

TIGERKLOOF INSTITUTION
(LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY)

From : PRINCIPAL

P.O. TIGERKLOOF,
Cape Province.

15 JUN 1953

Miss Horrell

Please let me have the address of the Secretary for the Johannesburg branch of the United Nations Organisation. We want to obtain some pamphlets and film strips for use here if possible.

Thank you

Anthony D Lewis

11-6-53.

File

~~SECRET~~

4/15/53

15/7/11

15th April, 1953.

Dr. Ellen Hellmann,
12, Bompas Road,
Dunkeld,
JOHANNESBURG.

Dear Ellen,

Herewith my letter to the Director-General of U.N.E.S.C.O.
and a copy of "Race and Society" by Kenneth Little. I should be
glad to have your comments.

Yours sincerely,

Quintin Whyte
DIRECTOR

QW/NB

File

A/B/5/1.

2nd April, 1953.

The Director-General,
U. N. E. S. C. O.,
19, Avenue Kleber,
PARIS 16, France.

Dear Sir,

I have just received your recent publication entitled :
"Race and Society" by Kenneth L. Little, and feel that I must
write in certain criticisms of the section dealing with South
Africa.

The general heading of the series in which this
booklet appears is "The Race Question in Modern Science", and the
implication is that the contents of the series will be scientific,
i.e. objective and accurate in fact, whatever the individual inter-
pretation of that fact may be. I am sure you will agree that it
is incumbent upon U.N.E.S.C.O. to be accurate, to check and re-check
its figures and facts and to attempt to be impartial and judicial
in its summing up if it is to maintain respect and authority for
itself and its works.

I realise that any attempt to digest the racial
situation in South Africa in eight pages is to attempt a considerable
feat, but the feat should not be attempted if there is not a greater
expectation of success than this booklet reveals. The task of
those working for greater racial harmony in South Africa is not made
any easier by inaccurate presentation made with all the world
authority and backing of U.N.E.S.C.O.

A. May I make the following points :

a). I note that on page 20 , line 10 to line 20 is a
direct quotation from page 109 of the Handbook and is
not acknowledged. I have not had time to check the
article fully against the Handbook. Hellmann is
spelt with 2 "n's", Afrikaner with two not three "a's",
and the Act is the Wage Act, not Wages Act.

b). Compression

b). Compression has given rise to implication of doubtful validity in a number of places, but it would require much more time than I have to go into these in detail.

B. In the Chapter on Labour in the Handbook which Mr. Little has obviously used, the following statement is made, "Neither the Industrial Conciliation Act nor the Wage Act permits differential rates to be laid down on the grounds of race. Consequently, where Non-Europeans, in practice principally the Cape Coloured, are employed as artisans, they are subject to the same statutory minimum rates as Europeans". Figures given in this paragraph indicate that the position may have changed with regard to relative positions of African and Cape Coloured since the Handbook was published in 1949 : I refer to the remark about Cape Coloured in the quotation given here.

e). On page 20, the writer states that "Recent legislation enacted under the present Government's policy of 'apartheid' decrees that Non-Europeans are to be residentially segregated from Europeans and separate areas are also to be provided for the various Non-European groups." The Group Areas Act has indeed been passed for this purpose, but the implication is that it is only now that legislative or other action has been taken to ensure this in the future. South Africa has had a pattern of such segregation over many years. The Act, which one condemns, seeks to disentangle existing mixed areas and ensure a complete residential segregation for the future. But to attribute this policy to recent enactments only, is misleading.

d). On page 21, it is stated that "a number of Universities" open their doors to Non-Europeans and that a separate University has been established for Non-Europeans in Durban, Cape Town and Witwatersrand Universities open their doors equally to Europeans and Non-Europeans. Natal University has a system of parallel classes with the same professors and lecturers for each section. Natal also has Wentworth College, a medical school intended for the training of Non-European doctors, and Fort Hare is the Non-European University College which is affiliated to Rhodes University. The University of South Africa examines for external degrees for which individuals of any race may work.

e). On the same page, it is stated that, generally, all public buildings and shops have tradesmen's entrances to be used by Non-Europeans. This is untrue. Europeans and Non-Europeans enter by the same entrance and are served at the same counters.

f). In Cape Town, the bus service for Cape Town and greater Cape Town is used by all racial groups without discrimination

as to seating. Apartheid has been introduced in the local train services.

- g). Non-European policemen patrol European areas, but do not arrest Europeans.
 - h). On page 22, it should be noted that Cape Africans were put on a communal franchise in 1936 and Africans in other Provinces given representation in the Senate.
 - i). The Cape Coloured voters are not yet on a communal franchise in the Cape, a recent Appeal Court decision having held that the legislation enacting this is ultra vires the South Africa Act. Cape Coloured voters continue on the common roll for this coming election. The rest of this paragraph is not accurate :
- C. The present position is :
- i. In the Lower House - 3 European representatives of Africans elected by individual vote by Africans in the Cape. No Indian representation. No special Cape Coloured representation.
 - ii. In the Upper House - 4 Senators representing Africans of the 4 provinces elected by a system of electoral colleges. 4 Senators nominated for their special knowledge of Non-European interests. No elected Indian representation. No elected special Coloured representation.
- j). The present Government has practically trebled the vote for Native education in its 4½ year period of office. The principle of compulsory education for Cape Coloured has been accepted in the Cape where most of them live, and is being implemented.
 - k). The irrational approach to questions of colour may be particularly Afrikaner, but, in Natal, it is particularly English-speaking in relation to the Indian population there.

As I have said, the publication of inaccurate information, particularly when there is a possibility of checking it, or having it vetted by those in a position to know, does not help those who work in a difficult field and who have looked to U.N.E.S.C.O. for an objective and scientific approach. While one may agree with many of Mr. Little's observations, I feel that the whole article is vitiated and reads more as a propaganda pamphlet than as a scientific treatise.

U.N.E.S.C.O. receives the publications of this Institute.
I suggested that your Department officials might consult them, - e.g.
our annual "Survey of Race Relations" for the past four years.

Yours faithfully,
THE S.A. INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS (INC.)

QW/RBW.

Quintin Whyte.
Director.

Copy to the Department of Mass Communication - for information.

W.H.

30 MAR 1953

THE RACE QUESTION IN MODERN SCIENCE

RACE AND SOCIETY

by

KENNETH L. LITTLE



In the same collection:

- Race and Culture,*
by Michel LEIRIS.
- Race and Psychology,*
by Otto KLINEBERG.
- Race and Biology,*
by Leslie C. DUNN.
- Racial Myths,*
by Juan COMAS.
- The Roots of Prejudice,*
by Arnold M. ROSE.
- Race and History,*
by Claude LÉVI-STRAUSS.
- The Significance of Racial Differences,*
by Geoffrey M. MORANT.

Price per volume \$.25; 1/6; 75 fr.

Price: \$.25; 1/6; 75 fr.

THE RACE QUESTION IN MODERN SCIENCE

RACE
AND
SOCIETY

by

KENNETH L. LITTLE

*Department of Social Anthropology
University of Edinburgh*

UNESCO PARIS

*First published in 1952 by the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
19, avenue Kléber, Paris-16^e*

*Second Impression, February 1953
Printed by Imprimerie Georges Thone,
Liège (Belgium)*

Copyright 1952 by Unesco, Paris

Printed in Belgium

SS.52.II.8aA.

C O N T E N T S

Introduction	5
The South African case	16
The Brazilian and Hawaiian cases	24
The British case	34
Conclusion	50

In any discussion of race and society, it is essential to have a clear understanding of the terms employed. It is history rather than race which is the main factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural attainments of the world's population. The fact that such differences exist is not sufficient reason for believing that there are underlying disparities in innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development.

Why, then, if "racial superiority" is only a myth and lacks any real substance, does "race" play such a large part in the affairs of modern life? In many parts of the world racial differences are the basis for discriminatory legislation and social practices which signify a flat denial of the scientific view. Moreover, many people—for instance both in the southern part of the United States and in the Union of South Africa—continue to argue that the Negro is biologically inferior to the white man. Many white Southerners claim that he is quite a different being, and many South Africans that he is unfit to live as a member of a white civilization. Australia prohibits the immigration of coloured races, and in a number of other countries black and white are separated, either by law or by custom. Can it be simply that the various fallacies of race are not yet known and understood by the governments and peoples concerned?

The plain answer, of course, is that superstitious and ill-informed thinking is not the primary cause of racial prejudice and of the innumerable laws and customs which govern relations between races. Harmony between persons of different racial origin does not depend upon their being properly informed about the latest findings of modern anthropology! If racial amity did so depend, it would be necessary to explain why racial differences are tolerated in one country and not in another; why they are virtually ignored in, say, Brazil or Hawaii, and why so much attention is paid to them in, say, South Africa or the United States. Brazil has far fewer schools per head of the population than white South Africa, and until the present century many Hawaiians were illiterate.

The fact is that race itself, in the biological sense, is irrelevant to racial attitudes and thinking. No doubt, there are many people with a deep and unreasoning repugnance to an individual of different colour who cannot bear the thought of any kind of physical contact with him. But this does not mean that they were born with such feelings or that such feelings are instinctive. The more likely explanation is that inhibitions of this kind are acquired, for the most part unconsciously, during early childhood. Children tend to take on the attitudes of those in charge of them at home and in school, and they learn to react emotionally in the same way as those about them. If their parents and friends strongly hold certain beliefs that the members of a particular racial group are unclean, unhealthy, etc., it is not surprising that, growing up in that environment, they come to have the same sort of feeling about that racial group as they do about dirt and disease. In any case, what is much more convincing than any psychological explanation is the fact that although such racial aversions are very common in some places, notably the southern United States and South Africa, they are almost unknown in certain other countries. If feelings of repugnance were innate, it would obviously be very difficult to explain how millions of men and women manage to work and to mix together without the slightest difficulty on this score. It would be even harder to account for the fact that miscegenation frequently goes on even in the face of severe penalties against it. The truth is that people can get along together without attributing peculiar qualities to each other, despite wide differences in complexion and variability in the shape and size of noses and heads.

The last point should help us to realize that it is not the existence of racial differences *per se* which gives rise to the problem of racial relations, but the fact that such differences are singled out by the members of a given society. What is important, therefore, is not whether groups of individuals *do*, or *do not*, differ in actual biological terms, but the fact that they conceive themselves as racially different. As it happens, there are national and cultural groups in all parts of the world which are not proper races in the anthropological meaning of the term. This does not prevent their members regarding themselves and other similar groups as races. Without this consciousness of group differences, race relations in the strict sense of the word cannot be said to exist, *however* biologically mixed the given society may be. Race

relations depend fundamentally upon the recognition and treatment of individuals as the representatives of a given biological, or supposed biological, group; and in the absence of that kind of recognition a relationship between persons of different race is no different from any other kind of relationship occurring in human society.

The problem of race and society is psychologically complicated. Racial attitudes and feelings do not exist *in vacuo*. As they are not biological in origin, they can only be social. This means that they must be the product not only of existing circumstances, but of the kind of contact which the groups concerned have had with each other in the past. This latter point is important because of the varying extent, as between one society and another, to which racial consciousness is fostered. In some countries the fact that people differ from each other in racial appearance passes unnoticed; in others it is a matter of constant attention. In some cases, it gives rise to special laws against inter-marriage; in others it has no social consequences. What is the explanation of this paradox—has culture anything to do with the matter? Can it be that conflict in race relations occurs because the groups concerned have different ways of life? There are many people, indeed, who assert that this is the main factor and that there will always be friction so long as racial differences are linked with differences in language and custom among the members of the same society. But the fact is that there are instances of groups with dissimilar cultures getting along amicably with each other, just as there are examples of hostility between races with similar cultures. And there are examples of racial groups with similar cultures living together in amity, just as there are instances of friction between races with dissimilar cultures. A few illustrations will clarify this point.

Jamaica, in the British West Indies, contains a population which is racially mixed in terms of whites, coloured (i.e. people of mixed blood), and blacks, but has a common religion and language, and is governed by a single system of laws. The wealthier and more prominent people are mainly white or near-white; there is a middle class composed mainly of coloured; the labouring and peasant section is mostly black. A great deal of attention is paid to gradations in colour and it is a considerable social and economic asset for an individual to be light in skin. This is because colour differences are largely linked with class differences. But there is no discrimination on grounds of race (as distinct from colour), and

race is no bar to any official position on the island. The children attend the same schools, and at any important social gathering there will be persons of black as well as white complexion.

As in Jamaica, whites and Negroes in the southern United States also have the same general habits and customs, speak the same language, and have the same general outlook on life, but there a rigid separation of the races exists in nearly every sphere. Negroes have separate schools, churches, recreational centres, etc., and are not allowed to mix publicly with white people in any form of social activity.¹ Segregation is upheld partly by law and partly by strong social mores on the side of the whites. It is strictly enforced by legal means, by intimidation or even by physical force. Violent action, such as dynamiting a house, may be taken against Negroes who infringe the code of racial etiquette by trying to improve the subordinate status assigned to them.

These are examples of racially dissimilar groups with similar cultures. In South Africa, the groups concerned are culturally as well as racially and ethnically dissimilar. There are the Europeans, who speak English or Afrikaans and are Christians; the Cape Coloured (people of mixed blood), who speak pidgin-English or Afrikaans and are Christians; the Indians, who speak mainly Hindustani and are Hindus or Moslems; and the native Africans, who speak mainly Bantu languages and follow mainly tribal customs and religions. As will be explained below in more detail, these various groups are socially segregated from each other, and the non-European sections of the population are kept completely subordinate. There is considerable friction and hostility between Europeans and non-Europeans in areas where they meet. In contrast, again, is New Zealand, which also has a racially and culturally mixed population. The majority are people of European descent, mostly British. They are known locally as Pakehas. The minority consists of Maoris, a people of Polynesian descent. The larger part of the Maori population still follows tribal customs, but there is no discrimination. Maoris have full equality under the laws of the Dominion and share the benefits of a social security act in common and equally with white New Zealanders. They are also eligible for, and sit, as members

¹ Within recent years, as the result of decisions of the United States Supreme Court requiring the Southern States to provide equal facilities in higher and professional education for Negroes and whites, some Southern States universities have admitted a few Negro students.

of the House of Representatives. A certain amount of racial mixture goes on, mainly with Pakehas belonging to the lower economic class, and a number of Maoris have settled in the towns. White New Zealanders tend to look down on the latter group, but the more general attitude is tolerant of racial differences, and the average Pakeha takes pride in his Maori compatriots.

An alternative to examining racial attitudes in terms of their cultural context is to compare the *antecedents* of each case with those of others. For example, in the Southern states, it was the institution of plantation slavery which firmly ingrained the notion of Negro subordination in the minds of the white population. In South Africa, it was the social and religious exclusiveness of the early Boer farmers which was largely responsible for native Africans and other non-Europeans being regarded and treated as an "out-group". But history is not a conclusive factor. Jamaica also had the institution of Negro slavery, and most of the slaves worked on plantations under conditions similar to those in the Old South. Brazil provides another example. Yet, both in Jamaica and in Brazil, race relations took a very different, and more liberal, course than in the United States. Again, the complete subordination of the coloured races of South Africa, which followed their wars with the European settlers, lacks its counterpart in New Zealand. Wars were also fought there between settlers and the native population less than a hundred years ago, but they have resulted in racial parity, not subjugation.

Thus, at first sight it appears as if cultural and historical considerations throw very little light upon the problem. However, if we extend our review of culture and history beyond the area of western civilization in its modern form, we are confronted by a very significant fact. This is the virtual absence of racial relations, as we have defined the term, before the period of European overseas expansion and exploration. In no other civilization, either ancient or modern, do we find the kind of legal and customary recognition of group differences which characterizes the contact of European peoples with other races. In the Moslem world, for example, the important differences to-day, as in the past, are those of religion. Moslem people are traditionally "colour-blind", and Islam insists on the equality of believers, whatever their race or colour. According to Koranic law, all members of a conquered population who embrace Islam

become the equals of the conquerors in all respects. Racial considerations are also lacking in the Hindu caste system although some writers claim that it originated in racial diversity. They argue that classical Hindu society was divided into four original *varna*, or colours, and explain this as racial differentiation. However, the word *varna* has quite a different meaning from *caste*, and the basis of exclusion in the caste system is not racial. It is religious and ritual, and both excluders and excluded assent to it and play their part in enforcing it. This is unlike any modern form of racial relations regulated by law and by social pressure on the subordinated group.

In other older civilizations, such as those of Egypt and Greece, the relationship between races was that of captor and captive, or master and slave. There is little evidence of aversion or special prescription on the grounds of race or colour. The Egyptians, for example, spoke scornfully of the Negroes to the south of them, and Egyptian artists sometimes caricatured the Negro's thick lips and woolly hair. But the Egyptians looked upon other foreigners, including blue-eyed Libyans, with equal disdain. Like other earlier peoples, the Egyptians mixed freely with their captives, whatever their colour, and some of the Pharaohs showed in their features signs of their partially Negroid ancestry. The Greeks also knew Negroes as slaves, but most of the slave population of Greece were of the same race as their masters, and there was no occasion to associate any physical type with the slave status. In any case, the kind of distinction which the Greeks made between people was cultural, not racial. They looked down on all barbarians but, provided the barbarian took on Hellenistic characteristics, he does not seem to have been subjected to social exclusion on account of his physical appearance.¹ In Rome, too, the situation was similar. The slave population was drawn from North Africa, Asia Minor, and Western Europe, and it included Nubians and Ethiopians as well as Germans and Britons. Roman citizens thought poorly of the peoples they conquered and spoke disparagingly of them, and of non-Romans in general, irrespective of race. It was considered disgraceful for a Roman soldier to take a barbarian wife, but this was not from any objection to racial differences: it was because such a union disregarded the custom of marriage between citizens. Nevertheless, it is said

¹ Cf. Ina C. Brown. *Race Relations in a Democracy* (Harper) 1949.

that nine out of every ten free plebeians at the end of the first century A.D. had foreign blood, and citizenship was given to every free-born man in the empire early in the third century. This conception of common humanity was widened further by the teaching of the Stoics and, above all, by the spread of Christianity.

In the period following the downfall of Rome, the Catholic Church emerged as a powerful political as well as religious institution. The Church fostered the spiritual unity of Christendom, teaching that all who were Christians were the same kind of men. As time went on the Church was more and more conceived as an instrument of international order, the glory of God demanding that the whole world be brought under its sway. With this purpose in view wars were fought against Moslems and "pagans", the basis of antagonism being entirely religious. Jews were persecuted and Moslems enslaved because they were enemies of the faith, not because they were considered racially different from Christians. Nevertheless, Jews, Moslems, and pagans, in their unlikeness from Christian Europe, serve as forerunners of the modern concept of alien races. In other words, this period between the First Crusade and Columbus' discovery of America was characterized by the religious view of world order, and it established a pattern of dealing with non-Christian peoples which was to be continued—lacking only its religious motivation—to the present day. In the meantime, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese merchants were making their voyages of discovery and meeting new peoples and cultures. The Moors and heathens whom the Portuguese encountered down the African coast were inferior to them as fighters, but this led to no conclusions about racial superiority. Nor was there, as yet, any idea of perpetuating the servile status of black people captured in such raids and forays. On the contrary, their conversion to Christianity was sought with enthusiasm, and this transformation was supposed to make the Africans the human equals of all other Christians. In this way, many of the Africans taken by the Portuguese were assimilated in the general population and a number of them rose to important positions in the Portuguese State.

What changed this easy-going attitude to men of different race was the development of capitalism and the profit-motive as a characteristic feature of Western civilization. The new lands discovered in America provided ideal opportunities for economic exploitation and their native inhabitants were too weak to withstand the well-armed European settler-business-

man. Tobacco, indigo, rice, cotton, and sugar cane, which could be produced on a large scale and at a considerable profit, were grown for sale in Europe. The difficulty was to recruit the workers required. There was a lack of free labour, and so it became necessary to use slaves. Slavery in the Spanish colonies was at first limited to the aboriginal Indians, but long before the end of the colonial era a large part of the native population was wiped out by harsh treatment or by European diseases. Also, Indian slavery was severely criticized on religious grounds by the Jesuit and other missionaries, including the celebrated priest, Las Casas; and so it was decided to introduce Negroes from Africa. They made better workers and were less restive in captivity.

The first African Negroes were landed in the New World about 1510. As already mentioned, trade in African slaves, including Negroes, was not new in commerce; but before the middle of the fifteenth century it was limited to the Mediterranean. In West Africa, there was not the same excuse for war, but if Christian men had any misgivings, they were allayed by a bull of Pope Nicholas V which authorized the Portuguese "to attack, subject and reduce to perpetual slavery the Saracens, Pagans, and other enemies of Christ southward from Capes Bajador and Non, including all the coast of Guinea". The usual condition was attached: all captives must be converted to Christianity.

These elementary methods of securing slaves sufficed while the trade was local, but the rapid exploitation of fresh settlements in the West Indies and on the American mainland greatly stimulated the demand and brought a more elaborate system into being. All along the West African coast trading-stations sprang up, which were stocked by African purveyors, and at which slaves could be procured by barter. The Africans offered for sale were, or were supposed to be, war-captives, condemned criminals, or persons who had sold themselves into slavery. By this convenient rationalization, the Europeans were relieved of moral responsibility, and the supporters of the slave trade even took credit for saving their victims from death. However, the scale of the commerce was too large to escape public attention, and as time went on there was increasing knowledge of the harsh and inhuman conditions on the plantations as well as of the horrors of the Middle Passage. The slave owner and trader had to find some way of justifying themselves or run the risk of losing both property and business. At first, they argued on the grounds of the

economic necessity of slavery to national prosperity, and then, as the humanitarian attack was pressed, they offered the ingenious theory that Negroes were sub-human and incapable of moral feelings; hence there was no obligation to treat them like ordinary human beings.

Mr. Long, in his *History of Jamaica*, published in three volumes in 1774, wrote:

"We cannot pronounce them *unsusceptible of civilization since even apes* have been taught to eat, drink, repose and dress *like men*. But of all the human species hitherto discovered, their *natural baseness of mind* seems to afford the least hope of their being (except by miraculous interposition of Divine Providence) so refined as to think as well as act like *men*. I do not think that an Orang Outang husband would be any dishonour to an Hottentot female."

What this amounted to was a deliberate attempt to de-personalize a whole group of human beings—to reduce them to mere articles of commerce or economic "utilities". The extent to which it was successful may be illustrated by the case of the slave ship *Zong*, when one hundred and thirty slaves were thrown overboard on the plea of lack of water. The law took its course, but the trial was not for murder. It was to decide whether the trowning overboard of the slaves was a genuine act of jettison, for which the insurance company would have to pay, or a fraud on the policy.

However, what is significant about this earlier development of racial prejudice is the fact that efforts to impersonalize human relations in order to exploit men more effectively for economic purposes were not confined to the African slave. The capitalist-entrepreneur of the day was just as ready to use people of his own race in the same way. Indeed, part of the early demand for labour in the West Indies and on the mainland was filled by white servants, who were sometimes defined in exactly the same terms as those stereotyping the Negro. Plantation owners bid eagerly for supplies of convicts from the London prisons, and hundreds of children were kidnapped and shipped from Scotland. But the white servants were allowed to work off their bond, while the Negro was gradually pushed into chattel slavery. His servile status was established by substituting a racial reason for the previous religious one—by characterizing a whole race as degenerate, degraded, immoral, lacking in intelligence, etc. The religious argument proved insufficient when it came to be a question of continuing slavery for the convert.

This, then, as Dr. Oliver Cromwell Cox has pointed out, marks the beginning of modern race relations.

"It was not an abstract, natural, immemorial feeling of mutual antipathy between groups, but rather a practical exploitative relationship with its socio-attitudinal facilitation—at that time only nascent racial prejudice. Although this peculiar kind of exploitation was then in its incipiency, it had already achieved its significant characteristics. As it developed and took definite capitalistic form, we could follow the white man around the world and see him repeat the process among practically every people of colour."¹

Dr. Cox goes on to quote Earl Grey's description in 1880 of the motives and purposes of the British in South Africa.

"Throughout this part of the British Dominions the coloured people are generally looked upon by the whites as an inferior race, whose interest ought to be systematically disregarded when they come into competition with our own, and who ought to be governed mainly with a view to the advantage of the superior race. And for this advantage two things are considered to be especially necessary: firstly, that facilities should be afforded to the white colonists for obtaining possession of land heretofore occupied by the native tribes; and secondly, that the Kaffir population should be made to furnish as large and as cheap a supply of labour as possible."

Dr. Cox's thesis is that racial exploitation is merely one aspect of the problem of the proletarianization of labour, regardless of the colour of the labourer. Hence, racial antagonism is essentially political class conflict. The capitalist exploiter, being opportunistic and practical, will utilize any convenience to keep his labour and other resources freely exploitable. He will devise and employ race prejudice when that becomes convenient. The reason why race relations are "easier" in most countries colonized by the Latin nations, viz. Portugal and Spain, is partly because neither Spain nor Portugal ever attained the industrial development of northern Europe. They remained longer under the political and economic authority of the Church. Also, the capitalist spirit, the profit-making motive among the sixteenth-century Spaniards and Portuguese, was constantly inhibited by the universal aims and purpose of the Church. This tradition in favour of the old religious criterion of equality is in contrast to the objective, capitalistic attitude of Anglo-Saxon and Germanic

¹ Oliver C. Cox. *Caste, Class and Race* (Doubleday) 1948.

countries, such as Britain, the Netherlands, and the United States.¹ It might be compared in some respects, however, with the assimilative aims of French colonial policy—to absorb colonial and coloured subjects as part of a “greater France” on a common basis of culture and citizenship.

What this implies is a direct relationship between race and society—that race relations are, in effect, a function of a certain type of social and economic system. The best way to consider the matter further is to take a number of societies with varying attitudes towards race and colour. South Africa is a convenient example to start with because racial consciousness and feeling is probably more intense there than in any other part of the world and is most explicitly confessed as a code of official opinion. Brazil and Hawaii represent the opposite extreme, and Great Britain will be considered as intermediate in this respect. The British situation will be described at some length, because it is less well known to students of racial problems, and because it illustrates quite strikingly the somewhat paradoxical fact that both racial discrimination and racial toleration sometimes exist alongside each other in the same society.

¹ Ibid.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN CASE

The South African situation is the outcome of European colonization, which commenced when the Dutch made their initial settlement in 1652, in and near what is now Cape Town. When the British took over the colony in 1806, its population numbered some 76,000 souls, including 30,000 slaves from Madagascar, India and the East Indies; 20,000 native Hottentots; and about 26,000 whites. Factors of race and colour were not so important as were religious considerations. Thus, if a freed slave woman were baptized she frequently married a white man, and she and her children would become absorbed in the white community. Marriage between white and Hottentot, as distinct from co-habitation, was extremely rare. The marriage of Eva, a Hottentot woman, and van Mierhoff, a white explorer, celebrated at Government House, was an exception and will be quoted as such in all books referring to this period. As the colony expanded, a growing divergence of outlook and way of life developed between the town and country folk. The lack of racial consciousness, and hence prejudice, in the town was largely due to the freer and less conventional mode of life. The population was in a constant state of flux, the town acting chiefly as a port of call, and refreshment and provision station for visiting ships. In the country, on the other hand, a more homogeneous, independent, and stable community was developing. Composed chiefly of farmers whose main concern was to flee interference by the administration, it developed a stricter and more rigorous mode of life.

This group lacked all those elements of class differentiation which existed among many of the earlier pioneers of European colonies in the New World. They were people with a common code and ideology deeply rooted in the Calvinistic tradition of seventeenth-century Europe. The doctrine of predestination and the concepts of the eternally damned and the elect were a part of their social heritage to which they clung tenaciously. The frontier farmer thus came to regard membership of his religious group as an exclusive privilege which distin-

guished and separated him by an immeasurable distance from those who did not share it with him. This belief in the exclusiveness of his group and its privileges justified his right to dominate the "out-group" which surrounded him, viz. the heathen Bantu whom he fought, and the primitive Bushmen whom he hunted as vermin. Any conception of the equality of human beings was foreign to him, and "liberty" and "fraternity" held no validity for him outside his closed circle.

This awareness of group exclusiveness found expression in a consciousness of racial and social superiority which coincided with the distinctions of creed and colour. Thus, colour became a mark of a separate breed, and for the first time in the history of South Africa group colour prejudice was accepted as a social fact. The attempts of missionaries to spread Christianity within the ranks of the "out-group" threatened this group exclusiveness and the Boer farmers met evangelical efforts to improve and regularize inter-racial relations with strong suspicion and hostility.

The growing influence of the administration and its machinery of control, were, together with the above considerations, a main reason for the movement eastwards and northwards known as the *Great Trek*, during the first half of the nineteenth century. This movement marked the opening up of the South African interior. Eventually, the trekkers managed to appropriate all the land north of the Vaal and Orange rivers, and a large number of Africans became employed on European-owned farms. A labour tax was introduced and the practice of employing African child labour was highly favoured. For the first time in their history these early pioneers were able to rule as they wished and deemed right—a policy of complete domination was apparent in its most extreme form. By contrast, in the Cape, a more liberal policy was in force. The 1853 Cape constitution had granted the right of franchise to all men over 21, with property or land worth £25, or earning a yearly salary of £50, irrespective of colour or creed. In Natal, a policy of separation had been established. Thus, completely divergent racial policies found expression and formulation within the same country.

The discovery of diamonds and gold in 1870 and 1896 respectively brought about radical changes in an economy which, till then, had been entirely agricultural. In the wake came an unprecedented growth of communications, the establishment of towns, and the employment of a rapidly increasing African labour force. The discovery and develop-

ment of these new primary industries led to the growth of other enterprises, all requiring additional labour, and these also opened up new types of employment for the large untapped African labour source. African women came to be employed in the European economy as domestic servants, washerwomen and cooks. In turn, this expansion of industry and growth of urban centres stimulated agriculture, and Africans continued to provide the majority of farm labourers. Their work was largely seasonal, and many would move into the towns in search of work during slack agricultural periods. Never in the history of South Africa had there been such a large scale migration of non-Europeans, in particular of Bantu, from the country to the larger European centres.

This introduced a new factor into the South African problem—Europeans and non-Europeans living next door to each other. Almost up to the time of the first world war, there was, in fact, virtual separation, the vast bulk of the African population being out of sight on reserved land in the south-east, or in distant Natal. Transformation of the predominantly subsistence farming economy into a more complex industrial system with different standards of living brought large numbers of Africans into close contact with Europeans; it also produced the "poor white". This category of European failed to find a secure foothold in the new economy, partly owing to the quick adaptation of the African to heavy manual and unskilled work, and the contempt with which Europeans came to regard such labour. It included farmers who had reacted slowly to the expanding demand for their products and failed to benefit from the urban markets. These, and the landless Europeans congregated on the periphery of the towns, living largely on public and charitable assistance. Their numbers were increased by the depression which followed the Boer War, and the growth of European poverty became a matter of public concern. A policy of protecting Europeans from non-European competition attracted political support and a series of colour bar acts were passed.

The first of these (in 1911) prevented Africans from obtaining certificates of competency necessary to certain skilled types of work, and laid down certain categories of work as exclusively for whites. A second act consolidated existing laws of recruitment and employment established in the gold and diamond industries, and made it a criminal offence for an African to break his work contract or to strike.

In 1918, the South African Industrial Federation came to a *Status Quo* Agreement, which as its name implies, aimed at preserving the existing position of white and black employment. An attempt to repudiate this Agreement and to dismiss some 2,000 white miners led to the 1922 miners' strike. The strike itself was unsuccessful but its importance lies in the fact that it showed the lengths to which European labour was prepared to go to protect its position.

This factor has been behind all subsequent industrial legislation, including the "civilized labour" policy, heralded by the 1924 Industrial Conciliation Act, and the 1925 Wages Act. The former introduced machinery to promote industrial peace on the basis of collective bargaining, but the statutory definition of "employee" in the Act debarred the majority of African workers from benefiting. The Wages Act aimed at raising the wages of white workers, unskilled and semi-skilled, and forcing employers to give work to whites in preference to blacks. In short, the aim of the European worker has been to exclude the non-European and to maintain a privileged position for himself in the labour hierarchy. In the mining industry, a statutory colour bar was created by restricting Africans to unskilled or semi-unskilled categories, whilst skilled and supervisory occupations were preserved for the Europeans. As a South African economist has written, "It has thus come about that one of the most striking characteristics of the South African economy is the authoritarian attempt to regulate the distribution of resources between different industries and different racial groups".¹ Any attempt to reverse this policy has been met by the active opposition of the white workers.

This tendency progressively restricting the rights of non-European peoples to full participation in the life of South African society has been a significant feature ever since Union. The result is a caste-like system of human relations in which Europeans always occupy the superior, and non-Europeans the inferior place. One of the clearest illustrations of this is revealed in salary and wage figures. Not only do the Africans provide the bulk of the unskilled workers, which means that they receive the lowest wages but even those who attain high professional status never receive as much as their European counterpart. For example, in the teaching pro-

¹ Cf. Sheila van der Horst in E. Hellman (ed.) *Handbook on Race Relations in S.A.*, p. 109.

7
fession scales will vary according to the qualifications, but even where these are similar in the case of a European and a non-European teacher, the salary scales differ. Thus, a non-European teacher possessing a university degree and professional certificates is on the scale £210-£390, and a European teacher with a degree and one year's training is on the scale £300-£700. In social work, the European male starts at £260 p.a., and an African male at £96 p.a.¹

This caste-like system is also characterized by the close relation in economic life between occupation and race. The greatest occupational gulf is between Europeans and Africans. Coloureds and Asians, in the districts in which they live, occupy an intermediate position. Professional, supervisory and skilled work is performed mainly by Europeans; to a lesser extent by Coloureds and Asians; and to an almost negligible extent by Africans. This is true of all branches of economic activity, viz. agriculture, manufacturing, transport, public administration, and professional work, with the exception of teaching, nursing, and religion where non-Europeans serve their compatriots. The division between the various groups also becomes more clearly marked, as with technical advance and more literacy, the non-European tends to enter forms of professional and skilled occupations which, up to now, have been the preserve of the Europeans. Such occupations then assume two levels of salary and status, with the non-European functioning at the lower level. *guth*

Woods 22
1
A further characteristic of the system is the rigid separation of European and non-European in nearly every sphere of social life. Recent legislation enacted under the present Government's policy of *apartheid* decrees that non-Europeans are to be residentially segregated from Europeans, and separate areas are also to be provided for the various non-European groups. This means that only persons belonging to the group for which the area is proclaimed can occupy land there, though employees belonging to another group can reside with their employers. In other words, Africans who work for Europeans can live near their homes and farms. In urban areas there are different forms of segregation. The most important of these is the establishment of locations, villages or townships administered by the local or municipal authority. All towns have one or more of these, and in these areas Africans may be permitted to lease lots for the erection of

¹ Cf. E. Hellman, *op. cit.*

houses and huts. Other Africans live in mine compounds, as domestic servants, and the remainder in tribal reserves and on European-owned farms.

This type of residential segregation forms the basis of other types of segregation. For example, all non-European primary and secondary schools are separated from the European school system, and there is a tendency for the different non-European groups to have separate schools. While a number of universities open their doors to non-Europeans, the Government has provided a separate university for them in Durban.

Generally, all public buildings and shops have tradesmen's entrances to be used by non-Europeans. In Post Offices separate counters are provided; otherwise separate queues are formed. In such cases, the non-European will generally have to wait until all Europeans have been attended to. Separate waiting and cloak rooms are to be found at all railway stations, even at small sidings along subsidiary lines of communication. In the town non-Europeans have separate buses and street cars, manned by Europeans in most instances. Coloureds and Indians may use European means of transport, but of late public opinion has been so explicitly disapproving that they have themselves preferred to use non-European transport. Third classes on all main, subsidiary, and suburban lines are reserved for non-Europeans, whites using only first and second class. Where non-Europeans use first and second class, these are separated from the European coaches. In the Cape, Coloureds were allowed to share coaches with the whites, but this was changed shortly after the Nationalist Party came into power. Despite protest, the Coloureds now have to travel in separate coaches.

Libraries are run only for Europeans, though separate branches have been set up in some of the larger cities, e.g. in Johannesburg the Public Library has established a travelling library which visits each municipal location once a week. Hospitals are run separately, and staffed by European doctors. European doctors may practise amongst white and black, whilst non-European doctors only practise amongst their own people. In reformatories, juvenile delinquents' homes, non-European social workers are employed under the direct supervision of a European. In the prisons, which are also separate for whites and non-whites, warders are all European. Non-European policemen may only serve in non-European areas and may only handle non-European offenders.

These measures, and the whole of the system of race relations in South Africa depend, of course, on the political supremacy of the European group. Only persons of European descent are eligible for either House of Parliament. In 1936, the Representation of Natives Act was passed, debarring the Africans in the Cape Colony from exercising the franchise. Up till then they were the only section of the African community who had at any time enjoyed the right of franchise on a common voters' roll with Europeans. In 1950, the Coloured voters were similarly removed from the common voters' roll. The present position is as follows. In the Upper House, 10 Europeans represent non-European interests; five are appointed by the Governor-General in Council, one of whom represents the Coloured community's interests; and five are elected by the non-Europeans by a system of electoral colleges. In the Lower House, 10 Europeans represent non-European interests; three represent Africans in the Cape, elected by block voting; four represent Coloureds in the Cape and Natal; and three represent Indians in Natal and the Transvaal.

What this racial situation in South Africa amounts to is, in large part, an adjustment to the circumstances created by the impact of a technically advanced civilization upon a primitive one. The industrial revolution begun at the end of the last century has continued, and its social results are analogous to the upheaval experienced by Britain during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. To serve the new industries of the Union, Africans have been recruited and have settled in numbers which far outstrip housing accommodation. The consequence is insanitary slums, shacks and shanties knocked up by the occupants out of bits of wood, corrugated iron, and old rags sprawling alongside new housing estates. The Africans are underfed and have inadequate medical services, their standards of living being extremely low. Most of them, moreover, are fresh from tribalism and have had no time to accustom themselves to the different rules and conditions of an urban life.

From the angle of the Nationalist Party, therefore, *apartheid* may be seen as a planned attempt to solve these problems by avoiding the friction of races living and working in close contact with each other. But the fact is that *apartheid* does not signalize any radical change in the older policy. The real factors of racial cleavage lie much deeper and are psychological as well as economic. Osten-

sibly, the position of the "poor white" is the main reason for colour bar legislation. Yet, behind the resistance to non-European encroachment on the living standards of the European working class lies the fear of virtually the entire white population of being politically and culturally submerged by a coloured race. This is the basic reason why equal rights are denied to the non-Europeans, and particularly the Africans, who comprise nearly 70 per cent of the total South African population. This explains the European reluctance to allow non-Europeans to develop culturally in a European direction, and to allow them comparable opportunities of education and training. The ever present fear is that as ever larger sums are spent on the uplift of the African, ever increasing numbers will demand enfranchisement and the time will therefore come when power will have passed into African hands.

It must be realized that this opposition to non-European advancement is felt almost as a moral obligation for many whites. It is not merely political or economic. Indeed, many of the most ardent exponents of *apartheid* acknowledge that their country would benefit economically and industrially through fuller use of its reserves of non-European man-power. However, the fact is that a large proportion of the white population, particularly amongst the Afrikaaner element, have attitudes which are quite non-rational towards the subject of "colour". They have feelings about meeting and mixing with coloured individuals which are irreconcilable with any notion of racial equality. These feelings go back to the earlier Boer farmers—the pioneers of modern South Africa. In other words, it is still the latter group's sense of exclusiveness, based on the doctrine and teaching of predestination, in a racial homogeneity, which constitutes the hard core of resistance and which rules out any solution not based on racial separation.

1
4
4

3

4.

4. Mub.

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.