

suggestions in regard to the policy to be followed. He was followed by Mr. N. J. Adams, the Union Registrar of Co-operative Societies, who explained the administration of the Co-operative Societies Act and stated that his office was ready to assist the formation of co-operative societies by Africans.

Mr. N. N. Franklin of Rhodes University College summarized the Trollop Report on the Agricultural Credit Societies of the Transkei, and Mr. S. Mampuru gave some information concerning the three consumers' co-operative societies which are the only African co-operative stores in the country. From these statements and from the discussion it was clear that the possibilities of co-operation among Africans have yet to be proven. The attempts so far made are valuable as indicating the difficulties and weaknesses encountered, not for any solid success yet achieved. There is lively interest in the idea of co-operation among both rural and urban Africans; there is goodwill and active assistance available at the office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies: it remains to be discovered in what ways co-operation can be developed usefully among the African people. Clearly indicated needs are: a simple detailed statement of procedure with regard to the formation, registration, and conduct of a co-operative society; the commercial training of suitable personnel; and the making available, to any co-operative endeavours of Europeans with knowledge and experience to act as advisers. On this subject, as is usual in discussions at the Council, no formal resolution was taken, but the Institute's Executive was asked to consider the points made in discussion and to take further action if possible. It is likely that a special conference on the subject will be organized.

Mr. F. McGregor, Chairman of the Wage Board, opened a discussion on Wage Regulation with an admirable statement of the provisions and administration of the Industrial Conciliation Act and the Wage Act. He showed how wage determinations have materially raised the wages of unskilled workers and in other ways have given them better working conditions. 42,000 persons are affected by present or pending determinations.

The discussion that followed the address raised a number of interesting points, such as the extension of the definition of an employee in the Industrial Conciliation Act to include Africans and thus to provide for the legal registration of African trade unions; the extension of Wage Board determinations to Agricultural Labour; and the adoption by the Government—a large employer of low-paid labour—of wage rates not less than those laid down by the Wage Board. Emphasis was laid on the need for research into costs of living for the information of the

Board at its sittings, and the publication for sale of the reports of the Board. To Joint Councils, social welfare organizations, religious and other bodies interested in the welfare of the poorer groups falls the task, in other countries normally that of trade unions, of seeing that employees enjoy the wages and conditions of service laid down in the determinations.

It was clear from the discussion that Council generally felt that the main assault on poverty conditions, slums, malnutrition, and the like, should be by way of wages adequate for healthy and decent living, and by the extension of social welfare services rather than poor relief.

The Rev. A. W. Blaxall told of the development of work for the non-European Blind at Ezeneleni and, while painting a serious picture of the incidence of blindness among Natives (in some areas one per cent. of the population being certified blind), also gave Council the good news that the Native Affairs and Union Health Departments are making £8,000 per year available for investigations and service for the prevention of blindness amongst Africans.

The Institute has been active in the formation of the National Council for the Care of Cripples, by which non-Europeans as well as Europeans will be cared for. It was in another connexion, at the close of the meetings, that the Council was brought face to face with the racial problems in its stark reality. What action should be taken when a national social welfare organization closed its doors to non-European delegates? Opinion differed.

Throughout the discussions, which lasted two full days, it was apparent that what Council saw was not the whole work of the Institute but only glimpses, typical and impressive, of its many-sided far reaching activities.

The South African public knows too little of the Institute, what it is and what it does. The Institute has only 1,000 members but needs many more if its work is to be generally known and is to make its maximum contribution to South African life. One member of Council suggested that the publications of the Institute are too "academically monumental" for popular reading, a comment that might be usefully considered by the new publications committee.

Those who are fortunate enough to attend the meetings of the Institute Council come away stimulated and encouraged. It is good to know that the Institute is playing so notable a part in South Africa's great racial problems, and there is cause for deep thankfulness in the knowledge that the Institute has been able to gather to its service persons of high qualifications and clear purpose.

RACE RELATIONS

'N KWARTAALBLAD GEWY AAN DIE
STUDIE VAN RASSEVERHOUDINGS
IN SUIDELIKE AFRIKA

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL DEVOTED
TO THE STUDY OF RACE RELATIONS
IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

INHOUD — CONTENTS

The Social Services: Discrimination and Counteraction. Professor Edward Batson ...	18
The Native Farm Labour Committee Report. Mr. Leo Marquard ...	23
Durban's Growing Pains: A Racial Problem. Professor Raymond Burrows ...	28
"South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit". Reviews of Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé's Phelps-Stokes Lectures. Professor A. C. Celliers, Mr. George Findlay, Mr. Z. K. Mattheus, Professor Raymond Burrows ...	31

GRATIS AAN LEDE

1/-

FREE TO MEMBERS

JOHANNESBURG

SUID-AFRIKAANSE
INSTITUUT VIR RASSEVERHOUDINGS

SOUTH AFRICAN
INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS

After urging that there shall be no relaxation of effort "to improve their [the Natives'] conditions by a more general development of habits of industry", the Committee adds that "it must be accepted as a fact that the occupation of land, whether for stock or crop production, will never again suffice to make the Native independent of wages derived from labour in European areas". The truth of this statement can hardly be disputed and it is interesting to have it on record in a Government Report. But what conclusion must we draw from it? Is the whole policy of Reserves wrong? Does the creation of Reserves not perhaps mean, in hard practice, the creation of depots where our reserves of labour may stew in their own economic juice until such times as they are required by European employers? When a responsible Government Committee makes a statement of that kind, it is evident that the time has arrived when the social and economic implications of the policy of Reserves must be thought

out afresh. It is, on the face of it, possible that in agitating for the granting of more land for Native Reserves—more land that will never be enough—liberals in South Africa have in fact done the Natives a disservice by increasing their dependence on Union labour markets and by weakening their bargaining power in those markets.

To return, in conclusion, to the question of farm labour: there are, broadly, two methods by which the supply of labour can be increased. It can be increased either by the use of force, or by making the conditions of labour sufficiently attractive. The Committee cannot, in a civilized country, recommend force; and it is doubtful whether the recommendations to improve the conditions of employment will have much practical effect. In any case, they are not sufficiently far-reaching because the Committee, as practical men, realized the futility of prescribing measures to which Parliament would never agree.

DURBAN'S GROWING PAINS: A RACIAL PROBLEM¹

Professor RAYMOND BURROWS

Department of Economics and Economic History in the Natal University College

THE adjustment of a rapidly increasing population to an urban area presents many industrial, economic, and social difficulties, even in the best-regulated municipality.

When to these are added, as in Durban, racial prejudices and commercial jealousies, any rational solution must be even more complicated, if only because an emotional setting and an absence of clear thinking accentuate the tension.

It is unnecessary to dwell on past controversy, but last year a considerable outcry was raised by some Europeans in Durban against an apparent flow of the Indian population into residential areas which had hitherto been regarded as exclusively European.

Causes

Three important underlying factors in this and similar problems in Durban are:—

1. Natural growth of all sections of the population.
2. Urbanization and growth of Durban as a city.
3. These and other changes taking place cause movements of groups within given areas.

The first fact which must be admitted is that European, Native, and Indian populations are all growing. It is possible that Durban is growing a little too rapidly to guarantee smoothness in the organization

¹ An address delivered to the Durban Indo-European Council.

of its expanding municipal responsibilities. The 1932 incorporation in particular gave Durban an enormous task, if only because it increased the Indians in Durban by over 50,000.

Hence, Durban's growth is due partly to its natural increase of population, partly to incorporating existing population areas, and partly to the "drift to the towns". These are disturbing forces to which must be added the ousting of residential areas in the centre by business premises, shops, and offices. Strains and stresses are only to be expected.

Such changes are seen in every city development, but Durban's growing pains seem worse than those of other towns because they involve a shifting of racial as well as other groups.

A study of the problem must refer also to the movements of various groups of people. As a rule, human beings like to form themselves into groups based on some common factor, such as similar habits and standards of life. The greater the number of common cultural associations, the greater the homogeneity of the locality. Differences in education, culture, race, or religion will, in our present stage of civilization, cause friction and probably difficulties.

Reasons for objections to neighbours are that they may be less tidy or may be noisier, or may have different customs. But this is noticeable even in the

same community, e.g. the European community, where the use of a knife instead of a fork in certain delicate operations of manipulating food may create an almost insurmountable social barrier. The correct use of "h" is another password to a social group. Most Europeans make rigid distinctions between their own rich and poor, and object to any neighbours with a lower standard of life, whatever their race or colour. But they are inclined to regard all Non-Europeans not only as identical, but all as equally poor and uneducated. The race and colour differences bring these objections to a state of intolerance. Yet Europeans allow, even encourage, people of other races to carry out household duties, drive their cars, and work in their businesses.

The colour-prejudice may be illogical, doubtless partly due to fear, but it must be regarded as a factor which cannot be minimized and one also which will persist for some time yet. It must therefore be accepted as an overriding influence in any short-period solution which may be suggested.

Another factor which requires careful study and intelligent handling is the influx of groups from outside. Workers from mining areas and from the country increase the so-called "drift to towns". For Indians, as for Europeans, this is due less to the offer of attractive employment, or even of any employment at all, than to economic pressure driving them off the land. The reduction of such "drift" is not to be solved by drastic restrictions but by the creation of agricultural possibilities for Indians, in sugar, bananas, and market gardening.

The above factors resulted in a 184 per cent. increase in the Asiatic population in urban areas in the Union (largely Natal, and largely Durban) between 1921 and 1938. Indian population was nearly trebled as against a 95 per cent. increase in urban Natives, and 54 per cent. in urban Europeans. In 1921 two-thirds of the Indian population were rural, and one-third urban, whereas in 1936 one-third was rural, and two-thirds urban. It should of course be remembered that Durban's incorporation in 1932 classified large numbers as urban residents though they had been part of the urban economic structure for some time. However, the inevitable result of these changes was to accentuate slum problems both inside and outside the town, to cause some filtering of "penetration", and to aggravate urban unemployment problems.

But in any case districts change in relative desirability. Some localities become less attractive than areas newly developed in the fresh charm of the neighbouring countryside. Some Europeans leave the Berea for areas ten to twenty miles away, others

are filtering in to take their places. In some areas values fall, and here and there members of other income groups enter, perhaps an occasional Indian family.

Also very naturally Indians grow in numbers and in wealth. They also like to move into better neighbourhoods. Their problems are very much more serious than those facing Europeans. For one thing, since 1922, the existence of an anti-Asiatic clause in the sale of municipal land forces Indians into areas already long and fully settled. Also an anti-Asiatic clause affecting Morningside, Stellawood, and Durban North, excludes expansion in new areas. Another obstacle to development may be the high initial cost of opening up new housing sites, especially in Indian areas. The owner must provide new roads and pay 15 per cent. to the municipality for taking over responsibility for maintenance.

Penetration

"Penetration" in its relation to, and effect on, (1) Ownership, (2) Residence, and (3) Commercial speculation can now be examined against the background so far outlined and from two aspects, (A) that of the group, (B) that of the individual.

(A) *Group Penetration.* One group's occupation of an area previously occupied by another group can first be examined. In Durban there is no instance of a group of Indians living off its own cultural associates and occupying a block of property forming an Indian island. Instead, the reverse has taken place in Durban North.

Bordering the Greyville Racecourse is an area which was once European in character and is now becoming an Indian locality. This constitutes a natural expansion from the Grey Street area. But it could not have taken place if Europeans had not voluntarily left the area. In Wards 2 and 7 there have been one hundred or so transfers of European-owned property to Indians during the last two years; on the other hand, certain Indian properties have been surrounded by European developments. Twenty years ago there were thirteen or fourteen Indian-owned shops in West Street, to-day there are only five. They have decreased by two in the last ten years. To-day the Turf Club wants additional ground for training purposes, and Springfield is an ideal site. Here, for years the Indian has fought against reeds and swamp conditions and has now tamed that valley and made of it a socially productive asset. But the Indian has no security of tenure, therefore he must go.

The valley to the west of the Bluff, a patch-work quilt of market gardens, similarly reclaimed from

swamp conditions, may be wanted for Durban's industrial development. Expansion and change are inevitable, but it will be a tragedy if a lack of foresight and intelligent planning eventually results in an unnecessary crop of human suffering and maladjustments.

(B) *Individual Penetration.* It would be difficult to find an instance where a European had elected to buy property and reside within an accepted Indian area. The reverse has taken place to the extent of some ten properties so purchased and occupied.

Very briefly the motives that prompt individuals to remove from their own areas to others, for residential purposes, are as follows:—

1. The desire to improve their social standing. The European has done so much in Natal to impress a sense of the importance of this on the Non-European that he can scarcely complain if the Non-European has absorbed a little of it.

2. The desire to challenge ideas of race inferiority.

3. The right of the rate- and tax-payer to enjoy the amenities of his town, whether naturally or municipally provided. This is particularly so where there is an absence of adequate sites, houses, amenities of roads, or lighting.

4. Resentment at any restriction on freedom of choice in the matter of the neighbourhood of one's home.

There is of course the political aspect of Local Government. Indian owners of freehold property and Indian tenants are not allowed to participate in electing the Council which is solely responsible for the expenditure of money derived from rates and taxes. In Westville, Indian rate-payers probably constitute 70 per cent. of the total.

Remedies

1. If Europeans do feel very strongly about so-called penetration then they and the European property agents should loyally undertake not to sell property within the borough, without ascertaining whether the transfer would harm the relations of the two communities. Similar undertakings could be made by the Indians.

Any drastic prohibition of acquisition of property by Indians would be unjust. Where this was practised, but where letting was allowed, it would be easy for a European to lease at exorbitant rentals to Indians.

2. Improvement of roads, lighting, and other amenities in the existing Indian localities, combined with steps taken to raise the Indian standard of life, especially in the old borough.

3. Other obvious remedies would be the building of sub-economic houses for Indians, and the granting of municipal loans to Indians for house-building. It might even be possible to encourage Indians to build on municipal land, using municipal plans and working instructions, perhaps using material either made by the municipality using Indian labour or bought in large quantities, and working under the supervision of municipal engineers and architects (as in Stockholm). Municipal Indian employees might be given a sample site to lead the way. Further, enthusiasts in the Indian community might seek the help of the City Council in establishing well-planned and well-managed suburbs for various classes of Indians, something on the lines of housing corporations and public utilities.

The Present Position

The agitation between the two communities has resulted in the intervention of the Government.

The Minister has appointed a judicial Commission to investigate the facts of alleged penetration. If, as one section of the Indian community contends, there has been no penetration, then the Indian need have no apprehension about the findings of such a Commission. To the European it will mean the allaying of unfounded fears.

If the allegation is borne out, then on its extent will depend the measures necessary to deal with the situation. It is unlikely that it has assumed proportions to justify a statutory settlement.

As there was a danger of speculative purchase of property during the interim period, the Minister suggested a Joint Committee instead of interim legislation, its whole purpose being to maintain a *status quo* pending the investigations. The Joint Committee would not merely try to prevent Indian purchase in predominantly European residential areas, but also it would provide the machinery for consultation and collaboration in regard to housing in general. Machinery has been set up which can usefully discuss housing, sites, and amenities. This must be a step more in the right direction than in the wrong direction. This is an advance on the voluntary undertaking to endeavour to restrict purchases by Indians given by the Natal Indian Congress in June 1936. The Council and its Housing Committee would certainly obtain a greater insight into the housing needs and other difficulties of the Indian community.

The only solution to our problems is a move towards greater co-operation. Hence, any co-operation between an Indian Committee and a Committee of the City Council will not only be useful in its own

sphere but it may easily mark the beginning of very important machinery of contact between the two communities. Both will learn from the other and in the process acquire not only knowledge but tolerance.

Facing the Facts

Even if we were able to contemplate compulsory deportation of Indians, it is clear that no matter how grudgingly we may admit it, we owe them a debt of gratitude, since the prosperity of the coal mines and the sugar industry is founded on the indentured Indian labourer.

Such a plan would not be feasible, since more than half of the present Indian population were born here and have no other home. Further, the spending power of nearly 200,000 Indians in Natal is important to business, while the removal of all Indian labourers with their ability to perform delicate mechanical and semi-skilled work would be disastrous to industry as a whole. Almost similar disadvantages would accompany any scheme of gradual deportation.

It is only by mutual co-operation, and a better

appreciation of each other's conditions, fears, and hopes, that we can hope to attain any solutions of our many problems which will and must be in the best interest of both races.

We may not realize fully that our Commonwealth is passing through a serious crisis, and requires the unselfish loyalty of all its peoples. Further, if the war ends as we hope it will do, countries and races must establish better relations when peace comes, if peace is to be permanent and if humanity of any colour or culture is to survive.

Penetration and Segregation are trivial things in the light of the wider issues that surround us. In any case it is impossible to discuss them in isolation. They are part of wider developments and of inevitable changes. There is no solution which does not also include remedies of housing, education, purchasing power, civic amenities, and many other such factors.

No human problem is insoluble. Both Indians and Europeans must treat this and other difficulties with open minds, with tolerance, and with good-will.

"SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE POLICY AND THE LIBERAL SPIRIT" REVIEWS OF PROFESSOR R. F. A. HOERNLÉ'S PHELPS-STOKES LECTURES

I

I HAD the pleasure last year of meeting Professor Hoernlé during the time that he was re-delivering the series of lectures which form the contents of the above volume. At the conclusion of the series I was unexpectedly pounced upon by the Chairman of our Public Lectures Committee and put to the task of thanking the lecturer. Whether my impromptu remarks then did justice to the lecturer I cannot very well confirm to-day; if my second effort should fall short of the mark I hope Professor Hoernlé will blame those responsible for falling so suddenly upon me for a review while heavily engaged in an effort at reconciliation not between Black and White, or Boer and Briton, but between Afrikaner and Afrikaner. That difference has in the meantime been happily composed. With the fratricidal struggle among Afrikaners settled there remain our other inter-racial problems. The struggle between Boer and Briton, politically and culturally, is on once more, but remains, as ever, silhouetted or projected against the European v. Non-European background. With the coming of the White man to South Africa a new era was inaugurated, which, after passing through many vicissitudes of collaboration and conflict, is, with the

¹ Lovedale Press, 1939. 3s.

advance of the twentieth century, rapidly assuming a critically decisive stage. The time has arrived when the question of the relation between European and Non-European in our sub-continent will have to be fairly and squarely looked in the face, when great decisions will have to be unflinchingly faced. With the rapid spread of civilization and modern technique in all fields of human endeavour the old liberal policy of *laissez-faire* is being hard pressed all along the line, and not the least along the line of colour. Race and colour prejudices are elemental forces which will only have spent themselves when the degree of linguistic and colour differentiation has been reduced to such an extent, by natural or unnatural means, that any further degree of refrangibility is out of the question. When that will be no man can tell. In the meantime it is both wise and expedient, especially in South Africa, to keep this fact closely in mind when dealing with matters affecting the interests of any or all of the sections of our multi-racial population.

I listened with considerable interest to Professor Hoernlé's lectures at the time they were delivered at Stellenbosch. I read them now with renewed and increased interest. Professor Hoernlé's book is obviously the result of intensive study and considerable meditation, and as such cannot fail to arrest the attention of the serious thinker on our racial problems.

His very thorough analysis of the technique of domination and his discussion of the implications of a caste-society are very thought-provoking and a welcome relief from the hollow-phrased racial jargon of the political hustings. He has made a scientific study of the subject and has presented his results in the approved scientific manner, even to the extent of stringing his results on to a thread of hypothesis, the doctrine of the liberal spirit.

Professor Hoernlé couples his study of South African Native Policy with the Liberal Spirit in an effort to give it a politico-philosophical basis. I am not so sure that he has been wise in doing so. Such a procedure may enhance its value as a scientific treatise, but in view of practical considerations, with the doctrine of Liberalism in rather a bad way, especially in South Africa, he would have been wiser to eschew such a line of advance. The same analysis, synthesis, and the same conclusion, but argued on a different sub-stratum of politico-philosophical outlook would have given Professor Hoernlé's work an impetus and a trajectory that would have carried it much further in our political firmament than it will now achieve; which will be a great pity. For I genuinely believe that, shorn of their superfluous liberal paraphernalia, the ideas he develops in these four lectures, the facts, illustrations, and implications, represent a considerable advance in our articulate colour-political thought, and as such should form the stock-in-trade of all Afrikaans- and English-speaking public men in South Africa. Our public men need a little more solid study and then we will have less empty talk. But, to be fair, I will have to invert the argument too. Our students need to have a little more vim in their moral and mental make-up, more steel, in order to be able to put across their panacea for the evils of our country with more vigour and conviction. Desperate diseases need desperate cures, as the saying goes. Let us have thorough-going but fearless diagnosis of our racial body politic, but let us then decide to act with the nerve of the grim and silent surgeon, who knows his business and gets on with the job. Things have gone very far in South Africa and if we want to alter the course of events materially we will have to decide to act. If we are going to act, and not just drift on, we will have to act soon and decisively, and on a scale which will completely dwarf anything that has ever before been attempted in South Africa. Our country has been the home of the individualist so far. The time has arrived for the subordination of the individualistic striving into a surge of collective action such as we have only seen on the continent of Europe. If total separation is to be the Elixir of Life, for White and Black alike, then let Total Separation be our

watchword. May the times call forth a leader worthy of the occasion and the task.

I commend Professor Hoernlé's book very heartily to all those interested in our racial problems. Even if his method of approach may not meet with their approval, his analysis and conclusions are sure to merit their attention. My own predilections have always been for "long-range" problems. The "long-range" note on which the book closes has made me overlook much of the "short-range" liberal thought with which the book is studded. I wish it a wide circulation and it's liberal author the courage of a non-liberal's convictions. If the author wants to escape from the confines of "Heartbreak House" he will have to rise from the Delilah-lap of classical liberalism, lift the gates from their sockets and carry them to the hills above. He will then find Afrikaans South Africa at his side.

A. C. CELLIERS

II

MANY men of good will to-day feel the urge "to think out the Native Question". The "raw deal" that is given to Africans under existing Native policy offends them. They therefore assume, and quite inaccurately, that this policy is a product of prejudice and unreason, and they set out to gather the facts and exercise an honest judgement upon them. The result, however, is not always satisfactory. More often than not these investigators find they are compelled to decide very much wider issues and then—many of them shrink from the task! Desisting from ultimate analysis, their practical programmes dwindle into merely edifying "hopes", not unmixed with fears. And their writings become monuments of frustration.

This is what has happened in these lectures of Professor Hoernlé. They avowedly end on a note of frustration, even if it has an extremely modest sound of "hope" in it, like the tinkling of a very tiny bell. He is too honest to permit himself the high-flown climax of the politicians, but none the less there it is, the "hope" that comforts one in frustration! And for Professor Hoernlé it abides not in a struggle of the masses, but in the shop-soiled formulae of the "Liberal Spirit" and the "Spirit of Trusteeship".

The men of good will, he finds, are fighting a losing battle. They are fighting piecemeal, rear-guard actions against the tactical initiative which lies with the advocates of oppression. Literally all we can or should do, is to put out a little propaganda for the "Liberal Spirit" as we go down. This is our short-term programme. Why in such a plight we should also have a long-term programme is not equally clear,

save that we require a banner to fight under. We cannot fight for "parallels", as that plays into the hands of the oppressors; we cannot have "assimilation", because nobody likes that; we had better fight therefore for "separation", a kindly version of segregation, although that for economic reasons is quite impracticable. Such is Professor Hoernlé's "Liberalism Resurgent", but finding itself in "Heartbreak House".

Professor Hoernlé is an analyst of thoughts. For many reasons I am determined to ignore his little note of "hope". For he himself gives us no lead. "We Liberals have not made up our minds whither we are going or whither we want to go." "We must not decline this task of reflection, merely on the ground that all three schemes are unrealizable." It is characteristic of liberal frustration that we should be waiting for a man, someone who has done the thinking, and who offers us a clear lead. From liberal frustration comes the reactionary return to the *Induna* and the *Führer*. It is implied in frustration that, if we cannot move forward socially, we must go back to some older social structure. But I do not accept the idea that Professor Hoernlé will leave it at that. As a logician he knows from the very fact of his frustration that his premises must be wrong.

As a man deeply interested in race relations he sets out to examine "the domination of Whites over Blacks". But is there any such thing? The Native bus-owner and the Native landlord tend to become "little kings" in the location. They "dominate" their fellow-Blacks far more obviously than do all the Poor Whites in the Rustenburg district put together. This White-over-Black domination is simply a misapprehension of the facts. "No development", says Professor Hoernlé, "can take place in South Africa except with the consent of the dominant White group." Yet malnutrition, and slumps, and booms, the development of Poor-Whiticism and many other things take place without any such consent. Indeed, the rapid "assimilation" of Native to European and the steadily increasing infiltration even of Native "blood" into the "European" ranks goes on in spite of the direct opposition of "the dominant group". The idea that Whites, as such, are in control is a democratic illusion, not a fact.

Domination is a class concept. It rests not with a race *qua* race. Every owner of the means of production is to that extent a dominator of those who sell their labour. In all systems, a man's survival depends upon his entry into the established relationship of mutual service and the division of labour. For us, the binding force of society is the free market where men must sell their goods, if they have them, or their

labour-power, if they have no goods. It is there that the owner of the means of production becomes the dominant, and the worker the subservient, citizen. In South Africa, it is not even clear that at any one time all Whites were owners and all Blacks were not. To-day, with the progressive concentration of wealth in fewer hands, great masses of Europeans have joined the dispossessed Africans. The history of African and European proletarianization from Kimberley onwards has still to be written and to Professor Hoernlé it remains a sealed book.

His failure to appreciate all this is the great defect of his lectures. He does not realize the extent to which the total product of the country is a Black product, profitably produced because it embodies African labour—a fact that at one blow renders "separation" and "segregation" so much moonshine. When he speaks of taxation from White and from Black sources, he overlooks that the "White sources" are largely mere conduit pipes of wealth from Black sources. Ignoring this pyramid of production and its essential character, affecting all our social correlations, he tends to attach primary importance to psychological attitudes and secondary importance to real external developments. He does not see that men's minds must and inevitably will come into correlation with the facts outside them, and that the mind cannot influence real developments unless it does so. Thus, while he speaks of the "spirit" of this and the "ideal" of that, he confuses the very basis of "domination". Indeed he labours under the astonishing misconception that "class" is a matter of being rich or poor! (See page 147.) This conceals from him the vital distinction between domination as a social, economic, and political reality, and the supposed "power" that is conferred upon men by the franchise under *Bourgeois* Democracy. The Whites have votes; the Blacks have none; hence he infers the Whites are the dominant, the Blacks the subservient people. Little does he sense that the owners of the means of production under a system dedicated to the protection of their rights dictate to a democratic parliament with unanswerable precision. The wheels of productive industry must keep turning. It is therefore the "sacred" duty of parliamentarians, whomsoever they represent, to see to it that the profitability of industry is maintained, for on that, under our system, depends its continued operation. And owners and workers alike are dependent upon it. If, therefore, wages are to be low for the great mass of the workers, it is a law neither of the "Whites" nor of *Bourgeois* Democracy, but an economic law of the system. It is a matter of capitalistic necessity, not "prejudice" or

"nastiness", that makes oppression and low wages the central feature of South African policy.

Professor Hoernlé touches very lightly on the economic side of the matter. Low Native wages, one would imagine, are more or less the Will of God; he therefore says very little about them. Here men like Mr. Pirow see far more clearly when they speak of "South Africa's greatest asset, viz. cheap and abundant supplies of Native labour". It is an "asset" for the dominators, not for the European workers, and, since it is cheap, it is not much of an asset for the Africans. Yet in all this book has to say about domination, political, educational, social, and even economic, one would never suspect that the process of exploiting this asset is a *central feature of policy* and that it controls all other aspects. In his confusion of "class" with rich and poor, the lecturer refuses to see all this. He dislikes the idea of antagonism embodied in such a view of policy, and, undigested, he dismisses it as the view of "doctrinaire extremists".

It is exasperating to find him comforting himself by embarking on a diligent search for one or two redeeming features under the tawdry camouflage of "White trusteeship". The mines want healthy and vigorous workers who would have to have higher wages to attend to their own health and diet. It is therefore cheaper to give them hospitals, balanced diets, and even games and cinemas upon a collective and dictated basis. A moment's conversation with a medical officer on a mine should indicate how much of all this is real "trusteeship", and how much is really enlightened profit-seeking. If we must look for noble motives—as if these mattered—we are apt to overlook the contradictory developments that flow from the practical motives, which do matter, and which in reality govern the situation. "Married quarters" for Africans on the mines would be more expensive than homes in the Reserves. The Compound is the solution. I do not like the dogged optimism with which Professor Hoernlé spies out the "brighter side" of these centres of compulsory homosexuality, that we so zealously maintain with the approval of Church and State.

To hail the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936 as an example of the real spirit of Trusteeship, because it makes allowances for the African's sentimental attachment to the graves of his ancestors and maintains tribal cohesion, is to be taken in by the legislator's preamble. It does not contribute towards an understanding of the more important features of Native policy. The vast spaces available in South Africa are a fine substitute for doles and unemployment relief as well as "married quarters". They serve as a sponge

that absorbs, and returns when required, the reserve army of African labourers. Tribal tenure is a guarantee that the land will never be properly worked and will never really belong to the Natives. Cheap labour must have a cheap breeding place, and so it is furnished to the Africans at their own expense. Our dominators do not say, and some of them do not even *think*, that they have these motives. None the less their conduct is to be so explained and not by the high rhetoric we hear on the topic of segregation.

Professor Hoernlé also has some fine words of praise for the hollow mockery of those sterilized slums, the model locations for the urban Africans; and he speaks enthusiastically, too, of the string-pulling and lobbying that White members of the Joint Council do for Natives. He admits that the liberal must not fool himself into thinking that this amounts to very much. Indeed, all the "advantages" so achieved amount to collective benefits in lieu of wages, but our lecturer does not realize this, nor yet does he perceive the contradictory teleology within the process of thus adapting Native life to the purposes of exploitation.

In principle, he talks vaguely about "liberty", because he disregards its economic foundation, and when he speaks of the ideal of a richer and fuller "quality" of human life apart from its material foundation, he comforts himself with an aesthetic abstraction. Meanwhile he offers no protest against the system nor does he comprehend its development. Within its bounds the African birthright is being sold for a mess of slightly better porridge, and surely, he reasons, half an egg is better than an empty shell. Indeed, this *ad hoc* reasoning characterizes the liberal approach, and nothing short of the realistic bombshell of fascism will dispel its fantasy of gradual amelioration.

GEORGE FINDLAY

III

The Union of South Africa is the most powerful State in the least developed continent of the world. With its large European population and its larger Non-European population, its wealth in natural resources, leading to rapid industrialization, its favourable climate, and its relative remoteness from the arena of international power politics, its development is increasingly attracting the attention, not only of our Bohles and Holms, but also of more sober students of human society and human institutions. Not least deserving of careful and painstaking study among the many aspects of South African life is the development of its Native Policy. We are indebted to the Phelps-Stokes Fund of the University of Cape Town for the publication of two useful studies on the evolution of Union

Native Policy, viz. *The Colour Problems of South Africa*, by Dr. (now Senator) E. H. Brookes in 1933, and now *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit*, by Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé.

In this book which is addressed primarily to White University students, the prospective leaders of White opinion in this country, Professor Hoernlé discusses a very significant question, viz., to use his own words, "What have the two liberty-loving White groups made, what are they making, of their historic task of governing a multi-racial community?"

In the first chapter, an account is given of the methods used by White South Africans for maintaining White domination over non-White groups—a domination "ranging from exclusive White control of political and military power, through preferential educational and economic privileges, to devices for establishing social distance between Whites and Blacks as well as preventing miscegenation, or race mixture". Many may argue that there is nothing new in this chapter, that it is merely a statement of the obvious, but it is entirely salutary that these facts which come into the every-day experience of every South African should be set out as clearly and as calmly as they have been here. If change and reform are to be brought about in South Africa, the "policy of White self-protection through domination" in all its ramifications must be accurately described and recognized for what it is, and this must be done, as far as is humanly possible, without that emotionalism and sentimentality which "engender more heat than light".

The author then proceeds to deal with those influences which have attempted, however unsuccessfully, to mitigate the harsher effects of the Union Native Policy of White domination over non-White groups. These forces, consisting in the main of Missionaries and Humanitarian Liberals, have found expression in the principle of trusteeship whose influence the author traces in various aspects of South African life. "Present-day South Africa owes it to these two bodies of men more than to Government policies that there is, as a fact of history, a strain of liberalism in its traditions, however much most South Africans nowadays resent that strain and strive to disown it." The acid test of the principle of trusteeship is its ultimate aim. Judged by this test, the principle of trusteeship in South Africa turns out to be nothing more than a "disguised instrument of White supremacy", "the silken glove over the steely hand of domination".

Having given a faithful description of the framework of South African society and the rationalizations that have been propagated in support of it, Professor

Hoernlé goes on to analyse the concept of Liberalism and to draw up what constitutes a practical and defensible interpretation of it in the development of human society. The liberal spirit is shown to have worked, wherever it has been given scope to express itself, for the liberation of individuals and groups by the abolition of restrictions in order to make a fuller life possible for human beings. Eschewing vague generalities, it has aimed at securing certain definite liberties both for individuals and groups, calculated to improve the quality of their lives in a definite historic context. But the principles of classical liberalism were first worked out and applied in countries with fairly homogeneous populations, where differences of culture and race were not as pertinent as they are held to be today in the world in general and in South Africa in particular.

The question therefore arises, and is discussed in the last chapter, as to whether a liberal policy is possible in South Africa, "a multi-racial State internally divided by the tensions and frictions resulting from the mutual antagonisms of four major groups... differing from each other in race", "when in such a society one race is dominant over the others and determined to maintain that dominance at all costs." In the view of the author, two courses are open to a liberal in such a society. First, there is open to him a "short-range" programme, viz. to "press constantly for a liberal interpretation of trusteeship and to use the elasticities of the present system, such as they are, to insert into it as much of the liberal spirit as he can", without seeking to undermine the policy of White domination except by constantly advocating his ideals, criticizing the official policy, and working for a change in public opinion. Secondly, the liberal must work for a "long-range" programme which envisages "an alternative to present-day South African society which is admittedly incompatible with the liberal spirit". In searching for an alternative type of society, Professor Hoernlé suggests three possibilities, namely, (a) *Parallelism*, which, while maintaining the framework of South African society, substitutes within it the *co-ordination* of racial groups for *domination* of the rest by one group, i.e. it envisages separate institutions for separate racial groups, without the White group being the dominant group; (b) *Assimilation*, which also maintains the multi-racial society but abolishes race differences within it by the completest possible fusion or amalgamation of the races with each other; (c) *Separation*, which breaks up the multi-racial society and organizes the several racial components as mutually independent social units. Actually, present-day South African Native policy is an "odd patchwork, exhibiting traces of Parallelism,

Assimilation, Separation". In other words, South Africa has not made up her mind as to which way she intends to go.

An examination of the practicability of these approaches to the solution of the problem of a desirable form of social and political organization for South Africa, leads the author to reject Parallelism on the ground that Parallelism, as it is now practised, does not eliminate White domination, and that no other form of Parallelism is likely to find favour in White eyes. He also rejects Assimilation, on the ground that "White South Africa as a whole, is opposed to Total Assimilation with a fierce determination". It might be pointed out here that the evidence shows that the Native population, at any rate, is no less opposed to social and racial assimilation than the White population, though being a subject race Natives are naturally less articulate about it. The solution which Professor Hoernlé favours is that of Separation which envisages "an organization of the warring sections into genuinely separate, self-contained, self-governing societies, each in principle homogeneous within itself, which can then co-operate on a footing of mutual recognition of one another's independence". This implies making the Native Reserves economically self-sufficient, the "bantuzation" of Native reserves, social, political, and other forms of separation. The advantages of the scheme include the fact that racial tension and friction would thereby be avoided, the separate groups could genuinely develop along lines of their own choosing, and would have separate "areas of liberty". Some scheme of this kind must be adopted, in Professor Hoernlé's opinion, if South Africa is to develop into a stable community, bearing in mind that "the Non-European groups will not for ever accept or tolerate with good will a caste-structure in which they are permanently condemned to the unprivileged position of the lowest castes".

Professor Hoernlé's book shows that he must be counted among those who are well qualified to deal with the subject of race relations in South Africa. Apart from his distinguished career as Head of the Department of Philosophy in the University of the Witwatersrand, he has always been intimately associated with the work of bodies such as the Johannesburg Joint Council of Europeans and Africans, and the Institute of Race Relations, of which he has been President for several years—both being bodies which have played an important part in increasing our understanding of the real meaning of Union Native policy and its significance for the welfare of the country as a whole. The most cursory perusal of his book shows that he has brought gifts to bear upon

one of the most delicate problems of South Africa. His straightforward, incisive style, his ripe knowledge and experience, his ability to maintain an objective point of view in matters over which there is such wide disagreement in this country, will be welcomed even by those who find themselves unable to accept his conclusions and his suggested solution of our problems.

We are indebted to Professor Hoernlé for his appeal to liberals to re-examine the tenets of their faith with a view to discovering how they can best apply them in a multi-racial society. Until this is done seriously, liberalism will continue to lose ground, as it is doing to-day, not only among the White but also among the non-White sections of our population. Rightly or wrongly, there is in Non-European circles to-day a growing feeling against so-called liberals, owing to the conviction that most of them stand and work exclusively for what Professor Hoernlé calls their "short-range programme". As someone has said, they seem to be satisfied to play the role of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in the body politic of South Africa, with the Non-Europeans as their dumb friends. Clearly, this will not satisfy the more intelligent sections of the Non-Europeans who are determined to hold their position as human beings, entitled to full citizenship rights in South Africa and to leadership of their people by themselves.

On the other hand, one wonders what sort of reception Professor Hoernlé's suggested solution of race relations in South Africa, viz. the organization of our racial groups into self-contained, mutually independent units, will receive. As far as the Non-Europeans are concerned, they will be inclined to dismiss the principle of separation as simply another form of segregation under which they will receive the worst of the bargain. They have never objected to separation as such, but to the injustice which is invariably associated with its application. The Native people do not object to separate schools as such, but to the fact that the needs of the schools receive scant attention, especially from the devotees of the segregation faith. The same applies to other separate institutions for non-White groups. At the same time, they have learnt that the mere being together with White people in the same institutions is no guarantee that even-handed justice will be meted out to them. When they belong to the same churches, the same schools, the same inter-racial groups of different kinds, the same local and general councils, the same trade unions, they always find, it is not unfair to say, that all these institutions, which apparently have no colour bar, are none the less dominated by White

opinion and White leadership. In the net result, there is no difference between segregation with injustice and the appearance of an absence of segregation with White domination. "Total Separation" into mutually independent racial communities, such as Professor Hoernlé advocates, is not open to either of these objections, for it eliminates both injustice and continuing White domination. Hence, the present writer has no hesitation in saying that Professor Hoernlé's sort of separation deserves the serious attention of all those who are interested in the development, here in South Africa, of stable "areas of freedom" for all the racial groups in the population. For, as Professor Hoernlé observes, the "caste-structure of South African society has no intrinsic stability and permanence". In a young country such as this, which is faced with entirely new problems of adjustment and adaptation or with old problems in a peculiarly difficult set of circumstances, it behoves us not to rely on an unthinking advocacy of so-called well-established principles on this or that question, but rather to adopt the scientific attitude of open-mindedness and wise and careful experimentation in our search for a social structure which will satisfy the hopes and aspirations of every section of our population. As a work permeated by that spirit, *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit* richly deserves the serious consideration of all liberty-loving South Africans.

Z. K. MATTHEWS

IV

LIBERALISM connotes freedom of opinion and democratic principles, but liberty to be worth having must mean more than the absence of compulsion. It must embrace a sense of responsibility, and foster loyalty and good citizenship. Its precise interpretation, of course, depends on a particular historical setting, and perhaps the nineteenth century doctrine of liberalism did not envisage a multi-racial society. But the true liberal spirit must value liberty for all groups and peoples, regarding it as an essential ingredient for human development.

Such an ideal of universal liberty does not require that differences of race, culture, and ideals should be ignored. But it does require that differences should be recognized and tolerated and also allowed to make separate contributions to the total achievement of mankind.

White South Africa is proud of its love of liberty, and its history is eloquent of a practical urge to preserve freedom and democracy. But are we

succeeding in the task of building up a multi-racial community?

Professor Hoernlé, in taking stock of the rights, disabilities, and opportunities of our Native peoples, suggests that the fundamental fact is the predominance of a White minority upheld by political power (legislative, administrative, judicial), preferential educational and economic privileges, and the steps taken to preserve social distance.

But there is a high price to pay. Native preoccupations in their work and leisure are inevitably coloured with fear, suspicion, and occasional hostility. There is the resentment of the more thoughtful and informed Native, and there are the fears of the White group.

As a caste-society based on race is in any case contrary to liberal ideals, it becomes necessary to re-examine our principles in the light of present trends. Fortunately in a democratic community we are free to advocate our ideals, criticize official policy, attempt to change public opinion, and press for a liberal view of "trusteeship". The situation is always hopeful and a better system is always possible, because White South Africa is still a democracy, and policy is still open to the influence of public opinion.

Professor Hoernlé then outlines his liberal alternatives as follows:—

1. "Parallelism", a development of similar institutions in the various racial groups, accepts the fact of race differences, condemns no racial group to legal or other discrimination, and credits each of them with the desire to preserve its own integrity and its social distance from the others. But any genuine "parallelism" must be ruled out as impracticable at present.

2. "Total Assimilation" would mean that race conflict would disappear by gradually abolishing race differences. Cultural assimilation, implying the disappearance of the more primitive type, would lead to economic, then political, and lastly racial assimilation. It must be admitted that a good deal of cultural and economic assimilation has already taken place. Europeans differ on the precise point where they begin to object to this process. But it is safe to conclude that total assimilation would be strenuously opposed. Hence this alternative also is impracticable.

3. "Total Separation" is suggested because of the conviction that a caste-society which involves perpetual friction, conflict, and bitterness is not worth preserving. The suggestion of genuinely separate, self-contained, and self-governing communities is of course in marked contrast with certain "segregation" proposals which would merely block Native progress and development,

while escape from White domination would still give the Natives access to European culture. Professor Hoernlé is well aware of the many and serious objections to total separation. The economic entanglement of Whites and non-Whites is of course one of the oldest facts in our history. Only half of our Native population live in the Reserves, a large percentage of these also earn money wages outside their areas, and large numbers of Native workers must be recruited from outside the Union. Whites and Natives depend on each other so closely that the links could not be severed without disaster to both.

Hence Total Separation seems no more practicable than the other alternatives.

Hence not one of the theoretically possible escapes into a social, economic, and political order more in line with liberal ideals is practicable at present. Yet Professor Hoernlé thinks that such a choice must be made, even if there is no hope of it being realized in the foreseeable future, for, in addition to existing liberal activities in sections of all three alternative fields, we must have a long-range goal with blue-prints for the right ordering of race relations.

For this purpose Professor Hoernlé chooses "Total Separation" as the long-run goal. Yet he admits that the goal is unrealizable, because White South Africa is never likely to agree to sacrifice its power, prestige, economic advantage, and convenience. But its choice as a goal would ease inter-racial tension, and make possible useful co-operation with all those favouring the development and enlargement of the Native Reserves, with those who do not oppose European culture for Natives, and with those who welcome a development of a self-reliant national Native spirit. The effort would at any rate clear our minds about the application of liberal ideals in a multi-racial society and be a test of our conscience, wisdom, and humanity.

We would agree with Professor Hoernlé that some hard thinking is urgently necessary, however dim and distant any chosen goal may be.

Professor Hoernlé's ultimate goal of Total Separation is too far distant to be worth discussion in details, especially of the economics of such separate racial groups. Perhaps if we keep this object in mind, however, our thinking and the experience we gain may suggest useful subsidiary positions to capture and perhaps modify the original long-range goal.

It would also appear that the racial and political problems which might be solved would be greatly outweighed by new economic difficulties which would follow even a tentative approach to the separatist goal.

Other possibilities therefore might well be considered at the same time in the strenuous thinking which is ahead. In large part the future welfare of the Native will depend largely on the success or otherwise of White economy. In this connexion the future of South Africa is and must continue to be largely bound up with the future of world trade and overseas investment. Some of our common difficulties could therefore be best attacked from the international flank with the co-operation of liberals in every country. It is probable, too, that our most serious obstacles to South African progress are due less to Nature's niggardliness in her provision of natural resources (other than gold), than to the shortcomings of the human inhabitants. Blue-prints for a common sense tackling of the causes of the friction within the White groups are urgently necessary, if only because the future is so very much more important than the past.

Careful consideration should also be given to the possibility of large-scale immigration. A larger population would give our farmers a wider home market, assist the more economical development of home industries, ensure a safer racial balance, and, by reducing White fears of numerical superiority of non-Whites, make it possible to raise the efficiency of Non-Europeans. The greater productivity and greater purchasing power of the half million Native labourers on European farms and the 600,000 Natives employed in urban areas would be a landmark in South African progress. Immigration, too, could be combined with a policy of encouraging the maintenance of South African population growth, requiring long-range programmes of housing, educational facilities, health, medical services, and no doubt a drastic revision of the policy of subsidizing the exports of food while ignoring the nutritional requirements of our poorest groups.

Before widening the circle of liberal principles and practice, it might be wise to examine the degree of freedom and democracy now present in the favoured minority. Freedom and democracy can have little significance; perhaps even no meaning at all, for those who are haunted by the fear of economic insecurity, ill health, and poverty. Perhaps it might be as well to see that there are no gaps in the foundations of civilization and then to build up a comprehensive plan of constructive social and economic reforms.

But the difficulties of any long-range goal should not discourage the smaller but more immediate possibilities.

Common sense suggests that neither European health nor European industry can be built on Native malnutrition and disease. Further, there are obvious

advantages in Non-European labour becoming more skilled and more diversified. In this process Native education is not a luxury, but a necessary basis for increased productivity, and the growth of a more thoughtful and useful people. With so much at stake, the present indifference of White South Africa is unbelievable.

Fortunately an improvement in social services, especially education, health, and housing, is becoming more feasible in view of a growing public conscience, and a dim realization that South African industrial expansion on economic lines will depend partly upon the widening of a home market in which the Native will be more valuable as an intelligent consumer than as a cheap and ignorant unit of labour.

South African resources and qualities must be developed to the full, and every individual in South Africa, of whatever race or colour, should be given a full opportunity of realizing the best of which he, or she, is capable.

Affording opportunities to the many will not only be the best way of maintaining a civilized standard for the few but also make it possible for the many to enjoy some of the benefits of human progress. It is

doubtful if Total Separation would achieve this desirable result.

Of course some of the above points would require a little less faith in economic freedom and a little more faith in the assistance, even interference, by public authorities or control boards than the average liberal would care to admit. At this point he might be invited to consider very seriously the possibilities of working out a little planning for an enlightened democracy.

Certainly, Professor Hoernlé challenges us to think. At the moment we are no doubt floundering without any definite objectives. Such hazy suggestions as are put forward in the name of "Segregation" are so obscure as to have little or no meaning. They claim attention because in some mystical way they seem to ensure that *not only will Natives still work for the Europeans and yet be kept out of sight, but that their continued poverty will safeguard "civilized" standards.*

"*Môre is 'n ander dag.*"—But the times we now live in and the tides of ignorance and prejudice wait for no man, not even a South African!

RAYMOND BURROWS