white domination during the past 300 years and in opposition to the Van Riebeek Celebration to be held in 1952 to ~~mark~~ to commemorate white settlement in South Africa in 1652.
- (b) To make preparations to take part in a Campaign of Defiance of Unjust Laws to be launched at a date to be announced later.

On April 6 in response to the directive of the African National Congress enthusiastic and widely attended mass meetings and demonstrations were held in different parts of the country. On that day throughout the country in rural as well as urban centres Africans and other non-Europeans gathered, not to rejoice over their own oppression or to indulge in violence as had been expected in official quarters, but prayerfully to dedicate themselves ~~to the cause~~ and to make a solemn pledge to rid themselves by their own efforts and self-sacrifice of the shackles by which they are fettered in the land of their birth.

On May 31, the date for the commencement of the Campaign was announced after a joint meeting of the Executives of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress as June 26, 1952, and on that date, Dr J.S. Moroka, the President-General of the African National Congress, called for 10,000 volunteers for the Campaign by June 26. In the meantime the Government had already taken action against certain non-European leaders known to be likely to play a prominent part in the Campaign. In terms of the Suppression of Communism Act these leaders were given 30 days within which to resign from either the African National Congress or the South African Indian Congress, as the case may be, and were called upon forthwith to cease and desist from addressing any public meetings and not to move from the Provinces in which they were domiciled. One and all the leaders in question decided to defy the ban imposed upon them by the Minister of Justice by addressing public meetings whereupon they were arrested and put in jail. Plans for the Campaign directed by a National Action Committee were not interrupted by these incidents and on the due date, as all the world knows, the volunteers went into action as directed. As a result hundreds of Africans and Indians have already been taken into custody and are awaiting trial.

Why have the non-Europeans embarked upon this Campaign which will undoubtedly entail such a great deal of suffering and hardship for those who participate in it? The decision of the African National Congress is inspired by the intolerable situation in which the African people find themselves, with their rights gradually whittled down and all the usual methods ineffectual to terminate the political subjugation, economic exploitation and ~~and~~ social degradation to which they are subjected. Since its inception in 1912 the African National Congress has tried various methods to bring about the liberation of the African people. On more than one occasion, in its early history, it sent expensive delegations to the United Kingdom to petition the British Government only to find that "the cow of British justice had run dry" as far as non-whites in South Africa were concerned. Another delegation to the Peace Conference in Paris in 1919 discovered that President Wilson's principle ~~of~~ of self-determination for small nations did not apply to Africans. In South Africa itself deputations representations, petitions and resolutions to successive governments have produced no better results; appeals to white public opinion through the Press, through co-operation in national, provincial or local organisations have failed to halt the downward trend of Union Native Policy.

The last 300 years have witnessed an ever widening gulf between the inhabitants of this sub-continent as a result of the short-sighted policies of successive South African governments. The Nationalists who control the present government did not initiate this trend but have merely accelerated the tempo of racial discrimination. The African National Congress is satisfied that the African people and other non-white groups have now no alternative but to embark upon a campaign for the defiance of the unjust laws imposed upon them. Normally the African people are a law-abiding people whose respect for constituted authority has been strained to the utmost by the racialist policies of the country. It is Field-Marshall Smuts who once described the patience of the African as ~~asinine~~, but even African patience is not inexhaustible is proved by the turn of events in South Africa.

The Campaign as at present organised rests upon a volunteer basis. Only persons who are convinced that it is their duty to participate in it are called upon to do so and when accepted are required to undergo a period of training and preparation. A strict discipline code has been adopted. It enjoins volunteers to "hold themselves erect and appear alert" and to maintain a "high standard of cleanliness both in person and apparel". The appearance, bearing and conduct of volunteers is regarded as important for both morale and prestige. The Code goes on to say, "Drunkenness, rowdyism and hooliganism are highly prejudicial to the unity of the volunteers and the cause, and therefore the volunteers are required to avoid any semblance of it. Provocation no matter how severe, must not be considered justification. A volunteer who is believed to have committed a breach of discipline will be dealt with by an appropriate officer". These measures of discipline are all the more necessary as the campaign is intended to be a non-violent struggle. In their present unarmed state it would obviously be futile and suicidal for the non-whites to think of an armed struggle against the powers-that-be in the country. The latter have a monopoly of the death-dealing weapons devised by modern science. With their bare hands the non-whites cannot hope to stop aeroplanes, tanks, machine guns and atom bombs, although history has shown again and again that the mere possession of force is by no means a decisive weapon in a war in which moral issues are involved. Mahatma Gandhi has in recent decades taught oppressed people that non-violence is not an easy form of struggle. It requires a degree of self-discipline and self-control surpassing that required of the man who fights from behind the shield of modern armour. The only

shield on the non-violent resister is moral principle coupled with personal conviction, a shield which is impervious to modern instruments of coercion but is not sufficient to protect the body from pain and suffering. Apart from the volunteers who will constitute the spearhead of the attack upon unjust laws, the rest of the non-white public will also be able to participate in the campaign which, if it is to succeed, will require mass support. Already in various centres Volunteer Welfare Committees have been formed to raise funds, collect and supply food and clothing and otherwise to take care of the dependants volunteers and their dependants. A Million Shilling Freedom Stamp Fund has been launched contributions to which come from both members and non-members of Congress. The Campaign is directed against unjust laws and nothing else and nobody else. As Dr J.S. Moroka, the President-General, has emphasised, "We do not hate the Dutch or the English, but we hate the oppressive laws under which we are compelled to live. Human values only grow in a wholesome social medium. In that respect, there is a crying need to evangelise the Europeans of South Africa. The one text which should be preached continually is 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you'". The Congress definition of 'unjust' laws is quite simple, namely, laws based on racial discrimination. There are many laws based on racial discrimination that the African people find so intolerable that increasing numbers of them are disobeying them anyhow. Hence the large increase in the African prison population, as the Reports of the Department of Justice show. But the ~~African~~ defiance of unjust laws by unorganised individuals, however large their numbers, has no effect upon the government because it is undirected and uncontrolled. It is this element of purpose, direction and control which the African National Congress has introduced into ~~African~~ the growing practice of the defiance of unjust laws. The consequences of this Campaign have already proved serious for those who have participated in it. Hundreds of men and women have been arrested and varying sentences have been imposed upon <sup>them</sup> for their civil disobedience. ~~The~~ The suffering and hardship which the campaign entails has led many people, both black and white, to advise the African National Congress not to embark upon it, but none of them have so far offered any effective alternative to bring about what the African people desire, namely, freedom from oppression. Obviously the African National Congress has no sadistic desire to bring suffering upon people just for the sake of achieving cheap notoriety. Like other peoples who have been

in similar situation the African people are prepared to undergo suffering in order to save themselves from the lingering death of humiliation and oppression. ~~Thoroughly~~

The obvious public duty of those who believe that the state of affairs which has been dealt with in the foregoing pages is not in the interests of either the inhabitants of that country or of the world in general is not to indulge in pious admonitions to the African to be patient and to wait, Micawber-like, for something to turn up, but to find out in what way he might contribute to the removal of the root causes of this growing sense of bitterness and resentment among the Africans and other non-white groups, to fight against those things in the social, economic and political ~~system~~ set-up in the country which are poisoning the relations between peoples who are common heirs to a land in which their interests are inextricably bound together.

It is not unfair to say that a special responsibility rests upon the Church in South Africa which in spite of the difficulties inherent in the situation is called upon to live up to its mission, namely, to urge men and women, black and white alike, to place their relationships in all spheres of their lives upon a Christian basis and not merely on the basis of expediency. "Like all human institutions the Churches often fail in their true functions, but this does not mean that they must not attempt them. Morals are at least of as much importance in the Cabinet as in the cabaret, and it not infrequently becomes the duty of the Churches to lash the money changers out of the Temple. It is only when they (the Churches) are not fit for their job that they should "keep out of politics""

It must never be forgotten, however, that the real Church is the worshipper in the pew. The policy of the State is in fact the policy ~~of~~ of at least some individuals drawn from all Churches, and it is futile for people to think they can relegate the work of introducing moral standards into our human relationships to the Church as an institution without themselves as individual Christians playing their part in meeting the challenge of the paganism which goes by the name of politics in the modern State. "Our task is not to withdraw from the world but to live our faith and apply it in political decisions under the guidance of the Holy Spirit".