

Racial Issues In South Africa

C. W. M. Gell

THE danger of civil war between the White factions in South Africa has temporarily receded. On August 27, 1952, the High Court of Parliament, consisting only of Nationalist Members of Parliament (Opposition M.P.'s having unanimously refused to attend), overruled the Appeal Court's decision of March 20, which had invalidated the Act disfranchising the Coloured voters. This August "judgment" was passed by the simple parliamentary majority which, the Appeal Court had ruled, could not legally enact the original legislation. On August 29, however, the Cape Division of the Supreme Court held that the Act constituting the "High Court of Parliament" was itself "invalid, null and void and of no legal effect and force". This decision was unanimously upheld by the Appellate Division on November 13. By these last two judgments the properly constituted Courts of the Union have duly expressed legally what every citizen well knew, and what many Nationalists had more or less admitted—that the High Court of Parliament was a clumsy and immoral attempt to evade the legal and moral obligations of the compact of Union as enshrined in the South African Act of 1909. Neither the "High Court" nor its "judgment", therefore, have any legal existence, and the Separate Representation of Voters Act remains invalid.

On September 15, while the appeal before the Appellate Division was still pending, Prime Minister Dr. D. F. Malan said: "I can give this assurance: that with all the

implications of this matter, we as a Government cannot allow ourselves to lose". As I explained in an earlier article, the two main implications are the elimination of Coloured voters from the common roll in the Cape Province in order to prevent their playing a decisive part in White elections and the ensuring of a Nationalist victory at the 1953 election. These are, in fact, the long-term and short-term aspects of the same problem. Now, despite Dr. Malan's statement quoted above, it seems probable that the Nationalists will accept the Appeal Court's two rulings, at least until after the election in which they will ask the country for a mandate to "establish the sovereignty of Parliament".

The reason for this reversal of the truculent clamour of May and June about a Third War for Freedom is that, since then, another issue has been raised in a form which may well enable the Nationalists to win another bare majority in May 1953, even on the present rolls. If this calculation is correct, it will pay them to keep the constitutional question relatively in the background, for many, even of their own supporters, have serious misgivings about abandoning the rule of law. But it should not be supposed that the Nationalists' ultimate intentions have in any way changed. No one expects them to get a two-thirds majority in May. Senator H. F. Verwoerd, the Minister of Native Affairs, said on October 20 that they would go ahead with or without a two-thirds majority. If the Nationalists win in 1953,

the constitutional battle will, therefore, be resumed in 1954 or 1955 with all its implications and dangers. No simple parliamentary majority provides a constitutional mandate to override the entrenched clauses of the South Africa Act and, whatever expedient is tried (packing the Senate with extra Government nominees or tampering with the jurisdiction of the Courts) will be a breach of the law and the Union compact. This will be resisted to the utmost by non-Nationalists who know that the abrogation of the Constitution opens the way for the Nationalist goal of a one-race one-language, one-party republic.

What has regained the Nationalists the ground they lost with the electorate by their constitutional manoeuvres is the development since June 26 of an organized agitation among the non-European races, and the failure of the Opposition parties to think out a coherent and distinctive policy in regard to it. In January 1952 the African National Congress (ANC) and the South African Indian Congress combined to warn Dr. Malan that they would resort to civil disobedience unless certain discriminatory laws were repealed—viz., the Separate Representation of Voters Act 1951, the Suppression of Communism Act 1950, the Bantu Authorities Act 1950,¹ the Group Areas Act 1950², the Pass Laws and the cattle-culling regulations.³ This Government has consistently refused to hold any discussions with non-European leaders or delegations. Dr. Malan, therefore, replied by letter that “in no circumstances would the Government repeal the long-existing laws differentiating between European and Bantu”. He quite correctly discerned in the projected campaign a threat to exclusive White rule and with the insensitivity which has characterised so much of his party’s handling of non-Europeans he added:

“It is self-contradictory to claim as an inherent right of the Bantu, who differ in many ways from the Europeans, that they should be regarded as not different, especially when it is borne in mind that these differences are permanent and not man-made.

“If this is a matter of indifference to you and if you do not value your racial characteristics, you cannot in any case dispute the Europeans’ right which, in this case, is de-

finitely an inherent right, to take the opposite view and to adopt the necessary measures to preserve their identity as a separate community.”

In its reply of February 22 the ANC said:

“In reply to our demand for the abolition of differentiating laws, it is suggested in your letter that there are ‘permanent and not man-made’ differences between Africans and Europeans, which justify the maintenance of those laws. The question at issue is not one of biological differences, but one of citizenship rights which are granted in full measure to one section of the population, and completely denied to the other by means of man-made laws artificially imposed, not to preserve the identity of the Europeans as a separate community, but to perpetuate the systematic exploitation of the African people.

“The African people yield to no one as far as pride of race is concerned, and it is precisely for this reason that they are striving for the attainment of fundamental rights in the land of their birth.”

Thus it expressed implicitly the inevitable demand for ultimate equality of citizenship and opportunity which has since been made more explicit. So far, the Indian and African leaders have insisted that they are not anti-White, but anti-discrimination based upon inflexible differences of dermal pigmentation.

II

IN an article in last Summer’s PUBLIC AFFAIRS I quoted Dr. Malan as saying that his basic motive is to maintain “the European dominance over the overwhelming majority of the non-Europeans”. It is well to remind ourselves of the 1951 population figures, as recently revised:

Europeans	2,643,187	20.8%
Coloureds	1,102,323	8.7%
Indians	365,524	2.9%
Natives	8,535,341	67.6%
	<hr/>	
	12,646,375	100.0%

All the Coloured races significantly outbreed the White and, despite high death rates, will increase their proportionate preponderance unless there is heavy White immigration, which the Nationalists discourage lest it diminish the present Afrik-

ander majority (64%) among White population. It is, of course, a fact that the bulk of the non-European population, especially the Native, is backward, uneducated, little civilised and at a very early cultural level. There is, however, a small but growing social and economic *élite* to whom these general remarks no longer apply. It is this, at present, minute minority which constitutes the challenge to and test of "white civilisation", and which is leading the current agitation.

In their attitude to this challenge there is little practical difference between the Nationalists and their European opponents. Both condemn the Defiance Campaign unreservedly, though each blames the other for provoking it. Both stand for exclusive White political supremacy. The Opposition's stand against disfranchising the Coloureds is motivated rather by fear of the immediate electoral consequences than by objection to the principle of curtailing non-European political rights. All European parties uphold the industrial colour bar which confines non-Europeans (at least in theory) to unskilled employment. All approve residential segregation and social segregation in public places and public transport. All agree to prohibit sexual intimacy between the races. As regards the Unjust Laws specifically mentioned by the ANC, the United Party (UP), which is the chief Opposition party, would withdraw the Coloured Voters Act and amend the Suppression of Communism Act to bring alleged Communists to public trial. This would satisfy non-European opinion on these two laws. But it would only amend the Bantu Authorities Act and Group Areas Act in important but not fundamental details. It would repeal some of the latest and most irritating of the petty pass regulations and administer the others less aggressively than the Nationalists, until it could implement the general and gradual amelioration to which it is committed. But its attitude on two of the four Nationalist Acts and these most controversial of all discriminatory regulations is very far short of present African demands.

When it claims to stand for "White leadership with justice" or for "Christian

trusteeship practised with humanity", the Opposition is using verbal formulas little different from Dr. Malan, who is "seeking to solve the problem by way of differentiation based upon just and fair treatment for each group in its own sphere." No European party envisages a day when its wards will grow up and justice is viewed by nearly all Whites from one side only. Where the parties differ, it is in degree and in methods of application. Nationalists proclaim a militant racial ethos of permanent, unbending White supremacy, founded in predestinarian Calvinism and literal Scriptural sanction (Genesis IX 25 and Joshua IX 23-27). Historical circumstances, the present cultural and technical superiority of the White races and self-interest, together with the fervent patriotism of a small and isolated people, confirm Afrikaner Nationalists in their conviction of being "chosen", both inter-White and contra-Coloured. There is, therefore, a special sense in which the "un-South African" loyalties of Jews, Catholics and Anglicans are depicted by Nationalist politicians and cartoonists. And it is precisely because the colour policy of the Opposition parties is unfortified by religious dogma that Nationalists regard themselves as the only sure custodians of "white civilisation". Paradoxically they desperately fear the cultural advance of the non-Europeans even while denying the possibility of their ever becoming responsible citizens or economic competitors on level terms. This explicit, if wishful and fearful, assertion of a *herrenvolk* ideology leads to all too frequent discourtesy and bullying of non-Europeans (and Europeans too), to the contemptuous and callous brutality of all too many of the police in their dealings with coloured peoples and, inevitably, to a great exacerbation of racial bitterness. But, while it avoided the more blatant of the Nationalist excesses, the UP's record of 1933-48 was only a little less discriminatory against non-Europeans. It accepted implicitly the doctrine of White supremacy and its advantages. Much of its racial legislation foreshadowed Nationalist measures and, when it created non-European consultative bodies, it did not greatly defer to them.

Thus, while it can justifiably say that four years of Nationalist strong-arm methods have provoked a unified non-European movement such as could hardly have been thought possible in 1948, it must share the blame for several generations of Coloured discouragement and frustration which provide the agitation with its background and residual strength. The Nationalists merely sparked off something which had been long maturing and the ANC has announced that it will continue civil disobedience even if the UP wins the 1953 election. By carrying the doctrine of "White supremacy with justice" to its logical and dogmatic conclusion, the Nationalists have brought to the surface and to the active consideration of educated non-Europeans all the latent contradictions of South Africa's traditional racial policy. No amount of "development in their own sphere" or of welfare, medical and educational services⁴ will compensate men for their permanent exclusion from the country's higher political and economic life on the grounds of the colour of their skin. The affront to justice and self-respect is too great for any material palliation, as all recent Asian history is there to prove. "White civilisation" is a philosophical and moral aberration, a contradiction in terms, no longer acceptable to articulate Coloured opinion.

III

THE Defiance of Unjust Laws Campaign began quietly on June 26. It has proceeded so far with a dignity and restraint which few thought possible, despite a certain amount of police provocation and ill-treatment in prison (usually explained away as "tripping on the stairs leading down to the cells" or "falling against the table in the charge-office"). By the middle of October, although Defiance was still theoretically confined to *selected* volunteers and had not yet been switched to mass resistance designed to "fill the jails", over 7,000 passive resisters had broken minor discriminatory regulations, been arrested and gone to prison joyfully rather than pay their fines. Some juveniles have been caned. Late in Oct-

ober mounting tension led to some dangerous excitement among crowds of Africans at Defiance demonstrations in Peddie and Kimberley, and to vicious little riots at Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg in which four Europeans were murdered and ten Natives killed by the police. These were followed by a riot at Kimberley on November 8 in which 13 Natives were killed and another at East London next day in which 2 Europeans and 8 Natives were killed. It is possible that the number of Natives killed may have been underestimated and in the four riots at least 136 Natives are known to have been wounded. None of these riots arose out of Defiance incidents. But rising racial tension, the Government's proscription of most of the non-European leaders and its refusal to meet any of them, all play into the hands of the hooligan element among the Africans and of the extremists on both sides of the colour bar. There is obviously a grave risk of increasing violence.

If there has been some failure in the leadership of the Defiance Campaign—a failure to carry out education about non-violence among a people who (unlike the Indians) are not prepared for it temperamentally or philosophically, and some misappropriation of funds—the Government is partly to blame. For, since May, it has proscribed some 500 alleged Communists, mostly Indians and Natives connected with the campaign. A small number of these men are undoubtedly genuine Communists, seeking to extract the maximum profit for their cause from any strife or dissension, regardless of human suffering. Their exact number is not known—in the UNO debates the Union delegates referred to 26 alleged former members of the Communist Party whom the Government considers dangerous—but it is certainly only a fraction of those who have been "named" and driven out of their jobs in the Congresses and Trades Unions on the basis of police evidence, untested in the Courts. This indiscriminate use of the Suppression Act against opponents of the Government's racial policy alienates support which South Africans would otherwise unanimously give to a drive against genuine and proved Communists — and seriously hampers

moderate non-European leaders in their efforts to keep control over their wilder followers.

The Government's attitude to this Defiance Campaign is straightforward. As Mr. J. G. Strydom, the Minister of Lands, said on September 13: "The White man can only succeed in staying in South Africa . . . if we retain all power in our hands". By definition under the Suppression Act, anyone is a Communist who "advocates, advises, defends or encourages the achievement of any of the objects of Communism". These "objects", according to Nationalists, include racial equality, thus making the Act applicable to liberals. (When the present writer wrote to this effect in a Johannesburg daily, he was shortly afterwards interrogated by the C.I.D.) Therefore, Defiance demonstrators, organisers and sympathisers are dangerous revolutionaries who must be ruthlessly suppressed. In any case, the non-European must be put in his place and taught who is *baass*. Mr. Strydom has promised new legislation similar to that used against the openly terrorist Mau Mau in Kenya. Mr. C. R. Swart, the Minister of Justice, is itching to flog passive resisters and has told the police to take "drastic action—to use their batons where necessary and to shoot where necessary", an injunction they are only too likely to obey with alacrity.

There are Europeans who are deeply disturbed by the Defiance Campaign and the lack of White response to its moral and political challenge. But those who think thus are a small minority of the White population and, with a virtually all-White election impending, no political party dare move far from "White supremacy". The Opposition leader, Mr. J. G. N. Strauss, has recognized the necessity of reaching agreement with moderate non-European leaders and has promised to consult them. But his four-point colour programme—1. social segregation; 2. no miscegenation; 3. residential segregation; 4. the application of non-European labour for the benefit of the country as a whole "on our farms, in our kitchens, in our factories and in our mines"—could only appeal to Europeans. In paying lip-service to consultation with non-Europeans, he dare not offer conces-

sions which the European electorate will reject; and without concessions, consultation is meaningless. Mr. Strauss's further promise to "lift the colour issue out of politics" is as irrelevant to the existing situation as his hope of greatly increased White immigration, which cannot affect the issue in time.

My own view is that few marginal European voters will believe, as Mr. Strauss assures them, that there is a way back to the traditional policy of Hertzog and Smuts: that more moderate language and a less militant administration of the law plus, perhaps, a few unimportant concessions will restore racial harmony. Offered the choice between the full-blooded *baasskap* of the Nationalists and the Opposition's slightly more anaemic version of the same theme, the floating voter, on whom the election result depends, may well fear to make any concession to an organised non-European agitation, lest it be interpreted as a sign of weakness. If he takes this essentially short-term view of his own self-interest, the Nationalists may well win again by another narrow majority.

IV

NOW, it is important who wins in 1953. A Nationalist victory would extinguish hope of compromise or moderation on either the constitutional or racial issues. A victory for the UP might give a short breathing-space in which reason and sanity might make themselves heard. But if I am right in supposing that the Defiance Campaign has started something that can never be stopped; that, even if this first movement is crushed, another and yet another will shortly break out, gathering strength from adversity and martyrdom, and gradually uniting the non-European majority in a common resolve finally to shake off the shackles of pigmentocracy—only too possible, also in a common hatred of the oppressor: then the policies of *neither* party offer any real hope of averting catastrophe.

This article can no longer avoid that word of ill-omen, *apartheid*, for on its interpretation depends whether South Africa's future is to be revolution or evolu-

tion. Here, once again, the two European factions are much nearer each other in practice than is at first apparent. The Nationalists theoretically believe in confining the non-Europeans to "their own areas". This they explain as reversing the present trend of Africans to migrate from the countryside to the towns. The Africans will have their homes in the rural Native Reserves from which migrant male labour will come to work in European industry and on European farms. Being only temporary sojourners in the "European areas", Natives will have no claim to political rights or economic opportunities in the European polity, but will be allowed "the fullest development in their own sphere"—subject always to overriding White control.

But, in fact, this is dishonest pleading. Putting aside altogether the question of African consent to such a scheme and the propriety of using migrant labour, the whole policy is impracticable. The Native Reserves constitute about 12 per cent of the area of the Union in six large and many small pockets of land. They cannot support their present population of 3 1/2 millions (about 40 per cent of the Native population today). Making every allowance for much that could be done to increase their carrying capacity by rehabilitating agriculture and establishing some light industries, there is no possibility that "in 50 years' time all the then Native population of 19 millions will be in the Reserves", as Senator Verwoerd recently promised. The Nationalists in their first term of office have done much to control and subordinate the non-European in the "European areas" and nothing to promote "his development in his own area". In fact, the rate of African urbanisation and integration in the "European economy" has greatly increased in the last four years. The Nationalists may retard it slightly; they cannot reverse it.

In practice, therefore, Nationalist *apartheid* is difficult to distinguish except in degree from the UP's policy of encouraging the economic integration of the non-Europeans, subject always to the industrial colour bar, residential segregation in the urban areas and exclusive White

political control. This concentration by both parties solely on European convenience and the provision of a cheap labour supply naturally appeals to the dominant White electorate.

But an increasing number of intellectuals, Nationalist and non-Nationalist, are coming to see that this cannot continue; that, even with a monopoly of modern weapons, one-fifth of the population will not be able to hold down indefinitely the other four-fifths, once they have acquired the technique of mass action; that to try to do so is also morally indefensible and will be economically disastrous; that it will lead in the not distant future to unpromising White nationalism being confronted by implacable Black nationalism and that there can be no peaceful solution to that appalling dilemma.

This awareness of impending disaster has led some Nationalist intellectuals and a section of the ministry of the Dutch Reformed Churches to advocate total *apartheid*, by which they mean complete territorial separation gradually achieved, the eventual elimination of Native labour from the White economy and the ultimate partition of the Union, if the African state so desires. They justify this solution by admitting the immorality and impossibility of maintaining the present master-subject race relationship for ever. But they feel that racial prejudices and fears are so deeply ingrained that the Whites will never be prepared to make substantial concessions to the coloured peoples in a mixed society which the latter would ultimately dominate numerically. They identify the preservation of civilisation with the survival of the White races and argue (with doubtful logic and less evidence) that political equality leads to social equality and that in turn to miscegenation. But, if they face the psychological facts only too realistically, they are less convincing on economic and territorial matters. They minimise the tremendous cost of eliminating non-European labour from South-Africa's economy.⁵ This would catastrophically reduce the living standards of both White and Black. And they try to avoid the territorial implications of partition either by offering the Africans parts of

Britain's various colonial possessions (which are not theirs to offer) or by envisaging an African state composed of the six divided units of the present Reserves, unable to accommodate more than a minority of the Bantu, without mineral or adequate natural resources and without the possibility of railways and harbours under African control. If South Africa does ever decide for partition, the Whites will have to think in terms of evacuating, say, the Transvaal and Natal. The sacrifice will be of that magnitude and will need to include capital works.

V

THE liberal solution was implicit in the old Cape tradition which the Nationalists are trying so hard to extinguish finally. It seemed to die with J. H. Hofmeyr, Smuts' Deputy Prime Minister, in 1948; but has lately been revived by the three elected Native Representatives in Parliament supported by Anglican and Jewish leaders and a band of university lecturers. The liberals accept that economic integration is a process that is irreversible and, indeed, desirable. But they ask that its moral and political implication be also accepted: that Christian and democratic principles require the abolition of colour as the test of a civilised man and the extension of full citizenship rights to all civilised people. Where Nationalist intellectuals stress the survival of the White races, liberals seek primarily the survival of civilised values, believing that South Africa must go forward in the faith that men will learn to live, work and vote as *men* and not as units of racial blocs; that, therefore, non-Europeans must progressively assume the rights and responsibilities of citizenship as they attain to civilised standards; that all must have equal economic and educational opportunities; that the question of mixed marriages and social life must be left to the voluntary decision of individuals. This policy involves admitting the educated non-European minority *now* to fuller political rights and wider economic opportunities, as an earnest of good faith and guarantee of an enlarging future. Its advocates also believe

that the only effective defence against Communism is to give the underprivileged a stake in the country that seems to them worth defending. At present they have nothing much to lose in South Africa.

To those who live across the ocean in another hemisphere, it may seem a simple choice between these two alternatives of partition or full integration. Provided the protagonists of partition offer adequate territorial concessions, there is little between the two ethically. But the economic argument is completely one-sided. Against that, however, must be set the very real fact of deep-rooted racial prejudices with a long and often bitter history behind them, and the colossal act of faith required of a minority group gradually to abdicate from power voluntarily in the hope that those whom they have repressed for so long will not return the compliment when they are in a position to do so.

My personal belief is that White South Africa will continue to vacillate, unable to choose between the material or psychological sacrifices, unwilling to face the risks which each decision involves, until it is too late to choose either. Since the Dutch Churches raised the question of total *apartheid* in 1950, every Nationalist spokesman has denied that his party intends any such thing. Opposition politicians and press are equally careful to dissociate themselves from any truck with equality, whether immediate or eventual, political or economic.⁶ It is too much to expect either side to risk losing electoral support by moving towards either constructive alternative before the election.

But I believe that the two or three years immediately after the election represent White South Africa's last chance of deciding upon a goal which will command the loyalty of the non-European majority and obtain the co-operation of their moderate leaders in working out a gradual programme. Whoever wins, if one party will declare for total *apartheid* or the other for total integration *as goals*, men of goodwill on both sides of the colour bar will have a rallying-point and an organisation round which to group themselves. But if neither will move from their present positions, both White and Black will be in danger of

despair and the policies of force which it breeds. Without hope of peaceful advance, leadership of the non-European movements will pass irretrievably to extremists and the two European factions will move towards solidarity over the short distance that divides them on racial matters in order to fortify themselves in a siege-economy. Two pieces of evidence that the Union is approaching that sort of moral and material bankruptcy are the number of Whites privately considering emigrating for their children's sake and the terrific increase in violent crime in the non-European urban slums, where 2½ millions live in conditions of squalor, disease and homelessness that degrade the victims as much as they menace the whole community.

As South Africans are never tired of proclaiming, these are *their* problems and the solutions *their* business, South Africans will be the first to pay for failure to solve them. But the outcome affects the future of European leadership all over Africa and is therefore of vital interest to the free world. Neither in South Africa nor anywhere else in Central or East Africa is the Native population ready as yet to carry the burden of civilisation or even of self-preservation unaided. Moderate Africans

readily admit that European direction, enterprise and capital are required for many generations in the best interest of the continent and her peoples, if they can be provided without affronting African self-respect or closing all avenues of advance to the coloured races. Each African colonial empire, British, Belgian, Portuguese, French, has some special problems and none has an unstained record. But the chief factor militating against efforts to promote genuine inter-racial partnership is what has been happening in South Africa these last four years—broken pledges, disregard of moral and legal obligations, attempts to evade or nullify the decision of a much-respected Court when it was favourable to coloured interests, the sharp increase in the severity and application of discriminatory laws. The Union contains by far the largest White community south of the Sahara. Its actions in the next few years will decide the future of Africa, since everything depends on removing the African's suspicion of the European's word and restoring his belief in European good faith. If the Africans finally commit themselves to an anti-White policy, most of Southern and Central Africa will become untenable for Europeans within this century—possibly within our lifetime.

¹This attempts to reimpose a fragmented tribal pattern on Native life, while bringing the Chiefs more closely under Government supervision and control. It is opposed by all articulate Native opinion, as tribalism obstructs political advance and economic integration into one multi-racial society and the Chiefs, always a conservative element, will become mere Government 'stooges'. This latter fear has been confirmed by the Government's dismissal of Albert Lutuli, a prominent Zulu Chief who belonged to the ANC and supported the Defiance Campaign. Others will have to toe the line or be dismissed.

²This provides for residential and territorial segregation, arbitrarily imposed by the Minister and his nominees without adequate redress in the Courts or compensation for the evicted.

³These two sets of laws and ordinances compel all Native Africans to carry annual tax receipts and passes in urban areas showing that they are employed or have a permit to seek employment (failure to carry all the requisite passes makes the offender liable to instant arrest); to register all service contracts under a law which makes their breach a criminal offence and makes it a crime to be insolent or disobedient to a White employer; to obey a curfew in urban areas; to stand in different queues at Post Offices and railway stations and to travel in separate coaches or buses; to keep down the cattle population in their overcrowded and over-grazed Reserves. Statutory offences against these essentially civil regulations account for more than

half Native crime and imprisonment. The Pass regulations are intended to help the police identify criminals and control the influx of Natives into the urban areas. But they are quite ineffective for both purposes. Real criminals forge the documents without difficulty. These regulations are the greatest source of day to day friction between the police and the law-abiding African population. Most of the laws have been long in force, but the Nationalist Government has administered them with a severity and arrogance not previously practised and has made a number of extremely provocative and quite inessential additions to the already long list of petty restrictions. It is almost inevitable that an urban African will sooner or later slip up on one of them. There was the recent deplorable case of an African minister being asked at the entrance to the Bishop of Johannesburg's garden party for his pass and being taken to the charge-office to pay £1 admission of guilt before he could return to the Bishop's house, because he had left his 'exemption from pass' certificate at home.

⁴Nationalists are fond of saying that White South Africa spends more per head on its Native population than any British colony. This is true. But it is also true that a much smaller proportion of the national income is spent per African in South Africa than in British colonies. South Africa is a rich, industrial state. It is all too apt to take credit for every penny spent on non-Europeans above what is extracted from them in taxes. This attitude overlooks the truth that in every country which hopes to avoid revolution the

wealthy must contribute to the uplift of the poor. In South Africa, owing to historical circumstances and a colour-rigid economy, that distinction is still largely racial; and one views with alarm the recent trend to restrict expenditure on Native education and municipal locations (Native townships) to what the Natives alone can afford.

⁵Nine-tenths of mine labour, three-quarters of agricultural labour and two-thirds of industrial labour is today non-European. Economists have long preached in vain that the two chief defects of the South African economy is its failure to develop the skilled potential of non-European labour and the waste of labour resources which results from the Whites regarding manual and menial tasks as "Kaffirs' work"

from which the colour of their skin debars them. About a tenth of the White population—the poor-Whites—are kept by the industrial colour bar at an economic level to which their diligence and skill does not entitle them and are deprived of the incentive of competition which would make them more productive citizens. Those who sincerely advocate partition have almost as great a psychological problem ahead of them as financial and economic.

⁶Mr. Strauss has even thought it necessary publicly to deny that a recent speech of his contained the very reasonable observation: "It is also time it is realised that the majority of the population cannot be suppressed for always".

Achilles' Heel

Man is a gregarious animal, much more so in his mind than in his body. He may like to go alone for a walk, but he hates to stand alone in his opinions.

GEORGE SANTAYANA