

## I. GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

The Institute understands that the government has appointed this Commission to enquire into all aspects of South African life as it affects the people classified as Coloured in order to give it a clearer picture of the situation as a whole. This will in turn enable the Government to decide on a broad general direction into which its policies may be steered in the future.

There appear to be two schools of thought in circles which support the policies of the present Government. One of these supports the idea of a homeland for the Coloured people similar to those being developed for the African people. Another school supports the idea of parallel development of the Coloured people in their own areas. The Institute wishes to place before the Commission some thoughts on these two policies which have emerged from its studies over the years and which it hopes will be of use to the Commission.

### Homeland Policy

We are aware that official policy has firmly repudiated the idea of a homeland being created for the Coloured people. We applaud this firmness and urge that it be maintained. Certain groups, however, remain convinced advocates of the idea. This advocacy is itself something that endangers White/Coloured relationships.

There are presently in existence a small number of reserves designated for the Coloured people. It has been estimated that only three per cent of the total Coloured population actually lives within them. They are small, scattered and isolated. In no sense could they constitute the nuclei of a homeland for the Coloured people.

It should be noted that the Coloured people are not in any realistic sociological sense a homogeneous 'group'; even less are they a 'nation'. Such group identity as may have recently emerged (and we doubt its extent) has been the result of largely extraneous forces, the most notable of which has been the simple fact of their being grouped together for statutory and administrative purposes.

The present geographical distribution of the Coloured people, in all four provinces, would have to be reversed if a homeland were contemplated. People from widely different parts of South Africa would have to be forced to leave their homes, places of work and settle in

a new and (to them) foreign locality. The injustice of such a policy and the hardship and bitterness that it would occasion do not require spelling out. A significant proportion of the Coloured population (perhaps as high as forty per cent) has been moved from residential and/or business localities to others in terms of the Group Areas Act. The implementation of this Act has been the biggest single source of bitterness among the Coloured people. A massive removal affecting the entire group would, we believe, lead to severe hardship and increase animosity.

It may be the case, of course, that proponents of the homelands policy in respect of Coloured people envisage the creation of two or three homelands, perhaps one on the Cape Flats, another in the northwestern Cape area, and another in the vicinity of Kimberley.

This would make no difference to the fundamental objection to the idea. Fragmented blocs jointly constituting a homeland, linked by some over-arching political authority, would be a farce. Whether the homeland be one or more units it is inconceivable that it could attain anything remotely approaching economic viability. The migrant labour system and all its catastrophic social consequences would be greatly extended among the Coloured people because most of them would still require, and be required, to work in the common areas.

Independence or even an advanced degree of political evolution in such circumstances would be meaningless.

A special case could possibly be argued for a homeland for the Griqua community in and around Kokstad. The Commission is referred to the notes on the Kokstad and Umzimkulu communities which are appended.

What is certainly clear from the statements of leaders of these communities as well as from the experience of the recent attempt to transplant persons from the Transkei to Cape Town to work on the Railways and Harbours, is that they do not under any circumstances wish to move from that area. Those moved to Cape Town had for the most part returned under their own power to their original homes within eighteen months and only a small percentage of younger and more adaptable people remained in Cape Town.

The Institute would favour open hearted discussions with this community to ascertain their wishes and then provision for them which would meet their present justifiable grievances and desperate sense of insecurity.

### Parallel Development

The policy of parallel development is the result of the present Government's attempt to exclude the Coloured vote from being a factor in White electoral politics. This point must be kept in mind lest one is tempted to think that parallel development is a well formulated and clearly envisaged political alternative to an existing situation.

In general what appears to be meant by parallel development is the duplication of organisations and institutions.

What does the principle of organisational and institutional duplication imply? Fundamentally that within the same geographical area - a province; a region; a city or a town; White and Coloured will have similar organisations, for each group, directed towards common functions. For example, the function of local government in a town or city will be the "joint responsibility" of a Coloured and a White municipality. Thus, duplicate Coloured and White organisations on all levels and areas of activity will then work out problems of common concern through a process of "progressively more representative contact and negotiation". At the highest level of political representation, the White electorate negotiate by means of the South African parliament with the Coloured - through the Coloured Representative Council.

The above political philosophy is confounded by the simple irony that if complete organisational and institutional duplication were a fact in South Africa, the necessity of using it as a principle for political dispensation for the Coloured people would not arise. For in such a case, the Coloured population would have its own effective parliament; its own industries; state departments; geographical areas over which it has complete jurisdiction - in short, this population group would comprise an independent nation state. If, however, it is accepted that organisational and institutional duplication is at present not a fact, but should rather be seen as a goal towards which one should commit one's energies, then problems concerning the functional autonomy and viability of the duplicated organisations and institutions become crucial in their significance. Consider the possibility of functional autonomy (i.e. accountable only to its own representative bodies for implementing effective decisions), and viability (i.e. the ability of an organisation or institution to exist and develop over time) of the following random list of duplicate

organisations and institutions for Coloured and White persons:- hospitals, schools, universities, factories, businesses, hotels, law courts, police force, army, post office, transport, welfare organisations, municipal services such as sanitation, water and electricity, etc. Many of these organisations fall into the public sphere and are controlled by political administration in so far as taxes can be levied, funds allocated, and developmental goals can be set.

Politics in any society concerns the effective allocation of privilege and facilities in all the above and other organisations. This is done through bodies that can effectively enforce their decisions in these respects. A political dispensation which does not take this into account as a basis for policy makes a mockery of politics. That is why one has to ask of the C.R.C. or any other duplicate institution two basic questions:

- (a) when will such a body be completely autonomous in deciding on its own policy in regard to taxation, industries, hospitals, schools, army etc., and
- (b) even if they are autonomous what is the viability of existing or future organisations for the people who depend on them.

These two issues are intimately linked because a body can be autonomous without necessarily having the power to generate wealth or development. Internationally speaking, one then distinguishes between poor and wealthy nations. The inability successfully to integrate these two principles lies at the heart of any homeland-type policy in South Africa.

If no reasonable or even plausible assurances can be given on these two issues concerning the Coloured people then parallel development becomes a political subterfuge. The principle of organisational and institutional duplication then simply means: "We duplicate when we (Whites) don't want you (politically, socially and residentially) and we integrate where we need you (economically)".

It is against such a possibility that one has to decide on the sincerity and good intentions of those who demand of the Coloured people that they should 'uplift themselves'.

The Institute appends excerpts from the evidence it submitted to the Commission which dealt with:

- (a) The Separate Representation of Voters Act Validation and Amendment Bill and
  - (b) The Prohibition of Improper Political Interference Bill.
- These still express the Institute's approach to Government and Administration.

## II. Excerpts from Evidence on the Separate Representation of Voters Act Validation and Amendment Bill

The Institute is convinced that in any democratic state the conferment of the franchise can be determined only by the capability of the person to exercise that right. Such capability is in no way affected by the colour of his skin. The denial of the right of properly qualified persons (or its curtailment) simply on the ground of the colour of their skin is therefore undemocratic and unjustifiable. The Institute believes that this follows logically from the acceptance of the values and principles of Western democracy. The curtailment of rights is particularly unjustified in the case of the Cape Coloured people, who do not differ in tradition, language, culture or interest from Europeans who have full franchise rights. It considers that to place the Cape Coloured people on a separate voters roll and give them communal representation in the form suggested in the Bill would result in a serious deprivation of political rights based not on incapacity to exercise them but merely on grounds of colour.

The Institute submits that the proper function of a Member of Parliament is to represent, to the best of his ability, national rather than sectional interests and the consideration of policy should have as its primary objective the interests of the population as a whole. Such interests consist in the moral, political and economic development of the individual as a member of the state and these interests are not made less important by membership of any particular group.

The Institute considers that the difference of approach and action on the part of Members of Parliament should be concerned with matters of principle or opinion, cultural, moral, or economic and that the more such concern is submerged by subordination to sectional interests, whether of class or religion, of language or race, the less useful and effective for the common good Parliament will become. The circumstances that in the public life of this, as of many other countries, sectional interests play an active and disruptive part,

is no justification for extending the process by creating additional sectional representation. The course of wisdom and statemanship would be to strive for the subordination of sectional claims to the collective interests of the whole body politic and to legislate for the good of the people as a whole, rather than for the real or supposed interests of any particular group or groups. The Institute believes that the interests, present and future, of Whites as well as Non-Europeans demand this conception of government and policy.

In a multi-racial country, demarcation by racial groups is of all forms of particularism the least desirable, and indeed, the most dangerous, as likely to foster and intensify antagonisms of a kind which history has shown to be peculiarly harmful.

A legislature split up into sectional groups, more especially if they are based on racial differences, cannot represent a unified national interest, would have nothing to hold it together, and is therefore liable to give rise to a dictatorial and irresponsible executive. Representation by territorial constituencies on the other hand, tends to counteract any such development because a large variety of interests is present in every locality if widely enough demarcated. Representation should therefore always be on a territorial system, with local constituencies - and only in the most exceptional circumstances, and only as a supplementation of the territorial system, should there be any departure from this principle. The Institute maintains that no such exceptional circumstances exist in the case of the Cape Coloured.

The Institute is of the opinion that the Cape Coloured people **have** absorbed western ideas to the extent that they must be held to qualify for acceptance into the democratic state. They know no other language than Afrikaans, and, to a lesser extent, English. Their culture is that of the Whites of this country, as are their institutions. Hence the Institute is at a loss to conceive on what grounds, other than grounds of racial prejudice and pride (which are inconsistent with the acceptance by Europeans of christian democratic principles) the political segregation of the Cape Coloured people can be based. The Cape Coloured people have made undeniable progress educationally and economically and in the fields of religion, culture and democratic responsibility and by doing so have established their right to the maintenance and extension of the political position which they have enjoyed.

### Civilisation and Democracy

Civilisation means a moral and political order evolved for the common good and is such that each member of society has the opportunity for the fullest development of his capacities and personality. In a Christian country such civilisation will be informed and permeated by the principles of Christian living, namely, the brotherhood of man in its Christian interpretation, the value of the individual and his potentialities, and the equality of the value of each man's personality, however different his functions and capabilities in society may be.

Democracy involves the acceptance of the recognition of personal responsibility, the indispensability of discussion and consultation as a means of reaching decisions as opposed to the acceptance of the word of authority, the equality of educational, moral and economic opportunity to all, and the acceptance of the impartial application of law.

### Institute's General View on Political Representation

The Institute is convinced that the aim of statemanship in the Republic should be to find a basis for the development in all groups of a common attitude towards the ideals of western civilisation expressed in a common loyalty to the state and in a standard of public and private life consonant with these ideals. For this reason, the Institute believes that the goal of official policy should be the attainment in due course of common citizenship by individuals of all races.

While adopting common citizenship as the goal of racial policy the Institute recognises that this cannot be reached at once because of differences of conviction and because of the wide range of differences in adjustment to western civilization. It believes that any means which will take the Republic along the road to the goal of common citizenship should be supported and that any measure which takes the Republic in a different direction should be opposed.

The Institute considers that, in a rapidly changing society, no fixed or immutable pattern for the future of White and non-White relationships can be laid down but it does believe that the Republic must envisage greater participation of non-Whites at all levels of government.

The Institute's views concerning the Coloured political representation were outlined in Memorandum presented to the Commission of Enquiry into the Separate Representation of Voter's Act Validation and Amendment Bill. In essence, the Institute stated that in any democratic state the acquisition of the franchise can be determined only by the capability of a person to exercise that right, such capability being in no way affected by the colour of his skin. The Institute considered, that, in the case of the Coloured people, the possession of the franchise was both right and just, particularly as they do not differ in tradition, language, culture, or interest, from Europeans who have full franchise rights. In light of this and having regard to the effects of communal franchise elsewhere, the Institute recommended the maintenance of the common franchise in the Cape (as suggested in the Willcock's Commission of 1937) and its extension to the northern provinces and to Coloured women. Despite changes since then and the implementation of governmental policy, the Institute sees no reason to reconsider this recommendation. It cannot see how the Coloured people can come to full self-realisation and development except by full participation through the common franchise in the affairs of the country, at all levels - central, provincial and local.

Its ideal aim for South Africa would be a society in which members of a particular group, while holding to their cultural heritage, will have ceased to regard themselves primarily as members of a particular race and will have come to think of themselves as members of a single, South African, national community. A broad South Africanism of this nature does not imply the obliteration of all particular cultural characteristics. The aim for South Africa should be unity in and through difference - and a mutual cultural enrichment.

The Institute would prefer to see an accepted and gradual extension of the common franchise to all racial groups. As a realist body, it does, however, take into consideration the strength of prejudice and fear, as well as the thrusting demands of non-Whites for their own self-realisation within a unitary state. It also has regard for the strength and force of group loyalties, the existence of varying forms of segregation already obtaining, and the strong degree of group antagonism, though apparently quiescent at present, that has been built up. It does not, however, accept that such factors are insurmountable obstacles to the ultimate attainment of that greater South Africa which it envisages.



The Institute therefore adopts a flexible approach towards the Republic's racial political problems. While seeking a political franchise by which non-White rights will be no less than White rights, it is prepared to accept transitional enfranchisements, provided that non-White groups and the government are prepared to accept these as stages towards an ultimate and fully accepted South Africanism. It is in this spirit and having regard to the obstacles already mentioned, but without reducing its ultimate aim, that the Institute approaches the political future of South Africa.

### III. Excerpts from Evidence on the Prohibition of Improper Political Interference Bill

The Institute challenges the basic assumptions set out in the Preamble of the Bill. It does not agree that the development of every population group "independently within its own group" is the traditional way of South African life. Despite efforts made to segregate from 1652 onwards, there has been integration at many levels for over three hundred years. Of particular pertinence was the long established Cape tradition dating back to 1836, when Municipal Ordinance No. 9 of that year made provision for the election of Municipal Boards on the basis of a franchise which did not make distinctions on the grounds of colour. In 1846 the principle of representative institutions for the Cape was accepted with no discrimination against the Cape Coloured. The 1853 Constitution for the Cape gave rights to European and Non-European alike on the basis of a common franchise. In 1892 the Franchise and Ballot Act raised economic qualifications but did not institute any racial or colour bar. In the Institute's view, the traditional and accustomed way of South African life has been to have Coloured and Africans on White farms, to have them in White homes, in industry and in commerce, in police force and civil service, in our harbours and our airways, and on our railways. In truth, there can be little independent development within one's own group.

In these circumstances, the Institute fails to see how "mutual co-operation and assistance" will aid "independent development" when such co-operation and assistance involves mutual effort and integrated undertakings. Mutual aid and co-operation has been going on for 300 years and the result has not been "independent development". If it had been so then there would presumably, be no need for this Bill.

The Institute believes that the concept of Bantustans, inspired by the development of "mini-states" elsewhere, has created an optical illusion despite the realities of the South African situation. The Western powers granted independence to hitherto dependent and colonial peoples and since then have proceeded to give economic, technical and other assistance to what have become politically sovereign states. The Coloured and Indian people cannot become sovereign states and talk of "self realisation" is therefore misleading.

In what way are groups to assist and co-operate mutually? There are the English, Afrikaner, Coloured, African, Asiatic, Malay, Chinese groups. As the Institute understands it, the Bill effectively denies, or can deny, any of these groups or individuals, or associations of these groups, the right to assist each other in their day-to-day affairs because practically every aspect of South African life involves discussion of "political views".

Nor does the Institute accept the assumption that every population group regards "independent development", that is, the right to live and strive according to its "traditional way of life" as an "inalienable right". "Inalienable" rights have been historically regarded as belonging to persons, not to groups. Even assuming that "groups" have this "inalienable" right of living and striving according to what is described as their "traditional way of life", does this not imply that the population groups must have free and equal political expression? How can this be accorded the Cape Coloured, so fully culturally and economically integrated with the White group, if not through free and equal participation in the Parliament which governs them? Otherwise, the only right to live and strive is a subordinate right and, as such, it is not "inalienable". This is hardly a foundation for lasting peace and good order.

The Institute also finds it difficult to accept the assertions in the third paragraph of the Preamble. The Institute does not understand what is meant by leading the non-White groups to "self-realisation".

The Institute has always looked to the progressive acquisition by non-Whites of political and other rights as the best means of ensuring racial accommodation and peace in South Africa and as consonant with those principles of right and justice which are fundamental to western society. It has been fully aware of the difficulties that the implementation of the policy will involve but has held that there can be no real resolution of South Africa's problems unless it is based on right principles and on accepted ethical conduct. In its approach the Institute has accepted that all peoples have adopted the values pertaining to western democracy in various degrees, but it has always believed that the long permeation of all non-White groups with Christian and democratic beliefs and institutions, and increasing educational and economic advance, the progressive application of the concepts of democracy was the surest basis for the stability and progress of all in South Africa. It has advocated the development of South Africa's under-developed areas, the evolution of subordinate governmental powers to non-Whites were practical, but at the same time, it has held that all groups be represented in local government and in parliament where fundamental policies are decided.

The Institute has rejected as inconsistent with South Africa's traditional way of life and the accepted principles of White civilisation, the idea that human relations cannot be democratically adjusted. It does not believe that arbitrary action or ministerial fiat will produce that racial peace which all desire.

**Collection Number: AD1715**

**SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS (SAIRR), 1892-1974**

**PUBLISHER:**

*Collection Funder:- Atlantic Philanthropies Foundation*

*Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive*

*Location:- Johannesburg*

©2013

**LEGAL NOTICES:**

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.