B4 43

Bantu Aspirations

[ca 1950s]

1. The ~~hard~~ total population of the Union of South Africa is approximately 11 ~~ole~~ million made up of 2,500000 Europeans, three quarters of a million Coloureds, one quarter of a million Asiatics and $7\frac{3}{4}$ million Bantu. It goes without saying that as the Bantu constitute the bulk of the permanent population of the country, their aspirations, their reasonable ~~wishes~~ wants and wishes are deserving of the earnest consideration of all those who have the welfare of the ~~country~~ Union of South Africa as a whole genuinely at heart. Every ~~responsible~~ government Commission that has given the matter any attention, from the South African Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5[2] to the Native Laws Inquiry Commission of 1947[3], has in one way or another tried to bring home to thinking people in Southern Africa the fact that the true welfare of the sub-continent is bound up with the welfare of the Bantu. Not even the most fanatical believer in the theory that South Africa is or should be a white man's country contemplates the idea of building up a state here in which there are no relations at all between black & white. Recent ~~words~~ statements by their leading figures have shown that not even the most ardent exponents of the policy of apartheid are in favour of ~~a sort of Hindustan & Pakistan~~ the establishment of two mutually ~~in~~ exclusive regions, one completely white & the other completely non-white, in South Africa. All are agreed that in whatever way the country is divided up into white & black areas either by Act of Parliament or otherwise, there will always be whites on the black side & blacks on the white side. As a rule in dealing with this question of the relations between black & white in South Africa emphasis tends to be laid almost exclusively on the ~~aspirations~~ hopes & aspirations of the white section

of our population. To their credit it must be pointed out that South Africans, both black & white, have been among the most informed and among the severest critics of those schemes which did not do justice to one or other section of our populations. It is in this sense and in this sense alone that we can call our race problem ours. It is only to the extent that we South Africans ourselves make a serious effort to find the answer to this problem that they are perhaps entitled to express resentment, as they so often do, to facile foreign criticisms of their handling of this major South African problem. When we say that our race problem is a domestic problem in which we want no gratuitous advice from such august bodies as the United Nations Organisations, we can only justify that attitude by making genuine efforts ourselves to grapple with this problem.

It is obvious that no satisfactory solution of our problem can be found unless certain conditions are fulfilled.
In the first place our policy must be inspired by & based upon sound principle. In other words where the fundamental principle upon which our policy is based cannot bear examination because it is enmeshed by considerations of self interest and a grudging regard or a total disregard of the interests of others all schemes devised from it are bound in the long run to suffer shipwreck. Prof. Eiselen in his book on "The Ideology of Apartheid" has suggested that one of the main reasons why we have thus far failed to evolve a satisfactory solution of our race relations policy for us in South Africa is because far too often our policies have been determined "by economic considerations offering quick and easy returns". According to this the principle of the exploitation of the natural and human resources of the country for the benefit of a certain section of the population has led South Africa to adopt in varying degrees a native policy

which will in the long run prove detrimental to the interests of both black & white in South Africa. He goes on to ~~fo~~ expound the policy of apartheid or separation which in his opinion is more calculated to safeguards the legitimate aspirations of white & black in South Africa. Later in this paper I hope to show why the policy of apartheid is itself not acceptable to the African. At the moment ~~what I am~~ the point I am trying to make is that in our endeavours to ~~find a proper basis for~~ find a policy on which all sections of our population can move forward together we must make sure that the principles by which our policy is ~~t~~ inspired are sound. Where our policy, whatever the expressions by which it is described, is based on naked ~~exploit~~ or disguised exploitation or domination, it is bound ultimately to rouse the resentment and opposition of ~~those~~ the exploited & the dominated

~~But~~ There is another condition of success in our search for the correct policy for S.A. which ~~t~~ in my opinion ~~need to be fulfilled if we are to find a solution satisfactory solution~~ has hitherto ~~never~~ received inadequate attention. As a rule in dealing with this question emphasis tends to be laid almost exclusively on the hopes and aspirations of the white section of our population. Among the dominant whites neither those who may be regarded as anti-African nor ~~those~~ the so-called "Kaferboeties" ever stop to consider to what extent if any the views which they expouse are consonants with the wants and wishes of the Bantu themselves. ~~Both~~ The followers of both schools of thought appear to take it for granted that they know what the hopes & aspirations of the Bantu are or ought to be. One group — the believers in apartheid — is satisfied that the Bantu ~~wan~~ desire or ought to desire to develop on their own lines in their own areas and then proceed to lay down what those lines should be without consulting the people primarily concerned. The other group — the ~~liberals~~ believers in trusteeship — is quite convinced that the Bantu have ~~no~~ or ought to have no desire to develop on their own lines in their own areas and they also blithely proceed to lay down ex cathedra the lines along which

they think the Bantu would like to develop. In neither case are the Bantu allowed any say in the matter. I should like to emphasise the fact that however sincere & genuine such attempts to determine for the Bantu what their hopes & aspirations are or ought to be, they are almost certain to be quite different from what the people themselves desire or are prepared to accept. If it is our intention to achieve success in this matter we shall have to be prepared more and more to give serious consideration to what the Bantu themselves think and have to say. Like all other peoples the Bantu claim for themselves the right to have a hand in the shaping of their destiny. The friends of the Apican are often disappointed to find in these days ~~when they encounter~~ their schemes intended for Apicans encounter just as much opposition among the Bantu as those of "non-friends of the Apican. Both sections may be tempted to attribute this attitude to traditional primitive suspicion or by saying that Apicans are becoming anti-white. The fact of the matter is that the Apican is no longer satisfied to conditions under things are done, not with him but for him. In the South Apican situation self-determination for the Bantu implies (for him) a full share in the determination of policy. However bitter it may be for European to swallow this pill of co-operation with the Bantu my submission is that it is a sine qua non for the evolution of a progressive policy for South Apica.

In the light of the foregoing considerations I now proceed to consider the nature and the basis of Apican opposition to the two principal policies contending for the mastery in South Apica today, namely the policy of apartheid & that of trusteeship.

To begin with apartheid. Put in the most favourable light the policy of apartheid contemplates the setting aside of areas in which Apican interests shall be paramount and

other areas in which white interests shall be paramount, "~~the~~ or in other words "the separation of white and native into separate self-sufficient socio-economic units", or total separation into distinct white and black "areas of liberty. The African people throughout the history of their contact with the European have never wavered in their rejection of this policy. The reasons for their attitude are not far to seek.

In the first place the African rejects this policy because he is ~~not~~ convinced that there is ~~any~~ no genuine desire on the part of its advocate to create "areas of liberty" for Africans, but only ~~whatever~~ their an intention ~~may be as~~ to make of South Africa a single "area of liberty" for Europeans. This conviction is based upon past experience which counts a great deal more in this connection than facile speculations about the future

For many years both before and since Union our schemes for the solution of the black and white problem have in large measure been inspired by the spirit of the policy of separation or apartheid although it has not always been described by these new terms. As far as the African is concerned although other policies such as assimilation or trusteeship have had their adherents in South Africa and have in varying degrees exercised a moderating influence upon it the policy of apartheid has been in the ascendancy all the time, and the practical effect of it has been to depress the status of the African in all aspects of our national life

~~Their policy~~

Omit

Omit

For many years both before and since Union our schemes for the solution of the black-and-white problem have in large measure been inspired by the principle of ~~differentiation or segregation or~~ separation ~~or parallelism or~~ apartheid. As far as the African is concerned although other principles or policies ~~have had~~ such as assimilation or trusteeship have ~~all these different designations have for~~ principles although had their adherents and have exercised to varying extent, a moderating influence on it, the policy of apartheid has been ~~they are described by distinctive appellations have the same~~ practical effect namely to depress the status of the African in all aspects of life. ~~Many all proceed~~ This policy is based on the assumption that the African differs so radically from the European in cultural background, in his needs & aspirations that it must remain forever impossible ~~for us~~ to find common ground upon which black & white can work together in a common political ~~system~~ structure. ~~We have endeavoured~~ An attempt is then made to ~~give concrete~~ justify ~~[illegible]~~ this national policy on the ground that it would enable the African to develop on his own lines in his own areas, and give him full scope for the exercise of his capabilities & the realisation of his hopes and aspirations. At the same time giving lip service & the philosophy of ~~[illegible]~~ apartheid has not prevented ~~[illegible]~~ the advocates of apartheid from acquiring in the organisation of our national life in such a way as to make the realisation of their ideal impracticable. Thus we have adopted a land policy the effect of which has been to make ~~it~~ impossible the living of the African apart from the European on a permanent basis. The result is that a far greater number of Africans spend the greater part of their lives outside ~~rather~~ the limited Reserves ~~the~~ set aside for native occupations than those who live out their ~~lives~~ lives within the Reserves. We have developed an economic system which is dependent for its very ~~[illegible]~~ survival upon the employment of Africans in non-African areas. ~~Even~~ On the other hand in our so-called Reserves we have developed a system of administration which is so dependent upon the European that it provides no scope for the African to acquire or develop the skills & techniques which might stand him in good stead if he were in fact allowed to develop on his own lines. The fact that Perhaps well known institutions as the Transkeian Bunga which has been in existence for over 50 years still depend almost entirely

upon the European for their success is to the African inevitable proof that when the European speaks about allowing the African to develop on his own lines in his own areas" he does so with his tongue in his cheek. The Transkei is probably as European-dominated, ~~if not more so~~ as any other rural area of this size in the Union, if not more so. In other services intended specially for Africans there is the same story to be told. Thus in the special segregation system for Africans the whole set up is managed and controlled and dominated by Europeans who until quite recently have shown scarcely any disposition to allow the African to develop on his own lines. In spite of the fact that there is probably a higher standard of general education among Africans in the Union than in any other country in Africa, no territory is more reluctant to make use of its educated Africans to serve their own people. In post offices, banking offices and other public offices where Africans are compelled to go for services the policy of separation does not apply behind the counters as well as in front of the counters as it might be supposed. Throughout the Union both inside and outside the so-called native areas, in any institution intended for Africans the European has far more rights and privileges than the African. "In practice the native finds his freedom of movement and action severely curtailed, that in his efforts to rise to a higher level he finds his progress in the economic, the social and political fields barred by the white man, who claims permanent superiority by virtue of his colour. He finds to his dismay that many of the Europeans who appear to champion the cause of equal opportunity for all, resent close contact and friendship with the native and that they are not prepared to go beyond distant friendship" ("Race Relations," Vol. XV No. 3 1948. p. 74) I submit that it is the influence of the adherents of the policy of apartheid but is responsible for this set-up.

All these factors have combined to lead the African quite understandably to look upon the policy of separation as but a thinly veiled form of exploitation and domination and to regard any person who advocates it as a political enemy. The African has consequently turned his back

upon the policy of separation ~~or parallel development or~~ whatever the name by which it is known. He is determined, however long he may be compelled to endure its results, not to give his assent to fritter away his ~~energies~~ time with the hair-splitting which goes on among Europeans who endeavour to establish subtle distinctions between policies] which in the last analysis ~~are~~ is designed to place ~~the~~ every permanently European in a position of ~~permanent~~ artificial superiority over every black man in every aspect of our national

But while the new advocates of ~~apartheid~~ separation are prepared to admit that our past policies have had the effect of the domination of the white over the African, ~~but~~ they would like us to believe that ~~in the~~ dressed in the new look of apartheid their policy has more positive merits than the negative demerits of past practice. According to them, "the first requirement is that the ultimate goal should be ~~clearly~~ seen clearly, namely, the separation of White and Native into separate self-sufficient socio-economic units, a process which will spread over many years. The aim once in view both parties will be able to adapt themselves gradually to the new circumstances envisaged by separation, and they will bear with greater equanimity and less bitterness the many hardships which they will certainly meet with in the transition period" (Eiselen, Race Relations Vol XV, No 3. 1948 p. 82). I should like to say at once that the flaw in this conception of "the ultimate goal" as far as the African is concerned, is that it contemplates the setting of "separate self-sufficient socio-economic units" under the final control of a government in which Africans will not be represented. The trouble is that the ingenuity of man has not yet devised a political system under which the legitimate interests of any people or section of a people can be safeguarded by an institution or institutions in which they are not directly represented. By ~~rela arranging that~~ vesting in the white Union Government ~~should retain~~ the ultimate political control of these "separate socio-economic units", the permanent "baasskap" of the white man is safeguarded. No scheme under which the baasskap of the white man is entrenched either directly or indirectly can ever ~~or~~ receive the approval of the modern African

The Native Reserves which would obviously form the basis of any policy of apartheid have been with us for generations and in theory these areas were set aside in order that they might provide a ~~sort~~ basis for a of national home for the African, as areas in which African interests would be ~~predom~~ paramount. But the fact of the matter is, in actual practice that the native reserves exist ~~not~~ for the benefit not of the African but of the European "areas of liberty". The existence of the Reserves provides the European to his satisfaction with some sort of moral justification for ~~the~~ his denial of rights & privileges to the African in the so called European areas. Not only that. Within the Reserves themselves ~~the~~ Europeans have accorded themselves greater rights than the African. ~~Throughout the Reserves are to be found European communities~~ The Reserves ~~belong not~~ are areas set aside for native occupation. The ultimate authority on any matter concerning the Reserves is vested in the government in which Africans have little or no say. The result is that Government can ~~cut out~~ declare any area in the Reserves to be non-Reserve and within that area give Europeans those rights which they are not supposed to have in the Reserves, ~~The result is that in~~ Thus in the Transkeian Territories you have European townships or villages in which Africans have no rights. Even outside those villages within the Reserves wherever a European individual is found his rights are accorded better protection than those of any African however exalted he may be in status within the African community. ~~#~~ The analogy often drawn that the African should be given

Land

On the question as to where these "socio-economic units" are to be established the new advocates of apartheid point to the Reserves as the areas in which might provide the material sub-stratum for ~~future~~ the African society of the future. The objection of the inadequacy of these Reserves they reply either by suggesting that the Reserves contain 40% of the best ~~land~~ agricultural land in the country or supporting that Great Britain might oblige by adding the Protectorates to the areas set aside by the Union which would enable the Union to solve its native problem without calling for too great a sacrifice from its European nationals. As usual of any sweeping is to be done it must be done by the Africa

no rights in the European areas on the ground that the European has no rights in the Native areas is false because the African has no share in the decision as to what ~~the~~ rights the European ~~should~~ shall have in the Native areas & what rights the African shall have in the European area. It is always easy for the European authorities in charge of the Reserves to ~~have~~ convince themselves that the Europeans in the Native areas are ~~necessary for the benefit~~ there because the Natives ~~need them~~ would not be able to exist without them. It is an keeping with this that A Minister of State under the new Government has already assured European in the Transkeian Territories that they need have no fears as regards their future in the territories if the policy of apartheid is applied.

But not only does the African contend that the European has so entrenched himself in the Native territories that they are ~~so~~ much more of a national home for him than they can ever be for the African but he also complains that the present area of the Reserves would have to be considerably increased if they were to be expected to provide a permanent & final & exclusive basis for the building up of a separate African society in which 800000 Africans must find full satisfaction for all their needs. If the European has infiltrated into the present Reserves to the extent that he has done, how can one believe that he will surrender the additional land that would be required for the purpose of creating an adequate "area of liberty" for Africans. In a word apartheid as practised hitherto has ~~realised~~ resulted in the creation of areas not of ~~liberty~~ self-realisation for Africans but of privileged position for Europeans, and the African has absolutely no reason to believe that the ~~[illegible]~~ present adherents of apartheid will be readier to sacrifice the ~~[illegible]~~ gains of ~~their predecessors~~ those who went before them. Under the ~~[illegible]~~ influence of the ~~[illegible]~~ policy of apartheid the white man has secured great gains for himself in this country. The execution of a policy of genuine apartheid ~~will~~ would demand from ~~the European~~ him sacrifices which they are not prepared to make.

But even if the gospel of apartheid had been a ~~credible~~ genuine one it would still ~~have to~~ come up against the African's claim that there is no part of the Union in which he is not entitled to have the same rights as any other section of the population.

The African ~~does not~~ has never at any time accepted the conception of "European" & "Native" areas. The mere fact that

the European has used his present dominant position to make a unilateral division of the country to his own advantage places the African under no obligation to accept that arrangement. The European lays claim to the whole country and by the use of exclusive political ~~privileges~~ rights & military power he has ~~legislated~~ placed himself in a dominant position both in the European areas & in the so-called native areas. The African, conquered disfranchised, discriminated against on every side, is not prepared to forego his claim to any part of the country. These two claims which are obviously mutually exclusive can only be resolved on the basis ~~by~~ genuine agreement between the two sections. The European has, however, become so arrogant as a result of his present dominant position that he cannot even contemplate the idea of working out a solution of this problem together with the African.

This brings me to the point I tried to make earlier namely that ~~any~~ no solution of the problem of race relations in South Africa which is arrived at unilaterally ~~and is applied~~ by one section of the population and is then imposed upon another section, will ever have the approval of the latter. The African has hitherto taken his stand on a policy of co-operation between black & white at all levels of our national life. The advocates of apartheid have always taken their stand on a policy of non-co-operation between black & white. The increasing influence of non-co-operationists among European is giving rise, as it was bound to do, to the emergence of a group of non-co-operationists among the Africans ~~There can be only one result of~~ Once the policy of non-co-operation becomes endemic on both sides of the colour line the only solution that will remain is that of partition, ~~the creation of a kind of Hindustan & Pakistan~~ That is the meaning of the efforts which are now being to weld together into one ~~organisation~~ the different political organisations of the African people. It has been suggested that the basis of that unity should be non-~~coll~~ co-operation with the white man on the ground that with apartheid in the ascendancy among Europeans it would appear ~~the policy of~~ the dominant whites has now ~~become~~ accepted a policy ~~one~~ of non-co-operation with the African. Non-co-operation begets non-co-operation.

Trusteeship

The policy of trusteeship purports to be based upon the principle that in every society a moral obligation rests upon those who are able to stand on their own feet to exercise guardianship over those who are not until the latter are able to take their place alongside them on equal terms. In the South African situation this means that the European who is admittedly in a better position to undertake this responsibility should exercise ~~guardianship~~ tutelage over the more backward African. Properly understood ~~this policy~~ and applied this policy ~~the~~ implies that the European should regard his position as one of trust in which it becomes his duty to assist the African both individually and as a group to ~~develop~~ advance as rapidly as possible to the stage where he can take care of his own affairs or (politically, economically, educationally, socially, otherwise) play his part in taking ~~part~~ care of the affairs of the Country as a whole.

The trouble with this policy is that the high sounding moral principle on which it is based not infrequently comes into conflict with the self interest of the European and it tends to degenerate into ~~a policy~~ from ~~[illegible]~~ a policy of trusteeship of white leadership ~~rather than one~~. [Now however backward the African may be as a group ~~at the~~ and however advanced the European may be as a group at the present time, the African is not prepared to accept a policy under which the leadership or guardianship of the white is made to rest upon his colour rather than upon the intrinsic merit of the individual European or the ~~[illegible]~~ pupillary position of the African is made to depend upon the his colour

The advocates of trusteeship maintain that their policy differs radically from that of apartheid on the ground that it purports to be based upon merit rather than upon colour. They hold that the European has had such a long start over the African in the acts of civilisation that he need have no fear of ever being

XV. While the Russian is prepared to accept a policy ~~based~~ under upon which the leadership or guardianship of the white is based upon the merit of rather than the color of the individual European