

The Native in South Africa

By L. MARQUARD

This book provides a simple, objective account of the present social, political, and economic position of the Natives in South Africa.

It is intended as an introduction for anyone who has just become interested in "Native Affairs" and it is especially suitable for use in secondary schools.

The first edition was published a few years ago by the Oxford University Press under the title *The Southern Bantu*. This new edition has been revised and brought up to date by Julius Lewin, lecturer in Native Law and Administration in the University of the Witwatersrand.

105 pages, cloth binding, 1/6d.

WITWATERSRAND UNIVERSITY PRESS
JOHANNESBURG

African Studies

African Studies (formerly *Bantu Studies*) is a quarterly journal that covers Linguistics, Social Anthropology, and Native Law and Administration.

It is under the joint editorship of Professor G. M. Dike and Mr. Julius Lewin, assisted by Professor J. Schapera and Mr. J. D. Rheimall Jones. It is published from the Department of Bantu Studies in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

The annual subscription is 12/6d.

WITWATERSRAND UNIVERSITY PRESS
JOHANNESBURG

RACE RELATIONS

RACE ATTITUDES

The African	1
D. G. S. M'Timkulu	
The Afrikaans-speaking South African	5
Ds. J. Reyneke	
The Cape Coloured	7
Dr. E. T. Dietrich	
The Indian Viewpoint	9
A. I. Kajee	
The English-speaking South African	13
Dr. Edgar H. Brookes	

ONE SHILLING

VOLUME XIII : NUMBER 1 : 1946



RACE RELATIONS

is the official quarterly journal of the South African Institute of Race Relations.

Its purpose is to supply authoritative information and guidance on matters having a significant bearing upon the racial situation in Southern Africa.

As the writers of articles appearing in RACE RELATIONS are free to present the results of their studies and observations as they think fit, any views expressed by them should not, except where articles are specially marked, be taken to represent the views of the Institute.

RACE RELATIONS is issued free to members of the Institute. It is sold to the public generally at a price which may vary according to the size of each issue.

The Institute also publishes a monthly bulletin of news and facts—RACE RELATIONS NEWS. This is also issued free to members.

Communications should be addressed to The Editor, RACE RELATIONS, P. O. Box 97, Johannesburg.

RACE RELATIONS

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL PUBLISHED BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS, P.O. BOX 97, JOHANNESBURG
VOLUME XIII : NUMBER 1 : 1946

THE AFRICAN

D. G. S. M'Timkulu

RACE attitudes are group attitudes reflecting the outlook, the opinions, and generalizations of one group with regard to another group. It is obvious that these opinions and generalizations will depend very largely on the background of the group and the nature of its contacts with the other groups or group. In discussing the question of race attitudes among Africans, therefore, it is important to realize that the Africans are no longer a homogeneous society. One must, therefore, first of all try to distinguish the various groups according to their background and opportunities for contacts with other races.

For this purpose we could divide African society into three main groups :—

1. The Africans in the Reserves.
2. (a) The semi-urbanized Africans.
(b) The Africans on the Farms.
3. (a) The urbanized Africans.
(b) The educated Africans.

Under 1 I include that large but diminishing number of Africans whose main contacts with the European have been through the local storekeeper, the Police, and the officials of the Native Affairs Department, and who to a large extent still follow the ways and customs of their fathers under such tribal conditions as are possible to-day.

Under 2 (a) I include the large army of migrant labourers of various sorts who come into the towns to work for limited

periods at a time. In outlook they are still definitely tribal, and regard their sojourn in the towns as merely a painful but passing phase of their lives.

2 (b) is self explanatory. 2 (a) and (b) have been grouped together as they have this one important feature in common: their chief contacts with the European come through a single agent—the employer.

Under 3 (a) I include that large and growing number of Africans who have made their homes permanently in the towns, and have no other means of livelihood except through the employment they get there.

3 (b). This group overlaps considerably with 3 (a). They have this in common that they both have longer and more varied contacts with Europeans than any other group. It includes all those Africans who through schooling, reading, and a fairly proficient mastery of one or the other of the official languages have had opportunities of knowing something of the European way of life.

Let us now consider the attitude of each one of these groups towards the European.

A. *The attitude of the African in the Reserves towards the European*

An important consideration which colours the African's attitude towards the European is that his is a dependent and conquered nation. He has to depend on the European for so much, and he has

heard this fact drummed into his ears so often that he has developed a childlike mentality in regard to the broader issues of life.

This is particularly true of the African in the Reserves. Most of the Europeans he meets represent authority in one form or another. The police and the Native Affairs Department officials are representatives of the "great white father"—the Government. The local storekeeper also wields a great deal of power on account of the fact that in times of need he can be of great assistance by giving credit to those whom he chooses. Under these circumstances the tribal African is apt to be subservient to every white man as he believes this will pay him in the long run.

By and large, however, his attitude is determined by his personal experiences in dealing with Europeans, and thus racial attitudes tend to be localized rather than generally diffused. In a Native area, for instance, where the Native Affairs Department officials are humane and sympathetic, the Africans are well disposed towards the Europeans. On the other hand, in some areas they are not, on account of the attitude of the official and non-official Europeans in the district. When this occurs, other underlying resentments come to the surface; for the African resents the fact that he has to live as a conquered subject, burdened with numerous restrictions in the land of his fathers. When such thoughts enter his mind he is apt to hate the Europeans as the one who has brought all these woes upon him. Let me emphasize, however, that these are underlying resentments which only come to the surface as a result of some harsh or painful experiences in the contacts between African and European. Generalizing as far as this group is concerned, one may say that their attitude towards Europeans is characterized by a general friendliness which may be upset by unsympathetic or inhuman treatment, but which reacts positively to any treatment which is based on the assumption that the African is a man and not a chattel.

B. *The attitude of the semi-urbanized Africans and the farm Africans*

These two groups are characterized by the following common features:

Firstly, they come into much closer contact with the European than the tribal African, but they make these contacts only within a very restricted sphere, for instance the master and his family, or the works foreman and two or three of his helpers. They thus come to know of the European through these four or five representatives. They judge all Europeans according to the estimate they have made of these few. Their judgements of the European, therefore, and the attitudes resulting from them are naturally highly individualized and consequently liable to gross error.

Secondly, these two groups are still tribal in their outlook, and their thinking is thus influenced by the old tribal ideas. They thus make little or no effort to formulate new principles or attitudes in terms of their new experiences. They accept the new but continue to interpret it in terms of the old. They can feel no need for new thought concepts. This is the reason why African organizers have found these two groups the most difficult to organize; and yet it is only through new organizations that they could be able to express their new group attitudes. They have, however, not been able to evolve anything new either in their thinking or in their attitudes because, whilst they have had a peep at the new world, they still belong mentally to the old.

Their opinions are thus most unstable, and being highly individualized they can be swayed hither and thither by any strong wind of feeling that blows. It is thus most difficult to fix on any general attitude or attitudes as representative of this group. The racial attitude of each individual depends on the kind of Europeans he has met during his employment, and also on the strength of the social bonds that still bind him to his old tribal life.

C. *The attitude of the urbanized African and the educated African towards the European*

In dealing with the semi-urbanized Africans we stressed the disadvantage of his lack of organizations as instruments in the moulding of opinion and, ultimately, in evolving a new outlook on life.

In dealing with this group we are under no such disadvantage; in fact, we are rather embarrassed by our riches. An inquiry into racial attitudes as mirrored by these organizations gives us a fairly clear cross-section of the general race attitudes of the whole group.

One ought to say, however, before beginning on this analysis, that that general attitude of friendliness towards the European which we remarked in dealing with the tribal African suffers a severe strain when the educated African begins to realize the inequalities which exist in this country. Even the kindest critic of our Native policy will agree that it does not give a chance to the African to develop to his highest stature. He finds various doors of achievement and profitable occupation locked and barred against him by the law of the land. Discriminatory legislation is passed against him merely on account of his race. Even when he is allowed to give his labour, he is paid less than a living wage. The educated African, therefore, for these and many other reasons, has become convinced that the dice are purposely loaded against him by the European.

Under these circumstances it becomes rather difficult for the educated African to maintain an attitude of friendliness towards those whom he considers as his oppressors. For this reason there have been, for a long time, two schools of thought in regard to this matter among the urban and educated Africans. There are those who feel that every European should be regarded as an enemy until he has proved himself. Those who think in this manner do not actually hate the European, but they distrust him, and feel that he can never really put himself out

or their good. They are suspicious of any friendly gesture from the European side until they have put it to a rigorous test.

On the other side there are those who believe that the European is really not as bad as his system makes him out to be. They blame the system and not the men. They point in justification of this view to the missionaries, and to the schools and hospitals that they have built; they point to various philanthropic and other organizations which have helped to uplift the African.

A dispassionate analysis of African thought to-day, however, seems to indicate that the latter group has lost considerable ground. They first of all conceded that one section of the European group—the Afrikaners—were the real enemies of the African people; but the British, they averred, were real friends of the African. They pointed to the abolition of slaves, to the great deeds of "good Queen Victoria" on behalf of the Africans, to the liberal policy of the old Cape in comparison to the policies of the Republics.

This political argument has, however, been definitely blasted by a different reading of the facts of history. The Africans have come to realize that there are just as many liberals among the Afrikaners as there are among the British. They point out that in that final catastrophe when the African lost the franchise, it was an Afrikaner who spoke up on behalf of the Africans. In some African political circles it is even pointed out that British Government sold the Africans as far back as 1902 at Vereeniging and sealed the bargain in 1910 when Union was formed.

On account of these opinions there is growing distrust of the European of whatever nationality, as the Africans feel that Europeans will always combine against the African for the achievement of their own ends.

The general shift-over of the urban and educated African towards this view is evident when one analyses trends of thought in the churches, the boarding schools, and the African political organizations to-day.

For a long time the church acted as a mellowing influence in African life. Whatever inequalities existed in the harsh every-day world, the Africans firmly believed that these would not exist within the church. But in many cases these hopes have not been fulfilled. The result has been racial bitterness and the ultimate formation of Bantu separatist churches. Even where this has not happened, there is a general acceptance of the inevitability of an African National Church, unless relationships between African and European take a turn for the better.

Twenty years ago in our boarding schools racial antipathies did not enter into the relationships between staff and students. But of late strikes and disturbances caused by racial ill-feelings have occurred in our schools. Many more students enter such schools with definitely set prejudices against the European, and the schools have consciously to set out to correct such views and preach racial harmony and understanding. This indicates that racial bitterness is steadily infiltrating into the home and becoming set as a prejudice which the young take for granted, and which is later buttressed by their own experiences in the towns. Racial bitterness is thus steadily growing among the youth of to-day, and the schools have their hands full in steering these young minds into the calm waters of racial co-operation and understanding.

This racial bitterness and distrust is most evident in African political circles. One has only to sit through a session of the African National Congress or the All-African Convention to realize how strained are the relations between European and African in this country.

Undoubtedly, amongst the urbanized and educated Africans there is a growing spirit of bitterness against the European which is sowing far and wide the seeds of mistrust and suspicion. The main effort in African circles to-day is to keep an even balance so that this bitterness may not turn to unreasoning hate or prejudice which would make co-operation and understanding between the two races impossible.

The attitude of the African towards Coloureds and Indians

In discussing the African attitude towards Coloureds and Indians, we could profitably leave out of consideration the tribal and semi-urbanized Africans, as their contacts with these two races are not very considerable.

The relations between the urban and educated Africans and the Coloureds may be said to be steadily improving, as both groups begin to think of themselves as racial entities. In times past there was a certain stigma attached to the Coloured man on account of his mixed parentage. There grew out of this an attitude which made the full-blooded African feel superior to the Coloured man. The Coloured man on the other hand vindicated his superiority by calling the African a "Kaffir".

This mild hostility between the two groups, however, is steadily passing as they both begin to realize how necessary they are to each other's welfare. The various attempts at organizing joint conferences of Africans and Coloureds are feelers in this direction.

The relations, however, between Indians and Africans have not been very harmonious of late.

When the Indians first came to Natal as indentured labourers, the Africans frankly treated them with contempt. They felt they were superior to these people who had come all the way from India to do work which they (the Africans) considered below their dignity. For this reason they adopted a superior attitude towards the Indians. When the Indians began to prosper, and make good on their little garden patches, the Africans regarded them with distant admiration, and often quoted them as examples of industry whenever they wanted to exhort their children; but it never seriously occurred to them to do likewise. It was still undignified to labour as hard as an Indian.

Then came the Indian merchants who, claiming closer kinship to the African on account of their colour, soon collared most of the African trade. The African ultimately

awoke with a rude shock to find himself indebted to the once despised Indian. He also began to realize that the business methods of many Indian traders were not above board. On this account strained relations developed between the African and Indian. The African now claims that the Indian is not only the worst exploiter but he also bars the way to his economic development by monopolizing all the commercial interests in the Native areas which the African feels ought to be open to him.

Whilst most of this is true, there is no doubt that the tide of African anger

against the Indian is not unmixed with a certain amount of chagrin, on account of the fact that the African so grossly underestimated the Indian at the beginning and now finds himself at the bottom of the economic ladder.

It is clear, then, that the general attitude of hostility and dislike which has developed among Africans for Indians is purely the result of economic conditions. One has a feeling that this attitude will not last, for there are forces at work which are bound to foster more amicable relations and better understanding between these two groups.

THE AFRIKAANS-SPEAKING SOUTH AFRICAN

DS. J. REYNEKE

THE Afrikaans-speaking South African is not more of a racist than any other section of the community, and it is incorrect to say that he is no friend of the Coloured races. It is true that he stands for what is commonly called a policy of segregation, but this does not necessarily imply that he wants to repress the African.

I propose to say a few words on the reasons why he is a segregationist and then to try and explain that he can be a segregationist without having any feeling of ill-will or desire for repression at the back of his mind.

When the Dutch came to South Africa in 1652 there was trouble with the Coloured races at the Cape—not with a Bantu-speaking people but with Hottentots and Bushmen who were there before either of them. When the Dutch started trekking inland, their frontiersmen met the Bantu coming down from the north along the East Coast and there were inevitable clashes. A century ago, during the Great Trek to the north, there were clashes in the Free State at Vegkop and elsewhere, in Natal with Dingaan, and later in the Transvaal with Sekukuni and

others. It is natural that the descendants of those trekkers should feel towards the descendants of the races with whom their fathers had fought much as European races that have clashed in the past feel towards each other to-day.

The British colonists who came to South Africa later, and especially those who went to the northern provinces after the Dutch pioneers had settled there, did not have the same experience. Still later arrivals in South Africa from Europe and America, especially after the discovery of diamonds and gold, came upon a scene which they had had no part in creating, and if they gave their sympathies to the weaker race they were guided by impulse and sentiment rather than experience. They were influenced too by the first overseas missionaries who had come to South Africa before them and had definitely championed the cause of the African as against the Dutch frontiersmen. That is why we have in South Africa a traditional Afrikaans view-point which is often labelled anti-missionary and illiberal as compared with the British or American, which is supposed to be more sympathetic.

In point of fact the Afrikaans point of view is more realistic (and easily understood if the historical background is kept in mind) than that of the newcomer to South Africa, which is detached and sometimes merely academic.

The reason why the Afrikaans-speaking South African pursues a segregation policy is, however, not that he wants to continue a fight or that he is filled with resentment towards a race with which he has clashed in the past, or which he fears for the future, but, from a purely subjective point of view, because he wants to preserve his own racial integrity. Instinctively he feels that he is not a mere colonist with the background of a big nation overseas from where he has come, but that his whole nation is centred only in this country. Holland is no more his homeland than Britain, France, or Germany. He, like the Coloured and the African, but unlike the Indian and the Britisher, has only one home, one native land, and that is South Africa. Instinctively, too, he feels that he wants to preserve his racial entity, and knows that, as a small white nation in a continent of black and coloured races, he will lose not only his identity but also his very existence as a nation if he allowed himself to be swamped by the black races surrounding him in overwhelming numbers. Something must be done for his own preservation as a white race and he feels that it is essential to keep himself racially pure and apart. This is his policy of segregation. It does not necessarily mean that he wants to segregate the African; it means just as well that he wants to segregate *himself*—but as he is in greater danger of being swamped by the black race than the black race is of being swamped by him, it is a matter of greater urgency for him, and therefore he takes the initiative in the matter.

The Afrikaans-speaking South African argues further: "My race has, as I see it, an older civilization. I am, from my point of view, superior in wealth, culture, intellect, etc., to the African, and therefore it is my responsibility rather than his

to decide and initiate the best policy for the future; and where I, as a white man, am, for historical and other reasons, a member of the ruling race, I must see to it that the policy I stand for is applied. If I let things develop, the result will be that I shall be swamped in the general mass."

Apart from these general considerations, the Afrikaans-speaking South African feels that the whole economic system of the land has been built up on the supposition—right or wrong—that the white man, who is the ruler, is also the employer, and that the African is the unskilled labourer. He feels that this economic system which has been built up through centuries cannot be replaced overnight without an upheaval greater than that of the French Revolution and he is honest and realistic in openly acknowledging that things are as he sees them. This, however, does not mean that he is altogether illiberal in his outlook; where he is frank in defining his view-point, he also wants to be just in applying his policy. He argues: "The only policy acceptable to me is one that will make it possible for the white man and the African to remain apart, each with the right to seek his own salvation (with the help of the other) but always keeping in mind that he must maintain his own racial identity."

When once this principle is generally accepted by British and Afrikaans South Africans, as well as by the African, the Coloured, and Indian, the Afrikaans-speaking South African will co-operate whole-heartedly with every other section in every and any scheme which stands for justice, fairplay, goodwill, and progress for all. He will accept the ideal of equality of opportunity for every section of the multi-coloured community, so long as that opportunity includes the opportunity for, and guarantees the maintenance of, his racial integrity.

These, in a general way, are the unformulated views, often hazy, but always honestly held without any conscious desire for repression as such by the Afrikaans-speaking South African.

THE CAPE COLOURED

E. T. Dietrich

It is my purpose in this paper to state what, in my opinion, is the best, or, for that matter, the *only* way by which racial harmony, peace, and goodwill may be achieved in the existent heterogeneous society of South Africa. Few countries present a picture more bristling in racial antagonism and prejudice than ours. If, however, by simple analogy, we compare South Africa with other countries where this problem is just as acute, we cannot but be struck by one picture common to all of them—and that is that racial and colour prejudices are co-existent with national oppression on a social, political, and economic plane.

This brings me to the fundamental common denominator—the basis and root cause of racial prejudice in this country, namely, the differential treatment accorded the various "racial" groups in the economic, political, and social sphere. It is my contention—and one supported strongly by well-known thinkers on this problem—that to eliminate racial strife and to effect goodwill and lasting peace and co-operation it is of the utmost necessity to pluck out root and branch this primary cause of all prejudice.

Harmony and co-operation between races, *deliberately* kept apart by the laws and constitution of a country, cannot possibly be effected by a mere wave of the magic, but futile, wand of liberal humanitarianism. In South Africa racial division has been deliberately fostered by the ruling class for its own ends. It is correct to say that the whole economic structure of South Africa rests on the continuance—nay more—the deepening of racial hatred and colour prejudice caused directly by the innumerable colour bar laws and regulations.

The main pillar, in the first place, of the economic structure of South Africa is

the colour bar. The economy of South Africa is a capitalist one—based on the super-exploitation of the Non-Europeans for super-profits. At the same time, a thin upper stratum of whites are deliberately bribed and privileged so as to keep them psychologically hanging to the tails of this exploiting ruling class and also deeply prejudiced and conscious of their so-called "racial superiority." The South African whites are deliberately bribed economically by white labour policies, apprenticeship acts, mines and works acts, preferential treatment in industry, higher wages, etc., to look for their comparatively high standard of living to this ruling class. In the social sphere, they are reminded continually of the myth of white superiority by residential segregation, and the ubiquitous, pernicious dictum of "Europeans only—dogs not allowed". Politically, South Africa is a democracy only for the whites, but for the vast bulk of the Non-Europeans it is a slave colony, for all adult whites have the vote regardless of any qualification.

The vast majority of whites, including the meanest poor white, for these reasons and only for these reasons, regard themselves as the chosen peoples—while all other racial groups are considered as sub-human in various degrees. However, in view of the crises in which capitalist economy finds itself from time to time, about 25 per cent of the white population has been reduced to Poor Whiteness—many of them living far below the social scale of many Non-Europeans. With the future deepening crises which are inevitable under capitalism, the abyss of poor whiteness yawns in front of the so-called white labour aristocracy of South Africa. Thus the cold economic facts of the situation gradually tend to undermine this myth of Aryan superiority. To counteract

this, the ruling class is frantically doing its best to preserve this myth and to maintain colour prejudice, because it correctly sees its doom in the unity of all oppressed peoples, regardless of colour. Hence we find the *policy* of segregation, racial discrimination, and national oppression being feverishly pushed forward in Parliament. It would seem that a veritable Bartholomew's Eve is in store for the Non-Europeans at the next Parliamentary session.

Mere pious wishes and humanitarian deliberations alone will not stem this reactionary tide of national oppression, the root cause of racial disharmony.

But not only has the ruling class erected a barrier between the whites and non-whites. Amongst the Non-Europeans themselves have they caused racial divisions. They have tried to make the Cape Coloured people feel themselves superior to the African by allowing them a meagre negligible vote without representation, by giving them a chance to enter a few skilled trades, and by separating them socially and residentially from the African. They are told that they are near to the whites—although a sort of unwanted step-child—and that in a few centuries they may aspire to social equality with the whites. However, cold economic facts are teaching them otherwise. Fifty per cent of the Cape Coloured people are living below the poverty datum line. The doors of the few skilled trades, traditionally open to them, are being shut. The Coloured intelligentsia find themselves bitterly humiliated by the denial of social and political rights. There is nothing under the present social system to which they may aspire. All around them they see poverty, degradation, and disease. To crown it all they are presented with a muzzle preventing them from protesting effectively against this whole incubus—a muzzle which would have the effect of tying them for all time to the oppressive machinery of the South African State, namely, a Coloured Advisory Council.

The Coloured people are beginning to come out of their isolation from the other

oppressed groups. Some of them have already made a clear analysis of this humbug of racial hatred and prejudice. They see in the oppression of the African and Indian a likeness to their own oppression. They realize why the African is herded into overcrowded reserves, why he has to pay poll tax and carry passes, why he is lower paid than the Coloured, why he has been completely disfranchised. And what is more, they see and realize that they are gradually slipping into the same economic and political slavery of their African brother. Meanwhile Liberal Joint Councils have, since 1936, been piously crying to teach all sections of the oppressed Sunday School lessons on patience and racial goodwill.

The policy of Coloured political leaders in the past has been to serve the ends of the ruling class and to preserve the artificial barriers separating the Coloured man from his ally, the African. They have served their masters well. It is only recently that the Coloured man is realizing the essential identity of his own bitter lot with that of the African: that his problem is the problem of the African and the problem of the equally oppressed Indian. He recognizes that only by united movement of all oppressed Non-Europeans fighting for the same aims can the tide of reaction and oppression be stemmed. And it is in *this* recognition that real and firm harmony and racial co-operation is in the process of gestation.

In the past, racial harmony, as interpreted by our so-called leaders, meant coming hypocritically together once a year under the patronage of vague white liberals, with the "recognized" leaders of the Africans for the purpose of formulating a few trivial, deferentially worded resolutions to be respectfully forwarded to the Government for consideration. Meanwhile the whole foundation of the joint problem of both racial groups was very skilfully and often dictatorially sidetracked. At the same time subtle segregation policies were tacitly agreed to and so also the complete disfranchisement of the African people.

Among the African and Indian peoples too, concurrently with the Coloured, there has been growing an awareness of the similarity of the problems, and that the similarity lies in the cold fact that the whole Colour Bar apparatus with all its effects of racial disharmony and strife and misery serves the preservation of the super-profits of the ruling class of South Africa. Inter-tribal feuds, always deliberately stirred up and fomented by the agents of the ruling class, anti-African prejudice and propaganda amongst the Coloured, hatred of whites by the Non-Europeans—all this can be laid at the door of the white rulers.

We maintain that real co-operation and peace cannot be achieved under the *status quo*, and we declare any pretence to achieve the same under the present

socio-economic system to be a deliberate and open deception.

We state the present unity movement on a definite programme for full democratic rights for all Non-Europeans to be the *only* practical beginning towards realizing goodwill and racial harmony amongst all peoples of South Africa. We also maintain, categorically, that anyone who *really* and *sincerely* wishes the realization of these must unhesitatingly throw in his lot with this unity movement. It is the duty of every European who is sincere in this regard to give this movement his wholehearted support; for only on the basis of such a programme and its eventual attainment is it possible to "encourage, work for, and foster peace, goodwill, and practical co-operation between the various sections and races of the population of South Africa".

THE INDIAN VIEWPOINT

A. I. Kaje

I DOUBT very much whether I am competent to deal with the subject of racial attitudes from the Indian point of view. The fact that we have such a body as the South African Institute of Race Relations is immediate evidence of the difficulty of the subject. I have before me a series of questions kindly framed by Mr. Webb for the purpose of guiding me on the lines on which the Institute has chosen to arrange this symposium. Perhaps you will allow me to quote one or two of the questions in order to explain my dilemma. I am asked, as anyone might be asked: is there a general attitude common to most Indians in their relations to Europeans? Of respect? Fear? Suspicion? Dislike? Envy? What attitude on the part of Europeans is most deeply resented by Indians? Open hostility? Superiority? Benevolent tolerance? In social contacts is the Indian at his ease with Europeans? Or on the defensive? Or ready to feel a slight? In bodies that have equality as a basis, such as the Indo-European Council, do

Indian members feel they can contribute freely? Or are they suspicious of the goodwill of Europeans? Does a subconscious feeling of inferiority make them assertive? What are the attitudes of Indian business men to Europeans of similar business standing? Do certain deprivations, such as the use of public libraries or inequalities in teachers' salaries, cause resentment against authorities? Resentment against whites? Despondency? Resolve to overcome disabilities? When does an attitude towards another race emerge? In early childhood? School days? What are its first manifestations? Anger? Jealousy? Envy? What are Indian attitudes towards Coloureds and Natives? Is there any difference of attitude on the part of Indians towards English-speaking Europeans? Towards Afrikaners? Towards Jews? Now I think you will agree that these questions are set to help our understanding of racial problems. But I think you will agree that all these questions can be answered fully only by survey of our

psychological attitudes, such as that made by Professor MacCrone in his *Race Attitudes in South Africa*, and by such other works, the bibliography of which is to be found in our libraries. A whole literature has grown up about this subject, and it is not to be supposed that a man like myself, whose education has lain in the harder commercial ways of life, can possibly bring to these questions a scientific knowledge or the analytical faculty enjoyed by those who have contributed to the great literature of race. So, when I am faced with a number of set questions, I am afraid I fall back upon a very common and simple answer and say that "it all depends". Take, for example, the question: "When does an attitude towards another race emerge?" I answer: "It all depends." A child may rapidly develop an attitude of jealousy, of envy, of superiority. It will all depend upon the environment of the child; the degree of understanding of his parents; the first contacts with a child of another race. Take, for example, an incident reported in *Die Transvaler*, of the refusal of school children in the Orange Free State to eat bananas and pawpaws because, they said, the fruit had been "doctored" with paralysis germs by Indians as a retaliatory measure against recent Provincial legislation. What are we to do in such cases as this? I think it might be said that, as far as Indian children are concerned, their attitude towards Europeans is determined by the attitude of the European children towards them. Let me put it this way, for it affects the answer to all these questions. The Indian in this country is a dispossessed person. He is unlike the African in several respects, and he stands, in a way, if I may say so without slight to European or African, between the two. If anything, the Indian destroyed the easy philosophy held by so many Europeans that the white man was the civilized man and the black man the uncivilized. Before he arrived in this country, the philosophy of the white man was on the whole typical of frontier societies, and part of that assumption

was undoubtedly that the white man was the elect, the civilized person, and the black man the outcast and the uncivilized. As the African emerged from his tribal stage, he took on the white man's style of living and, relatively speaking, his own civilization was not strong enough, as it were, to persist against this attraction towards the white man's mode of living. On the other hand, the Indian had behind him a long civilization, and his arrival in this country threw a wedge into the white man's philosophy. I think it can be said with some truth that a certain paternal benevolence has accompanied the rugged justice meted out to the African. In ordinary walks of life people like the African. He is no competitor; he is a colourful fellow; and on the whole he is honest and his courtesy attracts a certain affection. The Indian, on the other hand, was looked upon as a mysterious being, an oriental, full of cunning which is attributed to orientals. His presence upset the European assumption of superiority, an assumption which was carried so easily towards the African. I do not suggest that the European attitude towards the African was anything but that of a superior person, but I would say that on the whole Europeans have been brought up to look upon the African as an inferior person, but rather affectionately so. On the other hand, the European has been brought up to believe that the Indian is an inferior person, but full of possibilities for injury to the European interests. Now the European knows more about the African than he does about the Indian. Indian religious and social customs irritate the majority of Europeans. But there are other factors, of course, playing upon these attitudes, to which Indians react unfavourably. The history of the African is a history of a very gradual and slow recognition of the European obligation to him as a trustee. The very idea of looking upon the Indians as wards fills the Indians with horror. At no time, in fact, has any official recognition been given to such a conception as European trusteeship over

Indians in this country. The African is moving upwards towards political freedoms—very slowly, I know, but the movement is, at any rate, progressive. The Indian, on the other hand, started with many freedoms in this country which have undergone progressive abolition. Now what is the natural reaction of the Indian to this matter? His attitude has always been defensive. At every intrusion upon his rights and liberties he has chosen the only way he knew, a method which his philosophy and his tradition offer, a method of falling back upon passive resistance, if you like to call it so, but essentially upon the defensive. Where the law has prevented him from doing something he has sought deliberately not to defy the law but by legal process to get round it. He has openly admitted on more than one occasion before commissions that necessity has compelled him to beat the law by legal methods. This circumvention, it is true, has aroused Europeans to a variety of counter-measures and these counter-measures have always taken the form of harsher restrictions and curbs upon his activities. He persists, however, very much like the Jew has persisted throughout the ages, to defy all that the dominant European can place upon him. But a mere statement of the Indian's defensive attitudes will not suffice to describe the shifts in attitude to which he has been forced. The chief motive propelling the Indian is the feeling that he does not belong to South African society. The Indian has been made to feel that he is an intruder, that he is outside the South African polity, and this feeling arouses in him various attitudes, depending upon occasions. At times he has chosen to adopt passive resistance; at other times this passive resistance has developed into more active resistance. A belief in passive resistance accords with his tradition, a tradition which Mr. Gandhi did much to encourage. That belief persists to-day but I think it is very gradually disappearing. Look, for example, at the young politically-minded Indian, the worker in the factory, and

those other small groups which form what is called the Nationalist bloc. These groups, particularly the workers, many of them being attached to the Communist Party, are seeking their salvation through their common interests with members of other races, European and African. I have often maintained that the interests of the Indian merchant are the same as the interests of the European merchant or of the African merchant; that the interests of the Indian worker are the same as the interests of the European and African worker; so too with the professions. We see among our own Indian workers, particularly amongst the young, a movement to encourage unity among workers as such, and there is no doubt that it is making progress. Indians, then, do not think and act completely as Indians. Of course, on big questions affecting Indians as a community, questions like the franchise, education, housing, and any legislation which is designed to restrict Indian rights or even the rights of a section of Indians, all Indians unite in what may be called the Indian cause. They unite on principle. That does not mean they unite completely on method and approach. The point I want to make here is that the Indian community, like every other community, has reacted to class struggle, and that this struggle is now superimposed upon the racial struggle. We find that racial attitudes are changing, and I have no doubt that just as the conflicts of the past, originating in religious enmities, gave place to racial antipathies, so racial antipathies will gradually give place to class struggles. Actually to understand this change we have to recognize that the emphasis is changing in the race conflict from the word "race" to the word "conflict". The disturbance of to-day is not so much race as it is conflict, and the struggle of Indians as a body is a struggle of the dispossessed against the entrenched powers; the "have-nots" in citizenship against the "haves". On the other hand, the interests of the Indian as a worker coincide with the struggle of the European and the African as a worker,

the "have-nots" against the "haves". Now, in the political sense, all Indians are united as a group of "have-nots". They "have not" the franchise; they "have not" citizenship; they "have not" political freedom. So they unite against the European, and they are all inclined to unite with the rest of the political "have-nots" in their community—the Non-Europeans—with, of course, some dissentients. Where there is some difference of opinion regarding what is popularly known as a United Non-European Front, it is due not to any desire that other Non-Europeans should be denied citizenship rights, but rather upon the methods by which those rights are to be achieved. We can pursue this matter a little further, because I think in it we shall discover the secret of our conflict. We have seen that the Indian worker is inclined to join with other workers wherever opportunity offers for special purposes of improving his economic situation. We have seen, too, that other workers, even Europeans, are beginning to recognize that it is not his opposite number of a different race who is the enemy. We have seen, too, that Indians are beginning to recognize the need for joining with others who are dispossessed of the vote or citizenship. Between these groups the barriers of race are not what they used to be, they are disappearing—very slowly I agree, so slowly indeed, that their progress can scarcely be measured. But if I read the signs aright, I would say that despite the turmoil of the racial antagonisms that surround us there is a change going on. And the change is this. People are beginning to see very faintly that their discontent is not racial at all, just as they finally saw in the early days that the discontent was not religious. Let me put it this way. As you know, in Durban and Natal there have been fierce struggles about Indian penetration and the like, and the hatred of all manner of good people has been aroused against the Indian. People whose interests are scarcely touched by Indians have been made to feel that the Indian

is a menace. Now the more you study this problem the more you will be convinced that it is not so much a problem of Indian housing as a problem of European housing. The discontent resulting among good Europeans arising from the dearth of houses might naturally be directed at the Government. Actually the discontent is redirected against the Indian. Wherever a dispossessed community exists there will always be powerful interests to divert discontents from the channels of real responsibility to channels where they can do no harm. That is a fact that has been supported by all our studies of racial problems. I make bold to say that, were poor Europeans in Durban provided with houses, they would not join in the clamour against the Indians; for these same Europeans, many of them workers, are inclined in other directions to unite with Non-Europeans, including Indians. On the one point they are antagonistic to Indians; on the other they are moving towards understanding and co-operation. They may, of course, say that their opposition is not directed against the Indian worker, but against the rich Indian, but that only proves the point I made before that superimposed on the race struggle is the class struggle, and the class struggle occurs within races as well as outside them. Some signs of approach are discernible between the workers of different races as a result of common interests. So far practically no signs of this approach are to be seen between the commercial sections of Europeans and Indians, though their interests are identical. The Trade Unions are gradually, very gradually, broadening their base; the Chambers of Commerce and Industry are not. I do not know how to sum up these tendencies. If I might venture an opinion, it would be to emphasize the one I have already made. Racial antagonisms are the secondary products of a more fundamental disease of society. Wherever a community or a group is discriminated against or believes that it is discriminated against, social conflict will be the result.

The group may be a mixed racial group, a body of workers, or it may be a single racial group—the results are the same: there will be hatred and discontent. If you can abolish unemployment you eliminate not only the causes of discontent within a homogeneous society, you also eliminate racial hatreds in a heterogeneous group. If you can provide Europeans in South Africa with social contentment, employment, and good government they will be less ready to direct their discontent to attacks upon other races. If fear, unemployment, and the like, grips, say, the European, it is inevitable that they will vent their discontent upon Non-Europeans. Racism rises to its heights in depressions or at prospects of depression, the dispossessed race becoming the scapegoat. Indian racial attitudes do not then differ from race attitudes of others. It is an attitude of a dispossessed race on reaction to the imposition placed upon it by Europeans who themselves feel the insecurity of life and act inevitably in the way possible. The Indian schoolboy sees opportunities closed to him; he reacts in bitterness and frustration and turns, as a young man, to those bodies who reflect his bitterness at inequalities. The Indian worker sees a stop put to his potential skills and reacts in the same way. The whole Indian

community has watched the gradual intrusions upon their once possessed liberties, and they react. The remedy of this matter is not merely education of all society. We have enough education to-day to recognize that, whereas education can do much in enlightening the whole of our society, there is enough which can be done to-day in legislative enactments to bring about those conditions which would alleviate our present distress. Anything which creates better social conditions all round, anything which gives more meaning to democracy, anything which provides opportunities for employment, anything, in fact, which "makes democracy work" is bound to erase racial antipathies. That is the solution of our problem. There is no middle way to it. European hatred of Indians and Indian hatred of Europeans exist mainly as a result of the fact that democracy is not allowed to work; it is given no chance to work. So long as Indian and other Non-Europeans are retained within the nation but are not of the nation, so long will there be this canker of racialism. It is the inevitable product of the imposed servitude and it springs not originally from the Non-European but from the European who by withholding citizenship from those who can aspire to it is injuring his own self-respect.

THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING SOUTH AFRICAN

Edgar H. Brookes

THE purpose of this symposium, if I understand it aright, is to survey the attitudes of the various racial groups in South Africa toward one another. I propose to confine my own contribution to an attempt to analyse the sentiments on these matters of my own group—that of the English-speaking South African.

It is frequently believed, especially by people who do not know South Africa intimately, that the English-speaking

South African is more liberal in his racial attitudes than the Afrikaans-speaking South African—at any rate in his attitude towards the Non-European groups. Such a view lends itself to derision as one recalls an F. S. Malan or a J. H. Hofmeyr fighting a losing battle for the Cape franchise against the serried ranks of "loyal little Natal" and the descendants of the 1820 Settlers. But it has this much truth in it—that, if we use the term

"liberal" to express opposition to the extremer theories of segregation and the colour-bar, an English-speaking South African has to apologize to his tradition if he is illiberal and an Afrikaans-speaking South African if he is liberal. It requires as much moral courage for a Bishop to speak in favour of segregation as for a Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Church to speak against it. However, as a majority of the English-speaking public and a minority of the Afrikaans-speaking public are prepared to flout their respective traditions, the position in practice is that you cannot calculate in advance a white South African's attitude towards the Non-European races on the basis of his own racial origins. To this indeed may be added the fact that there is a growing number of South Africans who evade classification. One to whom I was speaking a few weeks ago was descended on the one side from a former President of the Free State, and on the other from the 1820 Settlers. I could not classify him: his views seemed to me to be an admirable blend of the best in both traditions.

The most articulate exponents of the ideals of the English-speaking group as a group appear to be the English-speaking Churches. Politically there is no party which can claim to articulate the views of English-speaking South Africa as a whole. The Dominion Party, whatever its merits, only speaks for a relatively small fraction. The Labour Party claims to ignore racial affiliations in favour of economic ones. In the United Party undue stress on either white race is deprecated. But in the English-speaking Churches, a large proportion of whose clergy still come from England, it is still possible to trace a specifically English point of view. Undoubtedly on questions affecting the Bantu, and, to a lesser extent, the Coloured, these Churches have taken up on the whole a consistently courageous and liberal attitude and form the backbone of purely liberal (as against leftist) opposition to reactionary colour prejudice in South Africa. They are responsible for most of the institutions for Bantu and

Coloured higher education in the country. They are the mainstay of the Christian Council of South Africa. In their Synods and Assemblies, the voice of liberal opinion is more clearly articulated than from any other forum in the country.

They, too, have taken the lead in the crusade against anti-Semitism, and have supplied such active non-Jewish membership as there has been in the Societies of Jews and Christians in various parts of the country. The active stand against Jewish disabilities has come mainly from those motivated by Christian principles in the English-speaking community. A similar phenomenon is to be found in Europe, where the Church and the Synagogue have formed a united front against forces that are hostile to all religion.

It is probably this Church influence which explains why the high schools represent the finest and best educational achievement of English-speaking South Africa. Many of these distinguished centres of learning are under direct Church control: others are influenced by Church tradition. The best in the English tradition is to be found there enlisted in the service of South Africa. In one respect, indeed, the high schools are better than the Churches, for they have made at least a beginning, of however limited a character, in Afrikaans-medium instruction, while Afrikaans-medium services, except for certain Coloured congregations, are almost unknown in the Churches under discussion. Indeed, the general attitude of these Churches towards the Afrikaans language and the Afrikaner traditions and aspirations leaves much to be desired in comparison with the attitude towards the Bantu. There is indeed little active hostility, but much indifference and insensitiveness. The sense of justice is clouded by a certain inertia, if not actual mental laziness and spiritual short-sightedness. The result is to discount, in the eyes of many Afrikaners, the sentiments of the English-speaking Churches towards the Bantu. On the other hand, the Churches are far ahead of the attitude of the English-speaking masses in areas

such as Durban, where ignorance and provincialism produce an unpleasant contempt for the Afrikaner and his language and a superiority complex that is almost ludicrously void of any basis of fact.

The English-medium high schools thus form in many ways the brightest spot in our analysis of the English-speaking community. The position of the universities is more complex. Most English-medium university institutions contain an appreciable minority of Afrikaans-speaking students, a considerable proportion of whom hold strong Nationalist views. Why such Nationalist students should deliberately go to an English-medium institution and fight its traditions remains something of a mystery; but they do. There is, of course, a very strong case for a university to develop as an inclusive institution in which every race and every shade of political thought should be represented, and from that point of view it may be argued that there is no justification for the existence of English-medium Universities as such.

Among the English-speaking university students there are, in general, four attitudes towards politics—liberalism, pure and simple; "leftism"; a kind of muddled "appeasement"; and indifference. The fourth is probably the most numerously supported and may well be the most dangerous of these attitudes. When one comes to discuss "leftism"—i.e. radical economic thought, whether socialist or communist—one treads on very delicate ground. There is, however, much reason to think that its victories have been won against liberalism in our universities, leaving the forces of reaction intact and the forces of racial good-will divided. Moreover, there is something artificial about it, so far as the English-speaking student is concerned. He very rarely develops it in his high school stage and in nine cases out of ten drops it within a few years of leaving university, yet in the universities themselves it is a very vocal philosophy of life, and tends to compete with reactionary nationalism for the allegiance of all who prefer politics to rugby.

The English-medium primary schools represent the least successful and least significant articulation of the English attitude towards race relations, although some of them are doing good work in the conscious combating of intolerance. In some ways, however, particularly in the maintenance of the language and in building up certain primary attitudes through the teaching of subjects such as history, their importance can hardly be overestimated. Their teaching staffs are prepared for their work mainly in the training colleges rather than the universities, and it is probable that we have paid far too little attention to the English-medium training colleges. Significant work has been done in them, perhaps particularly at Grahamstown where the training college is the only one in the Union under Church control, but they would repay far more interest and attention on the part of those of us who are concerned with race attitudes.

We may now proceed to analyse the general attitude of our English-speaking group to the other racial groups in South Africa. Towards the Afrikaans-speaking group the general attitude is not yet satisfactory. The worst of us are contemptuous, hostile, or "defeatist"; the best of us have hardly arrived yet at an attitude of complete equality. Frequently there is satisfaction in making gestures of good-will—which are indeed commendable as far as they go, but which are not adequate substitutes for the complete acceptance of the Afrikaner as a comrade on equal terms and his language as a language really and in practice entitled to equal treatment with English and to our sincere affection. There are faults on both sides, and there is no point in putting the whole blame on my own group; but it has failed in thoroughness and sincerity. We use the term "racialism" pretty freely to describe certain undesirable attitudes on the Afrikaans-speaking side, forgetting not only that we have in Colonel Blimp and Mrs. Blimp and family our own blatant racialists, but also that the cold sins of passivity, indifference, or superior-

ity may themselves constitute a most formidable racial barrier. In the vivid picture of the Last Judgement, in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, it is the sins of omission which are indicated; the more picturesque sinners escape mention.

As regards the Non-Europeans, the English-speaking attitude may be described as really and increasingly favourable towards the Bantu, towards the Coloured less favourable, towards the Indians least favourable. The friends of the Indians are few indeed. This is regrettable from many points of view—regrettable because the Indians are in fact an attractive people; regrettable because our antipathy to them indicates how much of our racial liberalism is emotional and sentimental and how poor the foundations of reason and principle; regrettable, finally, because the Indians are concentrated in an overwhelmingly English-speaking area and form therefore the acid test of English South African liberalism. It remains, it must remain, a mystery that an attitude of emotional enthusiasm for the Empire can be so easily combined with an attitude of race hatred towards the people who form three-fourths of King George's subjects and the country whose problems form the most vulnerable part of the Empire's life.

Our relatively tepid attitude towards the Coloured people probably arises from the fact that they are not picturesque enough for our liking, although writers like Dr. I. D. du Plessis have shown us that such an attitude comes from a lack in us rather than in them. Still there is a certain glamour for many people about tribalism, leopard skins, feathered head-dresses, assegais, shields, and (so to speak) the last enchantments of Rider Haggard, that the Coloured people do not supply. Whatever the reason, the attitude of the English-speaking European group towards this community does not seem to have improved markedly during recent years.

Far other is the case with the Bantu. Here there has been a decided improve-

ment in attitude on the part not of all the English-speaking group, but of more than a small professional class. Public opinion has changed for the better. There is a real and keen interest in Bantu social welfare, including health services and housing, and a healthy public opinion especially as regards municipal activities. A surprising amount of support has been forthcoming for wage increases, even from the persons who have to pay them. Provision is increasingly being made by large firms for recreational and other amenities for their employees. Even education is receiving great and growing support. A reasonable case put forward on behalf of the Bantu will always command an attentive, and generally a sympathetic, hearing. This change of heart, however, has not gone so far as to win approval for any fundamental change in the political structure of South Africa, such as a wide extension of the franchise.

On the matter of anti-Semitism a word should be said as to the deterioration of the English South African attitude. There are, it is true, more active, interested, and courageous supporters of the Jewish cause than there used to be, and there is a growing intelligent interest in Zionism which is a new thing in so far as non-Jews are concerned. But Hitler and the Ossewa-Brandwag have succeeded up to a point. The blatant anti-Semitism that afflicts a small portion of our Afrikaans-speaking community under the pressure of persistent propaganda has made no appeal to the English-speaking community, which prefers its prejudices to be articulated in a more gentlemanly form. Those prejudices, however, exist. They are wide-spread and very insidious, held by many people who would otherwise like to describe themselves as "liberals". They express themselves most painfully in social ostracism, and most dangerously in continual comments of the whispering type about the preponderance of the Jews in the professions, their alleged "black-marketing", their dangerous gifts of economic competition, and the like. This process is "softening up" our citadel from

within, and, if ever an anti-Semitic Government took office in South Africa, would, from the word "Go", impede effective opposition to its plans. I fear that we must regard those who hold such views as a kind of "fifth column", for anti-Semitism is the acid test of liberalism in these days.

It is indeed difficult to keep an all-round, all-inclusive attitude of goodwill in our complex and divided country. There are men infected with anti-Semitism whose attitude on the Colour question is admirable. And even if we simplify the issue to the terms with which Professor Macmillan has familiarized us—Bantu, Boer and Briton—we find a number of people who cannot, or will not, accept all three sides of our national triangle, which indeed forms a kind of *pons asinorum* of statesmanship. There are those, often in the Churches, who in their heart of hearts still support the early nineteenth-century "philanthropic" attitude, of Briton and Bantu *versus* Boer, and too often politicians with the appeasement mentality who stand for Briton and Boer *versus* Bantu. But no real peace or progress can come to South Africa so long as any one of our racial groups is left out of our national planning or our emotional enthusiasms. It is *all*, not some, who claim our love and service. Only muddle-headedness can really lead us to a different decision.

And muddle-headedness is one of our group sins. We even take a pride in it, and no doubt it is an amiable anfractuosity in situations where it does not really matter. The defects of the English-speaking South African group are not the same as those of the Afrikaans-speaking group, and we must beware lest we

"Compound for sins we are inclined to
By damning those we have no mind to".

We shall benefit most as a group by seeing our own group weaknesses and putting them right. High in the list comes a refined materialism (sometimes, perhaps, not so refined) which results in a lack of effective enthusiasms among our

English-speaking young people. Nationalism of the narrow kind may be a poor cause for which to make sacrifices. Still its supporters *do* make sacrifices for it. The tendency in our English-speaking group to gravitate to the better-paid posts in the professions and commerce, whether they are the posts in which we can render most service or not, is indicative of this attitude. So is the reluctance of men in established positions to descend into the world of politics. We as a group tend to cherish, politically speaking, "a fugitive and cloistered virtue" and to shrink from the arena "where that immortal garland is to be won, not without dust and heat". Many of our anti-Jewish and anti-Indian activities spring from nothing higher than a jealousy of the material success of these competitive groups. Of course, as always, we rationalize these feelings, for the self-respecting Englishman must never admit to basing his policy on immoral premises. With this materialism must be coupled indifference on public issues—a trait not without its appeal, but one terribly dangerous in a country like ours where the forces of reaction are active and militant. It would be a pity if liberalism were in the end to be defeated by mere sleepiness and complacency. The capacity for moral indignation seems to have weakened. Perhaps Hitler has satiated us with horror. I imagine that we find less often than we used to the appreciation of fidelity to principles. We have compromised so often that the moral issues are no longer black and white but two shades of grey, differing so slightly as not to be worth a real fight. "We have sat on the fence so long that the iron has entered into our soul."

These things and the muddle-headedness already referred to constitute our chief defects as a group—also a certain defeatism, which expresses itself in such ways as a dearth of candidates for the Public Service, on the far from sure ground that only Afrikaners can now attain high place in it, and most clearly and unfortunately in a shrinkage of the birth-rate. To bring sons and daughters

into the world is to be willing to sacrifice present comfort; it is also an act of faith in life, and that faith is too often lacking in our group.

Still, we have, as a group, many virtues and much to give. Surely one of our assets is that we are not afraid to analyse our faults and failures in public, and that we do not immediately adopt a defensive attitude when we are asked to analyse ourselves. Most racial groups in South Africa are perpetually on the defensive. When that changes, and a member of such a group can criticize it without being attacked as a traitor, it will have attained a maturity which the English-speaking group, with all its faults, has.

Perhaps the very division into groups which has been imposed upon us for the purposes of this symposium is not without dangers. We may have begged the main question. If, however, we must think in group terms, this we must say, and say it often and with conviction, if quietly—that the future of South Africa lies with the

moderate, conciliatory, and co-operative members of each group, with those who are reaching out towards a larger unity, and are willing to serve that larger unity already in faith. It is they who are doing and will do the real work of building South Africa, while others talk, agitate, and often take the front of the stage. Among the Bantu it is those who are willing to co-operate with Europeans who are really doing the constructive work. Certainly our own English-speaking group loses itself in a desert when it tries pathetically to maintain its untenable position as an imperial and ruling race, but when it loses itself it finds itself: when it gives itself on service to all South Africa it realizes the highest in its best tradition, and proves that in these new conditions and latter days the spirit of Alfred the Great and Edward the Confessor, of Shakespeare and Milton, of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, of Florence Nightingale and Josephine Butler, is not dead.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

D. G. S. M'TIMKULU is the headmaster of the Adams College High School in Natal.

DS. J. REYNEKE is a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, and a member of the Union Advisory Board on Native Education.

DR. E. T. DISTRICH, a medical practitioner, is President of the African People's Organization.

DR. E. H. BROOKES is President of the Institute of Race Relations, and a Native Representative in the Senate.

A. J. KAJEE was formerly President of the South African Indian Congress.