1. In recent years the spotlight of world publicity has been focused increasingly upon the Union of South Africa. Apart from the attention the country has attracted in the world press, and in such international forums as the United Nations, there has been a steady stream of books, articles in popular and learned journals and reports by foreign visitors to the country—all in an endeavour to get the measure of the problems confronting this newly formed society. The rapid development that are taking place in other parts of the African continent throw into sharp relief the situation in South Africa which appears set in a direction diametrically opposite to what is happening elsewhere in Africa. Dominating at the recent All-African Peoples' Conference were the boycotts of South African goods supported by the Labour Party in Britain and other influential organisations in Britain, elsewhere, and the spirited enunciation by Mr Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, in his address to members of the Union Parliament of the fact which South Africa is nothing but the other member of the Commonwealth— all these have placed South Africa and her problems in the forefront of world news.

2. The problems confronting South Africa do not result from any lack of generosity on the part of nature. The Union of South Africa, with an area about seven-eighths of the United States, has a population of 14 million; compared with the 160 million of the U.S. The country has a healthy climate with no very great extremes of heat or cold, and relative freedom from such pests as the tsetse fly and the diseases that have derived from some parts of Africa the name of "the white man's grave." As an African summarily has put it, "for from being a white man's grave," South Africa could more correctly be described as a "white man's paradise." Nothing in Nature does the white man have it so good as
in South Africa. Although not a very rich country agriculturally — according to experts only fifteen percent of the land is good for agriculture — it has vast natural resources of minerals — gold, diamonds, coal, iron ore, manganese, etc. and the uranium found in the mountain ranges from the Gold Mine. Development to be seen around the city of Kimberley has given added strength to the mining industry of South Africa. With the rapid industrialisation that has been stimulated during the 1950's by two world wars and the ever present threat of a third, South Africa's manufacturing industries are making an ever increasing contribution to the national income and to international trade. The expanding economy and high standard of living (encompassing all neighboring territories) have made it a centre of attraction to immigrants from all parts of South East and Central Africa, as well as Europeans who have been drawn to South Africa to make their homes here since 1652. In 1948 the anti-immigration policy of the National Government, especially since 1948, has prevented the dreams of white enigmists from becoming reality. The advent of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser has given the old sea route to the Suez via the Cape of Good Hope a new importance, giving the Union of South Africa a significant place in global military strategy. Because of the relatively stable conditions in the country and the increase in foreign investment, South Africa continues to attract investment capital overseas although it is feared that the racial policies followed by the present Union Government may in time adversely affect the flow of Capital to the country. Why is it that a country with such material and other advantages seems unable to evolve a social economic and political system that can ensure adequate safeguards for the legitimate aspirations of all its peoples? Is there any practical alternative to the apartheid policy?
of the present Nationalist Government which has given rise to so much controversy here and abroad. The political and economic aspect of the problem of an alternative to apartheid have been dealt with elsewhere in this volume. The purpose of this paper is to consider the possibilities in the field of social relations between the different groups that make up the population of South Africa.

3. It is usually suggested and I think rightly so, that any consideration of the basic issues involved in the black African situation must have regard to the multi-racial character of the population and in particular to the relative proportions of the racial groups represented here and the history and nature of their settlement in the country. The population of the Union is usually divided into four main categories: Europeans (white), Indians, Coloured (mixed). The Europeans number approximately three million, the Indians were million, the Coloured just over a million and the Africans (mainly Black but including some Chinese) about half a million. The Europeans have been established in the area since 1652, the Africans are indigenous inhabitants of the country, the Coloureds originally came as indentured labourers about 1860 on the express invitation of the Government. The Coloureds are the result of miscegenation between black and white, although they include a group of Malays originally brought into the country as slaves from the East when the Cape Colony was still under the jurisdiction of the Dutch East India Company.

Not only do these groups differ in number and in racial
stock, but they vary also in cultural background, in the
languages they speak and in the level of their development
in terms of modern Western civilization. They are as far
from being a homogeneous society as can be expected.
The core of the South African problem lies in the fact
that these groups, which are all determined to make
South Africa their permanent home and have lived together
in the country so long that their interests have become
intertwined, have not yet found a satisfactory
basis on which they can be welded into a united
nation with common ideals and common loyalties. This
is not because they have not seriously endeavoured to find
such a basis. The history of South Africa is studded with
trials to find a solution to the racial problems confronting
its peoples. Commissions of experts have studied the issues
involved and made recommendations to different South
African governments on various aspects of these problems.
Parliamentary select committees have heard voluminous
evidence on measures intended to deal with one or other
questions relating to the relations between white and non-white.
Innumerable individual studies have been made and various
schemes have been tried in the search for a political
system which would safeguard the rights of all
sections of the population. Yet all these efforts have
so far proved abortive. In fact, far from moving
in the direction of a solution of its major problems competent
observers are agreed that the country in recent years, especially since
1948, has tended to move in the direction of an intensification
of the stresses and strains that are tearing South Africa into
a link divided against itself.

Usually the question of group relations in South Africa today is considered almost exclusively as a study in relations between white and non-white, but this is an oversimplification of the problem. The white population itself does not constitute a homogeneous group. Of the three million whites, 68% are Afrikaans-speaking and 40% English-speaking and some of the bitterest conflicts in South African history which have left behind them a legacy of mutual suspicion and distrust, have been between these two groups. The Afrikaans-speaking section of the population, whose ancestors first settled at the Cape in 1652 consider that they have a better claim to the country than the English-speaking section whose forebears took over the Cape from Holland in 1806.

It was the dissatisfaction of the Afrikaans element with British Colonial Policy that led a considerable number of them to embark upon the Great Trek of 1836 when they left the Cape for the interior, where they later established independent republics with policies, especially as far as black-white relations were concerned, fundamentally different from the egalitarianism policy of nineteenth-century Britain.

In this way the period from 1854, when the independence of the Boer republics was recognized by Great Britain to 1902 when the Republics again became British colonies, was marked by a series of clashes between English and Afrikaans for supremacy. Even with the British victory in the Boer War and the subsequent formation of Union in 1910, the struggle between the two groups did
come to an end. The Rhodesian rebellion of 1914; the
struggle over the South African national flag; the struggle
over the dispensation; the struggle over the national cultures
("God Save the King" + Die Stem van Suid Afrika"); the
struggle over the official capital (English Cape Town being the
capital, and Pretoria being the administrative capital), the
struggle for dominion status; the clash over South Africa's
entry into the Second World War—all these highly
controversial issues greatly affected relations between white
and white.

To this day the British imperial factor is a ghost never absent
from South African politics. Although South Africa has attained
dominion status, i.e., has become a sovereign independent
state within the British Commonwealth of Nations, the
African-speaking whites are no longer part of the British
connection. As Sir Lionel Abrahams pointed out, the idea
of recovering their republican independence lost in 1902
does not derive from the British Commonwealth, but from the
struggle for self-government in time. "A very considerable number of people alive today
took part in the struggle for self-government and
independence, and thousands died for it," he said in
an interview with the New York Times. His successor
Mr. J. G. Strijdom was an ardent republican and Mr.
H. F. Verwoerd, the Prime Minister, has made the
republican issue a matter of immediate
practical politics by announcing his intention to refer
the matter to a referendum of the white electorate
on the near future and envisaging that a large majority

...t will settle the issue one way or the other.

On the other hand, in some English-speaking circles, this withdrawal of a republic from government with possible secession from the Commonwealth is looked upon as a serious move designed to deprive them of their rights in a land to which their claim in terms of their contribution and their experience is every bit as good as that of the Xhosa people. Hence, their determination to fight against the establishment of a republic in the black African countries against a republic outside the Commonwealth. The Xhosa maintain that the establishment of a republic will end and for all time to come, the differences between English-speaking and Xhosa-speaking whites, leaving only the question of formal relations between blacks and whites. On the other hand, the English maintain that a unilateral solution of this kind which takes into account the interests of the traditions of one section of the black population will never command itself to people who are just as proud of their history and their background as the Xhosa are of theirs. Only on the basis of mutual respect for their respective traditions and unity in diversity can they see any hope for healing the wounds of the past and working for the united nation which was envisaged by the founders of the Union of South Africa.

But what of these political and other differences? Both English-speaking and Xhosa-speaking South Africans are agreed that the greatest problem...
Emerging as the "Swat River" the black menace represented by the fact that the overwhelming majority of the population of the country is non-white. The feeling that the whites should have a uniform policy for dealing with the non-white problem was probably the principal reason for the formation of the Union in 1910. The Union as finally consummated was a union of whites in face of what they considered a common danger, the black problem. Their fears in this regard have not been mitigated by recent development in the part of South Africa.

On the contrary, the fact that so many native territories in Africa are moving in the direction of self-government and independence has rendered more urgent the question of finding a way in which black-white relations in South Africa can be placed on a basis which will ensure the survival of the white man and of western civilization in South Africa.

On the other hand, the non-whites do not themselves represent a united or uniform group. Thus the Africans are divided into a number of tribal units with variations in usages and customs, a plethora of languages, and they speak a variety of languages belonging to the Bantu language family, but not mutually intelligible to the ordinary speakers. This has not lightened the task of those seeking to weld them into a unified whole. Thus African political leaders who recognize unity among Africans as their strongest weapon in their struggle for a place in the South African sun have to contend with the differences which remain significant for a good proportion of them. On the other hand, the white men, especially the present rulers of
South African seek to capitalise on these differences by trying to bolster up tribalism in their system of native administration in which the principle of ethnic grouping is endorsed. Tribal chiefs are recognised or appointed; tribal authorities are set up; schools and colleges are organised on an ethnic basis — all in an endeavour to perpetuate tribal antagonism and enmities in the hope that while these are given free rein it will be impossible for the Africans to develop a united front among themselves. But the greatest decisive factor among Africans has been the common oppression to which they have been subjected by the European, and the common resentment they feel at having been drawn often against their wishes and with little regard to the concerns of their own social systems into the vortex of western civilisation. Africans have, of course, for generations been systematically drawn into the European economic system so that today there is no section of the South African economy — mining, farming, trade and industry — which does not depend to a greater or lesser extent on African labour. For over a century African missionaries have been at work among Africans urging them with no small measure of success to adopt Christianity as their way of life. The result is that over 50% of the African people belong to churches which we think at least recognise "mother law..." and no free man make my female," but regard all men as subject to the principle of the headship of man and the fatherhood of God. Under the influence of the missionaries and with increasing government support Africans have been brought into contact with western education and western science and have thus
been made heirs of the intellectual and spiritual heritage
of the modern world. They travel in trains, buses and aeroplanes;
they drive and own motors, listen to radios and watch
moving pictures; they play and watch all the games which have
brought to this country by Europeans, both indoor and outdoor. They
fell under the same government and are in the main subject
to the same legal system. They have learned the art of counting
and speakiterate not only their own language but also
the official languages of the country - English and
Afrikaans and in increasing numbers enter for and pass
the same examinations as Europeans for secondary and higher
education. As a result of contact with the white man at so
many points in their lives, there has developed as between blacks
and white a brotherly sense of mutual understanding. For them to
form part of this nation. This is however, initiated by the
legislative measures which discriminate against blacks in so many
aspects of their lives and by social practices which are calculated
to emphasize the things that divide rather than which unite the
white and the non-white sections of South African society.

What has been said about the Indians applies to the
Indians and the Coloured. The Indians constitute a separate
non-white community. Until fairly recently they have not
regarded it as either necessary or expedient to make common
cause with Europeans in their struggle for better rights in the land
of their adoption. They have lived in the main as a
separate community concentrated very largely in one province
 Natal - with enclaves in the other provinces except in the
Free State where they are not allowed residential rights. But
they too have been drawn into the South African economy
and political system. Over 80% of them have been born in South Africa and have never been to Asia. Many of them have adopted Western ways of living, have become Christianized, and been educated in Western-type schools and colleges, and so have become integral parts of the South African society.

The Indians — persons of mixed descent, the result of miscegenation between black and white — also form a separate community. Unlike the Indians of the African they have no cultural background other than that of the white man. Indeed, they have been isolated from the rest of society for a period of many years. They have been encouraged in this belief by their leaders, who wanted to keep the non-white from forming a united front against the white. Thus in 1923, the late Herman Holt, then Prime Minister of the Union, dashed hopes for the Coloreds to have a Bill which purported to be designed to give Colored equality with the white man. Of course it never reached the Statute Book. Dr. D.F. Malan took the initiative that he believed in the eventual emancipation of Coloreds. He felt that the Indians and Coloreds, after preparatory treatment and not seen entirely powerless as they enjoyed certain privileges or advantages over Africans, such as freedom from the law or better economic employment opportunities. But with the gradual improvement of the apartheid policy of the present government, they have begun to realize that the only effective method to 17
the yardstick by which the right to vote is measured. Non-white leaders who see the necessity for united front are faced with the task of proving the effects of the official policy of "divide and rule," although they are not always agreed on. The best method of achieving this is by all thinking non-white leaders to set up an anti-racial policy presented by the policy of white supremacy, the minor differences between them become insignificant. Efforts from time to time to achieve this have been made by leaders from the different non-white groups to bring about unity among them. This has been the basis of the common opposition to which they are subject, but these efforts have not yet achieved success although movement in that direction is much stronger today than it was ever been before.

On the other hand, the Government has always preferred to deal with the various non-white groups separately. It has separately not only from the whites but separately from one another. Thus separate schools, separate colleges, separate residential areas, separate bus services, separate work places, separate employment opportunities, separate social security benefits, and so on, have been set up for the different non-white groups - African, Indian and Coloured. The Africans have been further subdivided into Zulu, Xhosa and other ethnic groups, the latter being to provide separate identities for these groups. According to the present rules of the country, the reason for all these ills in South Africa - political, economic or social - is apartheid or separate development as it is now euphemistically termed. The white man in South Africa has used and is using the political power of which he at present enjoys a virtual
monstrously to give practical effect to this product of his political genius, that the salvation of peoples of different racial stock residing on varied cultural backgrounds living in the same country under the same government lies in their ever more rigid separation from one another in all phases of life. Under the apartheid policy there is separation in public transport, in public offices, in public amenities, in residential areas, in schools, in churches, in cemeteries, etc. In connection with these separate services we do not find even the fig leaf of the separate but equal doctrine which was casuistic when unjustified because it was so effectively dealt with by the United States Supreme Court in the segregated decision handed down in 1954. When the South African Supreme Court of last resort handed down a decision to the effect that where separate facilities are provided for the different racial groups such facilities must be substantially equal, the Union Parliament proceeded at once to pass in the first instance the Separate Amenities Act 1953 which laid down that separate facilities for different racial groups need not to be equal. The doctrine of separate but equal is not part of the traditional legacy of South Africa: on the contrary the current decline of South Africa is separate and unequal.

In about the policy of separation for fear leukemia to an equalization of opportunity and services for all sections of the population — be it "smelldout better" always vaguely promised by the separationists — just around the corner — has resulted in retarded development, the maximized satisfactions of one section of the population — the white — and the progressive depression of the status of other sections, including the gradual disappearance of rights and privileges formerly enjoyed in some parts of the country.
The Cultural Argument

There are many arguments generally advanced by the South African white in favour of separation. One is the argument based upon the cultural differences between the different groups represented in the country. The argument is that the differences between the various groups are so great and so fundamental that it would be impossible for them to form part of one community and that therefore it is in order to avoid friction between the different groups it is essential to keep contact between them to a minimum. It might be pointed out however, that culture is not innate but is learned behaviour and one of the results of contact between people of different cultural backgrounds is the transfer of culture elements between them. In fact, one of the results of the prolonged contact between black and white in South Africa is that many blacks have adopted western culture to such an extent that they are closer, to the white man than to their fellow blacks in their ways of life. From the point of view of making contact with whites the previous argument might well apply to the same extent, but experience shows that the separationist shows more venom in his relations with the educated man than he does towards the so-called "raw" non-white. The same white man who lives sometimes in fairly close contact with an ignorant, untutored African in the ways of the modern western way of life does the very sight of an educated African. An interesting example of this occurs in connection with the pass laws under which educated Africans are entitled to carry a green reference book, while the average African carries a brown reference book. The white police are more unsympathetic in dealing with holders of green reference books than with holders of brown reference books. In short the cultural argument for separation is more specious than real.
The Biological Argument

Another argument in favour of separation is that if the negative one that if separation between black and white were not maintained, social equality would result and social equality would lead ultimately to the physical absorption of the white man by the black and eventually to the disappearance of the white man. Therefore if the white men want to preserve his separate identity he must adopt a policy of separation between black and white.

Otherwise the white men would commit national suicide. It is usual to bolster this argument by saying that the different racial groups have a racial finale in terms of which they wish to maintain their separate identity and that attempts to prevent preserving racial separation are in keeping with the ethos of the different racial groups. The fact of the matter is that the Immorality Acts passed by the Union Parliament have not prevented succeeded in keeping the races apart sexually. Certain types of individuals among the different racial groups sexually apart. It is the worst type of hypocrisy to use this as an argument to keep apart people who wish to indulge in unexceptionable forms of contact whose name is legion because of the few who contravene the called immoral Acts.

The Political Argument

Perhaps the most important argument advanced in favour of separation is the political. In terms of this argument non-whites must on no account be allowed a say to elect or to become members of the ordinary organs of government, whether the national, the provincial or the local level, because that might ultimately lead to the ultimate lead to the supremacy of the European by the non-white, a domination of the European by the non-white.
If non-whites are to be given any say in matters affecting their welfare, this must be done in separate institutions specially established for them, preferably in what are described as their "own" areas. Hence the establishment of Native Authorities for Africans in the Reserves and the setting up of a Coloured Affairs Council for Coloureds, both with emphasis on the nomination of members by the various governments rather than on election by the people affected, so that these bodies represent the voice of the government rather than the views of the people concerned. Unless the white man maintains this tight control over the political affairs of the country, it is contended, some whites pass into the hands of the non-whites, to the detriment of the latter in particular and of the country as a whole in general. This is of course a fiction which can only be maintained by force. The non-whites have at no time given up their claim for full citizenship rights and even where they have participated in the bodies specially established for them, they have regarded these bodies as inadequate substitutes for a real say in the government of the country. On the contrary, these political organizations have continued and will continue to press their claims to political rights in no way inferior to those enjoyed by Europeans in the country or by non-whites in other independent countries in other parts of Africa.

Whether the arguments advanced in favour of separation are sound or unsound, the fact remains that this is at present the official policy of the country and the present rulers of the country seem like the world to believe that this is the only basis on which the problems of the
race relations in the country can be solved. According to them, the only way in which the development of the country can proceed in a peaceful and orderly manner is to the mutual benefit of all sections of the population.

This policy could only be justified if it did, in fact, promote the interests of all sections of the population, and if it produced as between the different sections of the population the wholesome relations on which alone the stability of the country depends. No impartial observer of South African affairs could support the contention that the policy of apartheid has advanced the interests of all sections of the population. This policy was not of course initiated by the present government. Previous governments have also given effect to it, although none of them raised it to the level which it has reached under the present government.

Even a cursory examination of the legislation which has been passed on the Apartheid Bill since 1948 will show that the direction in which it has been set has been that of circumscribing the rights of the non-whites in every sphere of life and entrenching the rights of the whites. Only a fool or a knave could suggest that this has led to healthy relations between black and white. While the whites have become more arrogant and contemptuous in their dealings with the blacks, the latter have become more and more frustrated and resentful in their attitudes towards the former. The apartheid policy has led to less and less contact between black and white and has intensified the feelings of suspicion and mistrust between the different groups. Although under the apartheid policy the non-whites have become more and more defenceless and rightless, politically, economically and socially, they have not abandoned their claims.
to full citizenship rights. On the contrary they have become more
uncompromising and more insistent upon their claim for full
equality with the white man in every sphere of life. Thus means
a generation ago non-white might have been prepared
to accept a policy of gradual extension of political rights to
them on the basis of educational and property qualifications, no
the n.w. white organisation or individual leader with any
following would today be prepared to consider, any the less
than the goal of universal suffrage. Similarly in the economic
sphere equal pay for equal work is the only policy which
commands itself to responsible n.w. leader of thought. Similarly
the use of colour as a basis for differentiation between people in groups
or individuals in the social sphere has become more and more
repugnant to the n.w. whites with the passage of time. No amount
of rationalisation of the apartheid policy has been able to backtrack
the n.w. whites into believing that it is other than a technique
for the domination of the vast majority of the population of the country
by a white minority. The State Information Office in its publications
gives glowing accounts of what is being done for the African in this
or that sphere of life. The journal 'Santu' issued by the
Department of Bantu Administration and development affairs
say pictures of what is going in the areas set aside for African
education under such headings as that "Pantherian means
Progress". Information officers stationed in different parts of the
country impressed the advantages of apartheid. Chief of varying
degrees of importance have had their students vastly
improved in the hope of turning them and their villagers into
apostles of apartheid. Trading rights have been granted to and accepted by African businessmen in African areas
and some of them have become very prosperous indeed. But none of these things have fooled the people. None of them have improved the relations between white and black in any significant way. Today when we are about to celebrate fifty years of union there is much less love lost between white and black than was the case in 1910.

If, as we have seen, the policy of separate development or segregation or whatever else it may be called has not produced the happy state of affairs for all which had been hoped for from it, the question may be asked as to whether there is any alternative to apartheid? But if it is suggested that the rulers of South Africa have set the ship on a course which must lead to shipwreck, is there any alternative direction in which they might seek to go?

In seeking to answer this question it is well to point out that the policy of separation is not the only policy that has been followed in Southern Africa. It is often suggested that the policy of separation is the traditional policy of South Africa as if that is the only tradition which has been practised in South Africa. It is correct to say that when the Boer republics were established in the middle of the 19th century, they laid down as fundamental that in their states there would be no equality between black and white in Church or State. But they did so precisely because there was a different tradition in those parts of the country from which they had trekked, although it might be said that the policy of equality before the
law, which was nurtured primarily in the Cape and to a lesser extent in Natal, was associated with the English and with the missionaries who entered the country later than the Dutch. It must be remembered that both groups were foreigners to Africa, and both these groups with their different attitudes on the question of race have become part of the permanent population of South Africa, and therefore the two tendencies—the tendency towards protection and colonialism and the tendency towards integration and liberalism both form part of the South African tradition. For that reason the apartheidists have not always had things their own way in South Africa. Although the policy of apartheid has in recent years attracted the more attention both inside and outside the Union and commands widespread support among the dominant whites, it has found opponents among them as well as among the non-whites. The white opponents of apartheid have perhaps not been as vocal in expressing their opinions as so determined in working for their translation into action as the non-whites, but they have not been entirely silent. Moreover, the white advocates of a policy of integration and cooperation between black and white have come from both the Afrikaans-speaking and the English-speaking sections of the white population. Any adequate history of racial tolerance and liberalism in South Africa must have to include the names of men like Senator the Hon. E. S. Nelen and the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyr alongside names like Sir James Ross-Innes, J. K. Merriman and W. P. Schreiner. Although these men have yielded to no one in their belief that the western form of civilization has to be preserved in South Africa, they did not think that this
necessarily implied the denial of political, economic or social rights to the non-white groups. Like their fellow white citizens, they believed in what they called the white leadership of the South African nation but did not subscribe to the idea that this leadership should be based exclusively or primarily on considerations of pigmentation or on the so-called innate superiority of the white man. Now today when the separatists, represented by the Nationalist party and certain sections of the United Party who are always trying to out-Nationalist the Nationalists in their True South African policy, there are predominantly white parties such as the Liberal party and the Progressive party which although they express, like voices crying in the wilderness, represent those among the whites who are searching for what might be described as the Holy Grail for South Africa – the alternative for apartheid.

Apart from the politicians with their policies and programmes designed to attract the white electorate, there have been those who away from the limelight have carried out practical experiments in black-white co-operation which have shown that there is nothing instinctive about apartheid or separation, that black and white can work together harmoniously even in South Africa. The Christian churches have perhaps come nearest to giving practical effect to the ideal of judging men not by the accident of pigmentation but by their most essential human qualities. Being churches in South Africa they have in many respects taken on local colour. They have built up separate churches, separate schools and other separate institutions for their members drawn up from different racial groups. They have sought to justify
these separate faculties on grounds of language or convenience but with the possible exception of one church or group of churches they have not sought to raise separation as such to the level of a theological tenet and have regarded it from the humanitarian point of view as a concession to human frailty and error rather than as a matter of principle. Hence they have been able to maintain contacts between black and white in their conferences, assemblies, and synods and to allow and even encourage that free association between man and man without regard to race or colour which is anathema to the separatist. And although some of these churches in their white eminence have a majority of non-whites against a minority of whites the former have not sought to dominate the latter by making illegitimate use of their superior numbers. The non-whites have placed the larger interest of the church to which they belong above the sectional interest of the group of which they are members.

In the field of education we have had significant examples in South Africa of contact between black and white not per se the divine results always feared by the separatist. For many years the Lovedale Institution in the Eastern Cape although primarily an institution for non-whites admitted white students as well. Some of the most distinguished white sons and daughters of South Africa received part of their education at Lovedale. Among these may be mentioned men like Sir James Ross, Innes, a former Chief Justice of the Union of South Africa; Sir William Solomon, another Chief Justice; and more recently, Denis Goldberg, the anti-apartheid leader and headmaster of the St. John's Preparatory School, Johannesburg.
Another institution which has demonstrated the possibility of South African students of different racial origins living and working together in peace and harmony is the University College of Natal. For over 40 years both students and staff were drawn from all sections of the South African population. They were bound together by common pursuits in the field of higher education, but actually did they meet on terms of equality in the classroom, but also in ordinary social relationships. No one was compelled to associate with anyone else but without any inferior pressure being brought to bear upon anyone, those who entered this community with the usual South African prejudices found that with the passing of time it became just as natural for them to associate from associations across the color line as within. Having been provided with the opportunity to meet on terms of equality, they did not find this an entirely unnatural as they had been led to suppose by their upbringing by the mores of the communities in which they had been brought up.

The so-called open universities in South Africa, particularly the University of Cape Town and the University of the Witwatersrand, are also able to testify on the basis of actual experience, that over a number of years that no undue adverse consequences have resulted from contact between white and non-white students. In none of these universities have any cases of friction or tension between white and non-white student been reported. The Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand have stated their reasons for wishing to remain open as follows:

"One of the reasons is that the experience has demonstrated the advantages of the association of different racial races at the university level. These universities are convinced that they have contributed to inter-racial understanding and harmony in South Africa. There is congruence in the fact that the association of students -
racial background, but to see them as ordinary human beings. In order to get to behave in conformity with the apartheid pattern, they had to be an intensive and systematic system of indoctrination through the schools, on political platforms, and in literature and other institutions bolstered up by legislative measures designed to prevent the spread of a different tradition. There is a sense in fact, in which the fury of the separatist attack upon the rights of the non-whites has been directly proportioned to the extent of their education that the hard facts of the South African situation were accepted by their own authorities and in favour of the thin unenforced or ill-defended views of their opponents, both white and black.

In short, the non-separatist has just as much stigma as the separatist to say that non-separation is part of the South African tradition and is entitled to as much respect as any other. Similarly because the non-separatist can point to the fact that their attitude to social relations in South Africa is calculated to promote mutual respect and harmony between the different sections of the population, which is more than can be said for the imposed separate apartheid pattern in whose wake we find antagonism, friction, bitterness and resentment between people who are thrown together in various walks of life.

The question may be asked as to whether apartheid and integration are the only two alternative ways of life in a common society. A great deal depends upon what exactly is meant by these two terms. To the extent that apartheid means a rigid separation between the various racial groups in South Africa in all walks of life and in all matters political, economic and social, it is not only indefensible but a great danger to the future of South African life, but it is morally indefensible as it is enforced upon particular groups in the non-white sections of the population without any consultation with them about their
If various races, as in the lecture theatre, the laboratory and on the
campus in general, live in peace without friction or inter-racial conflict,
relatives among the different activities, it seems good. There is undoubtedly a
growth of mutual confidence between white and non-white students, and non-whites,
not previously often chosen by the predominantly white electorate to hold
office in student organisations. The election of a non-white (Mr. Phatudi,
Representative Council (the governing body in student affairs) is a common
event at each of the four universities. The present Administrator of the
Transvaal was said that if every white in this country made a friend of
just one non-white, a big contribution would have been made to the
solution of many colour problems. The four universities have helped to create
the opportunity for such friendships to be formed. They have done much. In these
colleges they have tried to inculcate high intellectual standards
of scholarship — the science of the properties of the non-white as well as the white.
These are positive contributions to the welfare of South Africa

By the passing of the Education of University Education Act of 1959
these universities, the four universities have been compelled by law
to abandon an experiment which was in accord with the best traditions
of universities in the free world, and the main objective of South
Africa — the future leaders on both sides of the colour line — have been
denied the opportunity of during the formative years of their lives of growing up
in an atmosphere in which exclusive nationalism would find it difficult

to flourish.

But most ugly is the South African tradition different from
the rest of the world which is in the ascendancy today to be
found in church and university circles, but in other aspects
of life as well. In places of employment, in furthest communities, in farms
in the mines, and in their homes, many South Africans of different
solution of this problem. The non-whites as a whole and certain sections of the white population can never accept the apartheid solution as it is offensive to the moral principles to which they subscribe.

On the other hand to the extent that by integration is meant a completely undifferentiated society in which the different groups lose their identity completely, I venture to suggest that it would also be rejected by considerable sections of the different groups represented here. A common society does not necessarily mean a conglomeration or an aggregation of unattached individuals, but rather one in which individuals and groups enjoy the equal protection of the law, on which basic freedoms for all are respected and safeguarded, in which men and women are judged not by accidents of birth such as pigmentation or the shape of their noses but as the Thermenius put it "by merit and merit alone". A society of this kind would probably not be entirely free of discrimination but such discrimination as did exist would be based upon factors which men see men and overcome by individual or group effort. As a Negro leader once put it "I have no objection to your discriminating against me because I know knowledge because that is a state of affairs which I can alter by my own effort", or because I am not clean because by means of soap and water I can alter that situation, but when you discriminate against me because of the colour of my skin or the colour of my eyes you condemn me to a state of affairs which I can do nothing to improve my position. That is not discrimination but persecution, and that I must fight with all the means at my disposal". So a common society is not meant me in which the Natives ceases to be an African or ceases to cherish those things which Africans held dear among themselves whether it be their language or jukiehe. Nor does it mean that the African ceases to be an African or should be anglicised or
afrikanerised. Neither the Englishman nor the Afrikaner nor the African nor the Hebrew nor the Chinese wishes to be foreever his heritage or to abandon his language or his culture, such as it is. What he does not want is to find these things made the basis of discrimination against him or to become the pretext of denying him his legitimate rights in the land of his birth. The varying cultural backgrounds of the different groups represented add variety, colour and richness to the South African scene and are not incompatible or inconsistent with the recognition of the fact that we are members of one nation. This unity in diversity is the challenge of the South African situation. This challenge cannot be met by the "either-or" attitude of the separatist or the integrationist, but demands of the true South African a degree of flexibility of outlook and readiness of mind which alone is appropriate for a dynamic, not a static, situation such as the one in which we live. Thus it is obvious that there are millions of Africans in the country, between whom and the average white man ordinary social intercourse would be difficult, if not impossible. They speak different languages, have different customs and usages from those of the white man. They evolved naturally more slowly in their community social lives than in those of the European. But the same thing applies to different strata of European society. There is no legal basis for social intercourse between the university professor and the railway shunter, but their varying social circumstances provide no justification for denying them fundamental basic freedoms and fundamental rights. No one knows a law that the university professor may not live next door to the railway shunter. Without compulsion they each gravitate to residential areas commensurate with their economic circumstances and their general standard of living inhabited by people with whom they have more much in common. Similarly, as a matter of preference
Africans or Indians or China will live except in areas where
their own people have resided provided they can obtain these
amenities in the way of water, light, sanitation, transport
schemes, etc., in keeping with the standard of living to which they
have attained. What goes against the grain is when they are
compelled to live in locations where the accent is not on
residence but on restraint, where the amenities of civilized life
are conspicuous by their absence, which are close areas set from an area
but which are regulated by custom. What the consequences will continue to
condemn whether some luncheons are held to celebrate the event or not,
is the forcible removal of people from areas like Johannesburg where
they enjoyed freehold rights under the law to areas like Alexandra
where they are mere tenants. All of it at the very of reasonable
superintendents,

The same thing applies to university institutions. The small English
population in this country has made university institutions at its disposal,
some of them English-speaking others primarily Afrikaans.
Speaking but all open to academically qualified to study in them. One can
be no objection in principle to universities having a number of
university institutions situated in different parts of the country where they
are more accessible to qualified students. But to suggest that these
institutions for universities should be opened as an ethnic bias
and should be closed to members of the groups who wish to study there
is to condemn to an existence which is contrary to the university spirit.
Such centres are bound to develop in this state a narrowness of outlook
and a sense of inferiority which hangs unfavourably with the breadth
of outlook and the catholicity of interests which are expected for
students trained in a university in which a conception of the
whole population is to be found.
During the first fifty years of its existence, from the South Africa Act of 1909 to the Union of South Africa Act of 1913, the apartheid system has been given a fair trial. The state has used all its machinery to give practical effect to that separation creed in every aspect of our national life, but it has not succeeded in keeping the different groups apart. It has proved impossible for people who have so many interests in common and who are so interdependent as we are in South Africa to be driven apart. Nor has the process of forcible separation produced the harmonious relations between the different groups which were hoped for. In order to keep up the fiction of separation we have to pile restrictive measures upon restrictive measure upon the non-white groups in order to make the conditions in which they are subjected is continually harsh.

The time has come for us to abandon the policy of compulsory separation, as something that has been tried and found wanting and to substitute for it a policy which genuinely recognises the interdependence and the necessity for cooperation between the different sections of our population on a basis of equality. This does not mean that there will be no differences between individuals or groups, but it does mean that such differences will not be made the basis of discrimination between peoples as far as their political, economic or social rights are concerned. It does mean that recognition will be given to the fact that we are from parts of one integral whole, although the contributions which we make to the maintenance of that whole may vary in nature or in quality. It is well known that a Muslim leader has put the matter: "Surely it is not too idealistic, too academic, too traditional to conceive and envisage to treat the South African community as an organic unity, as a living organism whose several parts and organs are mutually dependent and are meant
for the common good."

"It does not require a biologist to see that injury to a single part or group of cells of a living organism diminishes its efficiency. Similarly injury to a class or race is self-injury, and as surely diminishes the efficiency of the whole community."

Life is a unity and its purpose is more life, and union, cooperation and association with equal, but not necessarily, equal opportunity are the food upon which it grows to form larger entities." (Molema: "The African's present political representation in Race Relations" Vol. X VII : 1950 p. 41).

"South Africa has become what it is as the result of the working together - co-operation - of its people in varying spheres of life and in different capacities. Some people in considering the achievements of the country tend to emphasize the preceding contributions of the European to its development; others lay stress on the contribution of the African, but the fact of the matter is that all we are and live to be is a compound of the efforts of all sections of the population. It is our co-operation which is responsible for our progress.

"As a result of this co-operation we have, in a long period of time, black and white have become inseparably bound together, not in any superficial physical sense, but in a much more permanent spiritual sense, any policy whether in the political or the economic or the social field which is based on the assumption that white and non-\( \text{\textit{We}} \) must have two well-defined parts of the country but two or more entirely different worlds is fundamentally wrong for South Africa with an historical & practical foundation.

Given the necessary goodwill and the necessary re-orientation of our approach to our national problems it might not be impossible to re-organize our social system in such a way as to give effect to the new spirit that might herald a new common society."