

The history of relations between black and white ever since they met on the banks of the Fish River in the Cape in the 18th century [1759?] has been one of conflict. For the best part of a 100 years after their first contact, the struggle took the form of armed conflict, with every weapon they had at their disposal the blacks tried to defend their country against white encroachment or invasion. But in the end they lost the fight which went in favour of powder and shot as against spear and knobkerrie. One tribe after another was subdued. The last major clashes took place in the 1870's in 1877 with the Xhosa, in 1878 with the Tswana and in 1879 with the Zulus. Since that time the only serious military uprising was that of the Zulus in 1906, the so-called Bambata's Rebellion which was really a protest against increased taxation.

For many years since then the Africans have reluctantly accepted the rule of the white man but have endeavoured to fight for the amelioration of their lot and the removal of the disabilities under which they labour by the usual democratic methods of persuasion and discussion. Instead of continuing to fight ~~with~~ the white man with the weapons of days gone by, they have put aside their spears and sticks and decided to learn the white man's ways. Through church and school, through working for the white man in varying capacities, in urban and rural areas, they have thought that they might eventually

eventually earn for themselves a respectable place in the new civilization which the white man has brought to South Africa. They have formed political, social and industrial organisations or associations of various kinds, and through them have made representations to the powers-that-be for the redress of this or that grievance. They fondly believed that the disabilities under which they laboured were due to their backwardness in the arts of modern civilization and that as they adapted themselves more and more successfully to the new ways of life they would be accorded more and more recognition as fellow - citizens of the white man. For that reason they cooperated with South African governments in various official bodies especially set up for the ventilation of their views on matters affecting their welfare (as substitutes for direct representation in the Councils of State). The Cape Africans were the only ones who enjoyed franchise rights, but even they always exercised their franchise rights in such a way that no exception could be taken to the manner in which they exercised them. With the aid of their franchise some of the best white parliamentarians were sent to the Cape legislature before Union and to the Union Parliament thereafter. In other parts of the country where Africans did not enjoy franchise rights, they lived in hopes that some day they would also be granted these rights, but in the meantime they co-operated with the governments concerned in other ways. Thus when the Union Government established local or district councils in the areas set aside for Africans, they accepted these Councils, although they were not satisfied that through them they could achieve what they wanted to achieve, namely, full citizenship rights. When the Native Conference was established under the Native Affairs Act of 1920 in terms of which the Government periodically called together African leaders to consult them about proposed legislation affecting Africans, they co-operated with the Government until the Government itself ceased to convene those conferences. When the Advisory Boards were established in the urban areas in terms of the Natives Urban Areas Act, the Africans, although they did not believe Advisory Bodies would achieve anything, nevertheless did what they could to show that they were prepared to give the system a trial. The same applied to the system of separate representation which was set up under the Representation of Natives Act of 1936. The Africans opposed that

legislation most vigorously, but once it was placed on the Statute Book, they gave it a fair trial and thereby showed that it did not fit the bill.

Apart from co-operation with the Government in official bodies specially set up to deal with African affairs, the Africans have established their own non-official bodies through which they have directed their requests to the Government. Among the most important of these have been the African National Congress established in 1912. The history of the ANC since its inception has been marked by deputations and petitions and resolutions addressed to various Ministers of the Union Government. ANC deputations have gone overseas to plead the cause of the African people. The first went to England in 1914 to protest against the passing by the Union Parliament of the Natives Land Act of 1913, a law which led to the eviction of hundreds of African families from European farms in different parts of the country. While the deputation was in the United Kingdom the first World War broke out, and the British Government became involved in problems much more pressing than the affairs of the Bantu in South Africa. The deputation returned disappointed but not rebellious. In fact African leaders immediately offered the services of their people in connection with the war effort of South Africa, and thousands of Africans volunteered for the Native Labour Contingent which participated in the war both in Europe and in Europe. To this day one of the most famous annual ceremonies among Africans in South Africa is their commemoration of the *sinking of* the troopship "Mendi" which went down in the English Channel with the loss of over 600 members of the Native Labour Contingent. Africans in that war were more loyal than some of their Afrikaner compatriots who, under the leadership of some of the Generals of the South African War of 1899-1902, staged a rebellion in 1914 against the Government while the country was engaged in war against the Central Powers of Europe. Some of the people who took part in that rebellion afterwards occupied high offices in the Government of the country, while the loyal Africans had to be content with seeing their position deteriorate still further year after year.

The second overseas deputation of the ANC was the one which went to the Peace Conference in Paris in 1919. This deputation was

inspired by President Wilson's Fourteen Points and in particular the idea that the war had been fought to bring about "Self-determination for Small Nations". Among the small nations that needed self-determination, in the view of the ANC, were the African people of South Africa who had been deprived of their land and their citizenship rights by the white man in South Africa. Therefore they wanted the Peace Conference to look into their case. At the same conference there was another delegation from South Africa - that of the Afrikaners under the leadership of General Hertzog who went to plead for self-determination for the Boer Republics which had been annexed by the British at the end of the South African War of 1899-02. There was of course also present at Paris the official South African delegation led by Prime Minister Louis Botha and his right hand man, General Smuts. The two non-official delegations - the African one and the Afrikaner one - returned home empty-handed. Since then of course the Afrikaners have gone from strength to strength until today they have not only got back their republics but are masters of the whole Union. ANC deputations have not only gone overseas but have waited upon South African governments in this country itself. The last big ANC deputations to which reference might be made was that of 1942. This deputation, under the leadership of Dr. A.B. Xuma, then President-General of the ANC, interviewed Colonel Denys Reitz, the Minister of Native Affairs in Cape Town, and discussed with him a wide range of problems relating to the African position in South Africa. Among the points on which the Minister appeared to agree with the deputation was the necessity for the relaxation of the Pass Laws and the recognition of African trade unions. Since that time far from the pass laws being relaxed, they have been consolidated, their enforcement tightened and have been extended to African women. Instead of the recognition of African trade unions we have developed a system under which disputes between employers and African employees are settled by the intervention of government officials who are more concerned with the punitive measures they are empowered to employ than with the advancement of the cause of the African workers.

The ANC and other African organisations such as the I.C.U. have of course not only made use of the weapon of the deputation and the

liti Conference resolution. They have also made use of the weapon of litigation. They have conducted or supported test cases in the law courts such as the famous case of Letanka in which the right of the Transvaal Provincial Administration to impose a Poll Tax on Africans was successfully contested in the Transvaal Supreme Court. But Africans have found ^{that} the use of the law courts does not advance their cause to any appreciable extent. Not only is this method very costly financially, but the fact of the matter is that court victories in South Africa tend to be only temporary because when the Government loses a case in court all it has to do is to amend the law suitably and the courts which must apply the law as they find it are rendered powerless to assist those adversely affected by the law.

Another weapon which has been used at different times by Africans is the strike weapon. This has been used mainly in the economic field. Here again the effectiveness of the strike weapon as far as Africans are concerned is nullified by the fact that for most types of African workers it has been made illegal for them to strike. So when a strike does take place, police intervention takes place.

Finally, mention must be made of the fact that in recent years Africans have also resorted to the weapon of passive resistance. The biggest effort in that direction was the Campaign known as the Campaign for the Defiance of Unjust Laws which was alunched by the African National Congress in June 1952, and was directed solely against certain laws such as the Pass Laws which are based on racial discrimination. In launching this Campaign the ANC invited all organisations and individuals, whatever their race or colour, to join with the Africans in the struggle to rid South Africa of racial discrimination. The Indians under the leadership of the South African Indian Congress, a few Coloureds under the leadership of the South African Coloured Peoples Organisation and a few Europeans under the leadership of Patrick Duncan, the son of a former Governor-General of the Union, identified themselves with the Campaign. During the campaign more than 8,000 volunteers, including the top flight leaders of the movement, were arrested and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment with hard labour, while some of the young^{er} volunteers were punished

by flogging. None of the men and women arrested offered any resistance to the treatment meted out to them, for when they volunteered, they took a pledge to observe the principles of non-violence and to suffer for the cause. All volunteers were expected to undergo a period of training and to observe a code of discipline based on moral and religious principles.

[Attempts were made to characterise the movement as "Communist inspired" or led by "educated non-white agitators" or "sponsored by Indians" or "inspired by anti-whiteism" - in an endeavour to draw attention away from its real significance as another step forward in the forging of an instrument with which the non-whites can withstand the onslaughts of apartheid. The campaign succeeded in rousing the political consciousness of the African people as never before. It resulted in a tremendous awakening ^{among} them and a fresh realization of the strength that comes from united action. The self-control and discipline shown by the volunteers in spite of extreme provocation, especially in the jails where they were imprisoned, demonstrated their appreciation of the principles of non-violence. Frustrated by ruthless oppression and unbearable conditions, Africans from all walks of life rallied to the call of the national organisation - the ANC - whose paid-up membership jumped from hundreds to thousands, to say nothing of the thousands of active sympathisers not in the books of the organisation. The Freedom Songs spontaneously composed during the Campaign became common in village and township, and roused whenever they were sung, the emotions of the people to a high pitch. The "Thumbs-up" sign of the ANC became a recognised symbol of unity and solidarity among Africans from all walks of life. The word "Afrika" - the abbreviation for the slogan "Afrika Mayibuye" (May Africa Come Back (to us)) became a common form of greeting or salutation among Africans. Everywhere a new spirit was abroad.

The Campaign succeeded in drawing the attention of the ruling whites in South Africa to the grievances of the non-white groups. Those who are politically conscious realised that campaigns such as the Defiance Campaign constituted the only means now open to the Africans of showing that they could no longer endure things as they are in South Africa. The dignified manner in which the struggle was conducted was appreciated and proved to many that the non-Europeans are

capable of effective organisation and highly conscious of their plight. Farseeing men and women among the whites realised that this campaign posed serious questions for the future. It raised the question of the relationship between black and white in South Africa. If the rapidly widening gulf between the ruling whites and the ruled non-whites is not bridged in some way or other, the inevitable result will be a clash of undetermined dimensions. Of course there are always those whites who cling to the belief that in any such clash, the Africans will suffer more than the whites, whereas the crux of the matter is not who will suffer more but why need there be any such suffering. For that reason the Campaign provided a challenge to the christian conscience, and dignitaries of the most important churches pressed from pulpit and platform for the resolution of the impasse between the Government and the African people. The Civil Rights League, the Institute of Race Relations, the Torch Commando, and similar organisations called for consultations between representatives of the Government and the leaders of the non-white groups.

Probably the greatest tribute to the effectiveness of the Campaign was the fury of the Government's reaction to it. At first sceptical about whether it would command mass support, the Government later realised that it would have to resort to the utmost severity to deal with the situation. The imposing of severe penalties, the arrest of more and more leaders, the banning of meetings of more than ten persons, restrictions on the movement of leaders - when all these did not seem to halt the movement, the Government went to Parliament and asked for greater powers to deal with the problem. The Union Parliament passed two laws in this connection) NAMELY, the Criminal Laws Amendment Act which increased the penalties that could be imposed on those taking part in any campaign by way of protest against any law and the Public Safety Act which empowered the Government in such cases to declare a state of emergency and to suspend by proclamation i.e. without reference to the Legislature "any Act of Parliament or any other law having any bearing on any purpose for which the regulations may be made" This power which purports to be designed to enable the Government to deal with threats to public safety or public order could of course be used to stifle any criticism or any legitimate protest against any law.

The passing of these laws did have the effect of slowing down the Campaign but they had no effect on the spirit of the people.]
The Defiance Campaign marked the end of the period of supplication for improved conditions for the suffering masses: the end of deputations, petitions and resolutions to the Government; the end of looking to the Union Parliament as a body set up to look after the interests of the population as a whole. The Union Parliament would henceforth be looked upon as a white Parliament, bent on protecting and promoting the interests of the white section of the population, whatever the results may be as far as other sections of the population were concerned. It meant for vast numbers of people the seeking of their salvation not through Parliament but outside Parliament.

This taking of the extra-Parliamentary road has of course been ^{forced} ~~forced~~ upon the people. Year after year they have seen every session of Parliament piling upon ^{them} one restriction after another, one burden after another, without any relief. How could they in the circumstances be expected to continue to look to Parliament as the source of their salvation? It has been drummed into them by deeds as well as by words that Parliament has nothing in store for them and that their salvation, if any, must be sought outside the walls of this august body which wields supreme power in South Africa. This turning away from Parliament has of course been interpreted in some quarters as meaning that the non-whites, particularly the ^{Africans} ~~non-whites~~, want to work for the overthrow of Parliament and that therefore organisations like the ANC must be looked upon as subversive organisations out to undermine the independence and safety of the State. For that reason since the Defiance Campaign there has been a great deal of loose talk about looking for evidence of treason by African individuals and organisations. The Minister of Justice has justified searches by Security Police of the homes and offices of individuals and organisations on the ground that they are searching for evidence of treason. This has culminated in the Treason Trial at present in progress. The fact of the matter is that the African people are a highly loyal and law-abiding people. To attempt to persuade them to engage in activities directed against the independence and safety of the State would be no mean task for any group or individual that undertook it. When the African people say they are embarking upon extra-parliamentary methods, they do not....

do not mean thereby anti-parliamentary. For them extra-parliamentary means ^{nothing more than} outside Parliament to draw the attention of Parliament to ^{their} ~~our~~ condition. For them it means 'as we are precluded from influencing Parliament from within, let us see if we can influence this body from without'. Now of course the Africans are not alone in the use of extra-parliamentary as against intra-parliamentary methods of influencing the powers-that-be. ^{Other sections of the population} They make use of press campaigns, protest demonstrations, processions, public meetings of protest, and the like, and nobody suggests that this means they intend to overthrow the State but according to the Union Government, if this sort of thing is done by the non-white groups, especially by the Africans, then it amounts to subversion.

This is of course not going to deter the African people from pursuing the only course which is open to them under the laws of the country, namely, to follow extra-parliamentary methods in the prosecution of their struggle for liberation. The use of these methods of peaceful demonstration and protest will not of course produce the desired results as long as they are interpreted as treasonable acts. In fact they will lead to an intensification of the apartheid programme of the country. More and more restrictions and more and more examples of negative apartheid will be forthcoming. All the normal avenues for the expression of private and public opinion by Africans will be closed, leading to more and more bitterness and frustration on the part of the non-whites. Attacks by the Government on non-white political organisations will become more frequent and more drastic. Already the ANC is like a red rag to a bull as far as the Government is concerned. Everything that goes wrong in the administration is blamed on the ANC. If people in a Reserve refuse to fall into line with schemes proposed by the Government the ANC is said to be behind. If a Chief does not co-operate with the Government, the ANC is said to have instigated him. If students in an educational institution or nurses in training in a hospital go on strike because they are dissatisfied with the conditions under which they live or work, the ANC must be behind. The most ridiculous suggestion in this connection has been that of a medical Superintendent of a well known hospital who is reported to believe that non-European medical graduates do not come

to his hospital for their 'internship' because of instructions from the ANC!

These attacks, wide as they often are off the mark, recognise the fact that the ANC ~~are~~ is a power among the people in spite of ~~everything~~ everything that has been and is being done to discredit the organisation. It is futile to try to ignore this organisation and to look for so-called African or traditional leaders outside its ranks. Even the Chiefs and Headmen who are generally government "stooges" recognise the importance of the ANC in the struggle for liberation. It always seems to me to be the height of stupidity for Government officials to think that they can exercise a greater influence among the Chiefs & Headmen than the recognised leaders of African thought.

[Almost any young African leader, to say nothing of the more experienced ones, could challenge any government supporter or Native Commissioner on any matter affecting Africans in any meeting of Africans convened by such a government supporter in the rural or in the urban areas and could prove to any ^{unbiased} ~~embarrassed~~ observers that the people are not with the Government. No government supporter would dare to accept such a challenge.] The Government's sins of omission and commission speak louder than any propaganda they might put out through their journal 'Bantu' or through the State Information Office.

But the effect of Government attacks on African leaders and African political organisations is that they are going to be driven underground. As no public meetings among Africans are allowed except for weddings, funerals and religious services, private meetings are held and conduct their business just the same. If public opposition to Government measures is prohibited, private opposition which can be ^{going to be} much more dangerous, ~~will~~ will be organised. At the present moment all the outstanding leaders of the Africans stand by the policy of non-violence in achieving their aims. But with the passage of time as this policy begins to appear to the ordinary man not to yield results, the leaders who stand for non-violence and for co-operation between black and white on the basis of equal opportunity, will be replaced by leaders who do not. The intransigence on the white side of the colour line will be met with similar intransigence on the black side of the colour line. Unable to get the ear of public authorities in their

own countries, the non-white will begin to look beyond their own borders for inspiration, guidance and direction. Already events in other parts of the continent of Africa are having a tremendous impact on the man-in-the-street in South Africa. Already he sees that people in other territories in Africa are on the march towards independence, some of them obtaining ^{their} independence by peaceful methods, while others have had to fight to gain their freedom. It will not be surprising if he begins to say to himself, that if we cannot achieve our freedom by peaceful means, we may have to resort to other methods. The question at the moment is not whether the latter methods will succeed, but whether they will not come to appear to the African in South Africa as the only methods open to ~~them~~ him.

In making up his mind on this question, the African will, I think, be influenced by what he considers to be the attitude of the Western powers to the position of the non-whites in South Africa. In international organisations such as the United Nations Organisations, leading Western Nations such as the United States, the United Kingdom and France, have shown little sympathy for the struggle of the non-whites. They have consistently supported the Union Government in its legalistic attitude that the treatment of the non-white groups is a matter essentially within its domestic jurisdiction. It is, in other words, nobody's business how we treat our blacks. The endorsement of this attitude by the Western Nations is not calculated to strengthen the hands of those non-white leaders and organisations which stand for co-operation between black and white in the peaceful solution of the problems of the country. On the contrary it is strengthening the position of those who say we shall have to look to the East rather than to the West for support in our struggle.

There are signs, however, that some government supporters are beginning to be dissatisfied with the way in which the policy of apartheid ^{is being carried out} /by the Union Government.. Those supporters ^{who} ~~who~~ are to be found principally in certain circles in the Dutch Reformed Church and in the Afrikaans universities are firm believers in ~~apartheid~~ apartheid, but they believe that the way in which it is being applied to date can only lead to disaster. For what has been the course of apartheid to date? It has been a series of deprivations of rights and

privileges without anything positive being put in their place. Franchise rights have gone with nothing effective as a substitute; land rights have gone; people have been deprived of their rights to their homes and had nothing worthy put in their places; freedom of movement has been curtailed with nothing to compensate for it; freedom of speech has gone without the Government being able to show how the people can advance their cause without having to speak about their rights. The march of apartheid which was supposed to have drawn Government and people together seems to have driven them further apart, and mass arrests for failure to comply with some one or other aspect of apartheid has become the order of the day.

And so there have been Afrikaners who have raised their voices against the trend of events in South Africa. Some have been voices uttering warnings against the negative character of the policy of apartheid as at present. Prof. B.B. Keet of the Theological Seminary at Stellenbosch University has in his "Wⁱth South Africa" been a most trenchant critic of apartheid. Prof. Ben Marais of the Theological Seminary of Pretoria University in his "Colour ~~and the~~ ~~Test~~" has examined apartheid critically against the background of world opinion. Professor Pistorius, Professor of Greek at Pretoria University in his "No Further Trek" has warned against trying to tackle the problems of modern South Africa with a mentality based upon a bygone past. Thirteen Nationalist professors at Pretoria University put their names to a document criticising the Government for their tampering with the Constitution in order to achieve their ends. These have been voices in the wilderness, but they have served to prove, if proof were needed, that there are distinguished Afrikaners whose consciences are offended by the sort of thing which is being carried on in their name, as it were.

Furthermore there have been those Afrikaners who have called for a more positive approach to the policy of apartheid, who look upon apartheid not so much as a means of depriving the non-whites of their political, social and economic rights but as a search for a method of giving them such rights without endangering the position of the white man. They believe that this can be done within the framework of the policy of separate development. The most authoritative statements of the views of this group are set forth in the Report of

of the Tomlinson Commission on the Socio-Economic Development of the Reserves, a seventeen-volume document in which detailed recommendations are made as to how the Reserves might be developed into national homes for the Africans, leaving the white man predominant in the rest of the country. The Tomlinson Commission set out to find a solution for "the dilemma in which South Africa finds itself with regard to its racial problem". This dilemma is conceived by the Commission to be due to the increasing tendency towards integration of the races, resulting in the two groups becoming interwoven to an increasing extent. In the view of the Commission this development is fraught with such dire possibilities as far as the Europeans are concerned, that "a speedy definite and unambiguous solution" must be found. "Integrate and perish or Separate and survive" - that in the view of the Commission is the choice before South Africa. The solution envisaged by the Commission is that of separate development of the European and the Bantu communities "as the only direction in which racial conflict may possibly be eliminated and racial harmony possibly be maintained". This separate development of the European and Bantu communities can only be achieved through "the sustained development of the Bantu areas on a large scale". The Commission thereupon proceeds to define the Bantu areas and to indicate how they might be developed into a satisfactory "national home for the Bantu, and what the cost of this development is likely to be during the ~~past~~ first ten years - just over £100 million!" After the Government had received the Report in summary form, it issued a White Paper in which it accepted the Report in principle but rejected so many of its detailed recommendations that the acceptance in principle sounded somewhat hollow and empty. There are still some Afrikaners who think that the line of development indicated by the Tomlinson Commission ought to be pursued more vigorously and more consistently. The most that this group has been able to extract out of the Government is the Bill now before Parliament known as the Bantu Investment Corporation Bill in terms of which the Government propose to set up a Government Corporation with a capital of £5000,000 for the promotion of the development of the Reserves. It is a far cry from the £10 million per annum for the next ten years proposed by the experts of the Tomlinson Commission to the puny

£1½ million for all time suggested by Mr. M.D.C. de Wet Nel, the new Minister of Bantu Administration and Development who was himself a member of the Tomlinson Commission.

A third line of attack by Nationalist supporters of the Government on the present trend of government policy has been in regard to the lack of contact and consultation between the Government and the thinking sections of the African population. The Government under the influence of Dr. H.F. Verwoerd as Minister of Native Affairs has for some time now decided that the only way in which to maintain contact with the African people is through the Native Commissioner on the one hand and the tribal chief on the other. Occasionally in addition to these personal contacts between individual chiefs and individual Native Commissioners, the Minister of Native Affairs has held meetings with groups of chiefs from certain defined areas - chiefs of Zululand, chiefs of the Northern Transvaal, chiefs of the Transkei, etc. These gatherings known as "Indabas" have given the Minister the opportunity to expound at great length various aspects of the policy of apartheid and he has apparently been advised or has decided on his own that as long as he does that, he is keeping in touch with African opinion and need not worry himself about any other sections of African opinion. Unfortunately these "indabas" have not been the success that it was hoped they would be. They have not produced the peace and harmony which was hoped for in the Northern Transvaal from which indaba-ridden area more chiefs have been deported than from any other area. Chiefs supposed to be loyal to the Government have not been able to produce the miracle of acting like ^{Pied} ~~Red~~ Pipers of Hamelin blindly followed by their people. The people have not hesitated to repudiate the Chiefs where the latter have not adequately represented their views. This troubled state of affairs on the Reserves the Government has attributed to the activities of the ANC thereby tacitly admitting that the ANC has a greater influence over the people in the Reserves than the so-called traditional leaders of the people, the Chiefs. Of course all this talk about the ANC being behind every movement against the Government in the Reserves is so much twaddle. The fact of the matter is that the modern African "Chief" is not a chief "by the people" as he was hitherto but a chief "by the Government". The people do not regard him as theirs at all. They look upon him quite rightly as a

Government man - government appointed or government recognised.

If he does not express "his Masters Voice", he is liable to be deposed forthwith, and therefore, poor man, how can he be expected to express the views of the people, when he is not really a leader of his people but a servant of the Government?

Some Afrikaner leaders have consequently called for a change of policy in this regard. They have advised the Government to endeavour to meet the effective leaders of the African people and not the chiefs who are in effect merely servants of the Government. For the Government ^{to insist} on making contact only with the chiefs is like a man looking into a mirror in which he can only see his own image. Among the leaders in this movement for genuine consultation with the genuine leaders of the people is Prof. L.J. du Plessis of Potchefstroom University. By no stretch of imagination can Prof. du Plessies be described as a kaffirboetie (niggerlover). He is a man who has played an important part in the development of nationalism among the Afrikaners, a firm believer in apartheid who was the only Afrikaner willing to travel to the United Kingdom to go and defend apartheid in a symposium held on the subject in London. He is ^{reputed to be} a member of the Broederbond, the secret society which is supposed to have as its primary aim the defence of Afrikaner interests in South Africa. He ^{was} ~~is~~ also a director of well known Afrikaans newspapers which play an important role in shaping Afrikaner opinion. In other words he yields to no one in his love for the Afrikaner and in his patriotism. He has come to the conclusion that apartheid cannot be made to work if it is simply something rammed down the throats of the people. If it is to succeed, it must be carried ^{out} with the willing co-operation of the African who must for himself see that ^{it} ~~is~~ holds something in store for him as well as for the white man. This can only be brought about through consultation between black and white about the measures contemplated under the policy of apartheid.

Another group which has called for consultation between black and white is the South African Bureau of Racial Affairs, SABRA, as it is commonly called. At its annual Conference held in 1959 this organisation passed a resolution urging the holding of consultation between white and black leaders in the policy of apartheid. This did not please members of the Government and in particular Dr. H.F. Verwoerd who was one of the foundation members of SABRA. This did not,

however, deter all the members of SABRA from pursuing this idea of consultation with African leaders. Early in 1959 a number of SABRA members consisting of university professors from the Afrikaans-speaking universities of Stellenbosch, Potchefstroom, Pretoria and the Orange Free State, embarked upon a series of informal discussions with African leaders in different parts of the country. I had the privilege of being present and taking part in one of these discussions. It was clear from these discussions that the Afrikaner representatives were ~~generally~~ ^{genuinely} interested in knowing something about the African approach to various aspects of government policy and practice. Some of the discussions have been heated because the Africans have not pulled their punches in dealing with the apartheid policy for which they regard the ^{professors} ~~progress~~ as much responsible as the politicians. After all it is the university professors in the Afrikaans universities who have provided the theoretical basis - the philosophy underlying - the policy of apartheid and they cannot at this stage be allowed to get away with trying to lay all responsibility for the evils of apartheid at the door of the politicians. At all events the important thing about these discussions is that they have taken place. Although they have not had the blessing of the Government, they have undoubtedly enabled those who have participated in them to exchange views, to their mutual benefit.

But even as far as the Government is concerned, the criticisms that have been levelled against apartheid, especially from the ranks of its own supporters, have not been entirely without some effect. Much more than in the past the Government has in recent months been at pains to show that its policy of apartheid has its positive as well as its negative aspects. This is the so-called "new" note that has been brought into discussions of apartheid from the Government side. There is a new attempt to dress up the policy in new ^{garments} ~~garments~~ so as to make it appear better than it really is. This attempt to "liberalise" the policy of apartheid has taken different forms. In the first place the word 'apartheid' is being quietly dropped and the expression "separate development" made to take its place. The word "development" has a more progressive and more dynamic ring about it than the word apartheid which seems to have a static connotation.

Secondly, the Department of Native Affairs has been divided

into two sections each with a Minister of Cabinet rank, namely the Department of Bantu Administration & Development and the Department of Bantu Education. These new appellations again are more indicative of progress and development than the non-committal term "Native Affairs"

Thirdly, the Government has decided to proceed more rapidly with the so-called 'positive' aspects of the policy of separate development. Into this category falls its programme for the development of educational facilities for Africans, especially in the field of higher education. Instead of the Africans having only one University College to cater for their needs, it is now proposed to establish two new university colleges for Africans and to take over the University College of Fort Hare. This can be represented as positive apartheid because the Government is going to make itself responsible for the financing, the management and the control of these centres of learning from which the Africans will benefit and so become more enamoured of the policy of separate development. Similar colleges, one each, are to be established for the Coloureds and the Indians. As a quid pro quo non-whites are to be deprived of the privileges they formerly enjoyed in the form of admission to certain "white" universities. A start has already been made with the erection of buildings at the sites proposed for the new colleges and visitors from overseas are taken to these places to see for themselves ~~the~~ the "something better" implied in the policy of separate development.

Another step in the direction of positive apartheid is the programme for the development of the Reserves. In this connection the Union Parliament is already discussing the Bantu Investment Corporation Bill in terms of which a Government corporation with a capital of £500,000 is to be established for the purpose of providing Africans with loan facilities for the establishment of small industries within their own areas. When the African is deprived of these facilities within the so-called European areas he will be able to console himself with the idea that if he went to the Reserves he would be able to enjoy them there.

The fact that £500,000 is a mere bagatelle when one considers the size and the needs of the Reserves is beside the point. The thing that matters is the propaganda value of the scheme as far as the white electorate is concerned. "Look at what we are doing for the African in his own areas - that is separate development".

As far as political rights for Africans and the question of contact between the Government and the people are concerned - in that sphere too, the day of 'something better' has dawned. Here what is contemplated is the setting up of Bantu authorities on a tribal or ethnic basis both in the Rural areas (the Reserves) and in the urban areas. These rural and urban Bantu authorities will consist of government-nominated or government-approved Africans and through them the African people will be able to make their wishes known to the Government. In the five or more 'Bantustans' into which the Africans will be divided there will be territorial Authorities on the lines of the Transkeian Territorial Authority which is already in existence. At the head of each of these 'Bantustans' will be a white official known as a Commissioner-General through whom the Bantu concerned will communicate with the Government. Having given the Bantu all that, the Government will then be able to abolish the system of separate representation for Africans which was established in 1936 under which three whites represented them in the House of Assembly and four whites in the Senate. The Bantu will then have no cause for complaint for not being represented in the white Parliament which will of course remain in full control of the whole country including the 'Bantustans'. The Africans will have their political rights in their Bantustans through their Bantu authorities and will have contact with the Government through their Commissioners-General.

In these areas of their own Africans will be encouraged to ^{establish} ~~have~~ institutions of various kinds of their own so that they will have no cause for complaint when they are debarred from similar institutions for whites. Thus they will be encouraged to establish their own cinemas so that they will not be able to complain when they are barred from attendance at white cinemas. In order to encourage Africans to go ahead more rapidly with establishing such cinemas for themselves, they will be barred forthwith from white cinemas which they have hitherto attended on a segregated basis. And so the process of establishing the "something better" for themselves will be set on foot among Africans.

As a result of these schemes of positive separate development it is hoped that Africans will come to realise more and more that apartheid is a constructive, not a destructive force in their national life.

The question may be asked as to the extent, if any, to which this endeavour on the part of the Government to dress up its policy of apartheid in new clothing is likely to persuade the African people that their footsteps have been set on a new road, leading or likely to lead to "something better" for them. I am afraid at the present moment thinking Africans look upon the new apartheid like a wolf in sheep's clothing, as something which must be recognised for what it really is and not for what it pretends to be. They look upon apartheid, whatever the form in which it appears, as a technique of domination, a system of maintaining the present baasskap (boss-ship) of the white man on a permanent basis. Now the white man is of course entitled to strive to maintain what he has gained for himself in the course of his stay in Africa, but what he really cannot expect is that the African should give his blessing to a state of affairs under which he always gets the worst of things. Being under the domination of another group is not exactly a pleasant thing for those who have to suffer it, and there is nothing else for the latter group to do but to continue to fight against domination until they overcome it. That is the course which the African people have chosen for themselves. Whatever the odds with which they have to contend, they will not rest satisfied until they have achieved their ultimate objective, namely, full citizenship rights in the land of their birth. For that reason it does not appear as if they will co-operate with the Government in its new measures of positive apartheid which are coupled with a demand for the acceptance on their part of the fundamental basis of the policy of apartheid. In their fight to rid themselves of the incubus of apartheid, they will draw much inspiration from developments in the rest of Africa, where in one territory after another the African inhabitants are putting off the shackles of colonialism and imperialism.

Naturally the conditions under which the struggle has been pursued have varied from territory to territory according to the conditions obtaining in that country. Thus Ghana with its small white population cannot be compared in this regard with Algeria with its large population of French colonists. The Nigerian people are confronted with a very different proposition in their struggle for liberation from that which faces the people of Kenya or of the Central African Federation. In

In the main the differences turn largely on the size of the white population and the nature of their settlement in the areas concerned. Where the white population is small, consisting mainly of officials, missionaries and traders, it has been possible for constitutional advances to take place without arousing a great deal of bitterness and ^{with} a minimum amount of violence, if any. But ^{where} the white population includes a section of the whites who regard the territory concerned not merely as their temporary home but as their permanent domicile, Constitutional advances have been more difficult and have almost necessarily been accompanied by violence. Unfortunately the Union of South Africa falls into the second type of the territory. It has a European population of three million, many of whom have been established in Southern Africa for three centuries, and it can be taken for granted that they would be prepared to resort to violence in order to maintain their privileged position in the sub-continent. The non-white groups realise this and have hitherto always excluded the use of violence as a method of obtaining the redress of their grievances. They recognise that in any armed clash between black and white, the whites would be at a tremendous advantage, certainly at the outset, and that African loss of life would certainly be heavy. Responsible African leaders have therefore always warned their people against any idea of resorting to arms in their struggle for liberation. But the question is whether they will always be prepared to listen to what I have called responsible leaders. There is more and more talk among the younger leaders about whether the method of non-violence will work in the South African context. Some are beginning to suggest that the possibility of a resort of violence should not be ruled out altogether. They point out that in any case, as the struggle proceeds and is intensified, it will not be the African people but the Government and its supporters who will resort to violence, and that it would be futile to expect the people assailed not to defend themselves in the best way possible. This is of course largely a counsel of desperation born out of the situation in South Africa in which the non-white groups are faced with a white population which is apparently impervious to the democratic processes of persuasion and discussion. If the white population were prepared to make concessions to the non-white groups and to recognise them as potential citizens of the country whose rights and

privileges, however limited they might be at the present time, will gradually have to be widened, this mood of desperation might not become widespread or endemic, But a situation in which all hope of future development appears to be denied to more than two-thirds of the population, can hardly be described as other than very explosive. The white population under the leadership of the Nationalist Party put their faith in force. At the present time the non-white groups are completely unarmed and therefore presumably completely defenceless. The whites on the other hand have at their disposal an army and a police force which is supplied with all the latest weapons for mass destruction, and as one white friend put it to me in discussing the possibilities of the South African situation, "If the worst comes to the worst, we'll shoot hell out of you fellows". But, of course, as I pointed out, the battle does not always go to the strong. If any such conflict were to take place in South Africa, the whole of the African continent would be on the side of the oppressed groups of South Africa, and it is doubtful whether the case of the white oppressors would receive as much support as they at present hope for. They regard themselves as the bastion of Western civilization in Southern Africa and that whatever they do now or in the future, in any clash between white and black in South Africa, the western world will automatically support the white side. This thinking with the blood in dealing with national problems is the bone of our existence in South Africa.

The facts of the South African situation indicate that black and white are here in such numbers with their interests interwoven to such an extent that the idea of armed conflict between them should be ruled out altogether as an instrument of national policy. A peaceful solution of the problems confronting the two groups seems to be the only way out.

The Nationalists believe that the peaceful way out is the way of separate development. This involves taking the Native Reserves as they are at present and converting them, however small their area, into a national home for the Africans in which they can, with State assistance, develop to their hearts' ^{content} ~~content~~ and enjoy all the rights in their own areas which the white man enjoys in his side of the country.

The new Minister of Bantu Administration and Development, Mr. M.D.C. de Wet Nel, grows almost lyrical in the glowing accounts he gives

of what the African will get and become under this policy of separate development in the years that lie ahead. He has got the blueprint for it all. All he is waiting for is for the African to accept his schemes and agree to co-operate with him. But there is a fundamental flaw in these grandiose schemes, and that is the fact that they are unilaterally conceived and unilaterally directed and unilaterally imposed upon the people for whom they are intended. Even if it were conceivable that the African might agree to the placing of the relations between black and white on the basis of separate development, he could obviously never approve of a system under which the whole scheme is operated by the white man without consultation with the people primarily affected by it. At the very least he would demand to be consulted and to have his views given serious consideration at every stage of the process. By consultation here I mean consultation with the people's freely chosen representatives and not consultation with the servants of the Government - the Chiefs. Not only are the Chiefs largely disqualified for this task because they are Government servants who cannot give, on any subject, any views but such as are acceptable to the Government, they are also disqualified because they represent in the main the least informed section of the African population. The position of the present day is quite unlike what his position was in traditional African society. There the Chief was among the best informed sections of the community as far as the culture of his tribe was concerned. From his youth up he was trained in the law and customs of his people, and he could be relied upon in most cases to give a good account of the views of the people in the small scale and relatively stable society in which he lived. With the coming of western civilization the position of the hereditary chief has changed for the worse vis a vis his people. While in the case of most tribes, in Southern Africa, under the influence of Christian Missions, education, industrialisation and urbanisation, the ideas of the people have undergone a revolutionary change, the chiefs have in the main remained relatively static. They have been passed by ^{most} by/modern developments in African society. They represent the most conservative sections of African society. Consequently to attempt to rest a scheme of development upon their views and their leadership, is really asking for too much. The most the chief can do under present circumstances is to

surround himself with the best informed among the members of his tribe and to rely upon them to help assess and evaluate the schemes concerning which he is called upon to express an opinion. On the other hand, any chief who does that will find himself blamed for being under the influence of 'agitators'. But if the policy of separate development is ever to command the widespread support of the people, the Government will have to give everybody - and not just the chiefs or the business people who want trading licenses in the Reserves - a stake in this development and ^{one} cannot see that happening without widespread and continuous consultation with as a broad a section of the African community as possible. That seems to be regarded as too much of a condescension on the part of the white bosses of the country. So every scheme of separate development instead of providing scope for African initiative and African endeavour, becomes one of providing more whites with opportunities for employment in the higher ranks of services intended for Africans, thus converting the Department of Bantu Administration and Development and the Department of Bantu Education into governmental agencies which are top heavy with European civil servants. The same applies to the Non-European Departments of local authorities and municipalities which look after the interests of the Africans in the huge African townships in the urban areas. Instead of them providing Africans with avenues of employment and training in the service of their own people, they are used to help solve the poor white and the white juvenile employment problems. This does not mean that Africans are not at all employed in these Departments, but ~~it~~ does mean that they are confined to the lower ranks of the service in which they can never learn to stand on their own feet or to develop the sense of responsibility which might stand them in good stead when called upon to run their own services. In other words it is not intended that the stage will ever be reached when either in their own areas or in services intended for them they should ever be masters of their own fate. As long as that is the theory and the practice underlying the policy of separate development, it can never be other than an insult to the intelligence of the African people. In view of the fact that there seems to be no possibility of the white

man changing his outlook in this regard, all that remains is for him to be allowed to carry out his policy of separate development and for its impracticability to be established in the process. The doctrine of natural consequences seems to be the only one that can be followed with the white man who has decided to harden his heart against all appeals by the African for a reasonable approach to the problems of the country. Taking this road will undoubtedly bring much suffering upon many people and will delay the development of harmonious relations between the peoples of South Africa for decades, if not generations, but it seems that this futile attempt at turning back the clock of progress will have to take place before there can be a forward move in the national affairs of the country. Things will have to get worse before they can get better.

The trouble about this hardening of the heart against common sense and reason is that it evokes a similar response among those against whom it is directed. The African who believes as our fathers did that surely in the end reason will prevail and that the disabilities under which we labour should be patiently borne because they will only last for a season, is becoming a rarity and it is to be feared that by the time he is ready to adopt a reasonable attitude, the white man will find himself against a blank wall of opposition. He will find that what he calls the 'extremists' have taken over the leadership of the African group. Already the slogan - Africa for the Africans - which had been largely discredited when the Marcus Garvey movement was at its height in the 20's - is coming back into popularity in some African circles, and he would be a bold man who would dare to predict that it will not catch on this time. After all the trend of events all over the African continent is that the time is more than overdue for Africans to be freed from old-style colonialism and imperialism, and that in most African territories means 'Africa for the Africans'. The undiscerning will not stop to ask themselves whether such a policy is appropriate for South Africa with its large population of settled Europeans. What they will content themselves is that it would be intolerable for a pocket of colonialism and imperialism to be allowed to remain in South Africa when the rest of the continent is free from it. We have not yet reached that stage

and in my opinion it is still possible at the present for white nationalism in South Africa and black nationalism to reach a compromise which would make possible their co-existence in the country. But such a compromise would require a degree of statesmanship of which the ruling whites have hitherto not shown themselves to be capable. It would demand of them a readiness to consult and to co-operate with the non-white groups, especially the Africans, which can only be brought about by considerable internal and external pressure. The internal pressure will be the development of a higher degree of political consciousness and a better state of organisation among the non-white groups, especially the Africans. The external pressure will come both from within the African continent and from beyond Africa. The rapidly increasing number of independent states, as they ^{become} stronger political and economic units, will give increasing support to those struggling for liberation in Africa and will bring pressure to bear on the South African Government to achieve this end. Already the Pan-African Conference at Accra in December 1958 has suggested an economic boycott of South Africa. South Africa has the most highly developed industrial economy in Africa and the ^{natural} ~~best~~ market for ^{her} ~~the~~ manufactured goods is the hinterland - the territories to the North. South Africa is also highly dependent upon these territories for a good proportion of the labour on ^{her} ~~the~~ mines and farms. A well organised and well supported economic boycott could do South Africa a great deal of harm. To meet such an economic boycott South Africa would, among other things, have to develop her internal market and that would involve improving the economic position of her non-white inhabitants whose poor economic condition militates against the development of a sound internal market. As far as countries outside Africa are concerned the friends of South Africa are to be found primarily among western countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States etc. These are the countries which, however embarrassing it is to them to do so, have hitherto stood by South Africa in international forums such as the United Nations. But it seems clear that their continued support will increasingly depend upon whether South Africa can convince them that her internal policies are not a menace to international peace in Africa in particular and in the world in general. All these

territories, including the United Kingdom and the United States, are turning their backs on old-style colonialism and imperialism and are showing increasing appreciation of the hopes and aspirations of the rising territories in Africa. They will not be willing to forfeit the friendship of these new independent states in Africa in order to placate a country whose policies have become an anachronism in the modern world. Moreover, these countries have their eyes and ears concentrated on the East. Russia and her allies are also making a bid for the friendship of African territories and peoples. The African peoples have not hitherto shown themselves to be enamoured by Russia and the blandishments which she has dangled before. They clearly do not want to exchange one form of imperialism and colonialism for another. They are looking for friends, not dictators or rulers. Most of them would much prefer to retain the friendship of the countries with which they have been associated for generations, if not centuries. But if they cannot get the friendship and co-operation and assistance in the development of their former metropolitan countries, they will not hesitate to turn in the direction where such friendship and assistance will be forthcoming, whatever the ideology of those countries may be. The ideology of apartheid, the policy of racial discrimination, the domination of non-white by white - these are the greatest friends of Communism on the continent of Africa. It says much for the good sense of the African people that they have not embraced communism in spite of the fact that it promises all and sundry the moon, but constant re-iteration of the dangers of Communism or calling every African leader who criticises Government policy a communist, as is becoming common in South Africa, is not calculated to undermine the policy of communism. On the contrary it gives communism credit for what it has not done and therefore enhances its prestige. Communism becomes the forbidden fruit whose attraction becomes the greater the more it is vilified and condemned. Sooner or later the danger of South Africa policies to the peace of Africa and of the world will be recognised for what it is and South Africa will be urged by her friends as well as compelled by her foes to abandon the path of rigid separate development with unjust discrimination and to follow the path of peaceful co-existence and a juster ordering of the relations between the different sections of the population.