

execution. The fruits, the benefits and amenities of this development must be shared and enjoyed by all sections who brought it about. For Europeans, in the name of apartheid, segregation, separation, conceived and decided by them alone, to plan to drive Africans out of these area to arid regions of undeveloped protectorates and overcrowded reserves will be, on their part, to yield to the lowest and most shameful motives of selfishness and self-interest of which people who claim to be christian, democratic and civilized cannot be proud. It will be the cruel exercise of state power without ethics or morals.

The Europeans broke apartheid or separation of nature. They crossed the seas and invaded the continent of Africa, the home of the African. It seems reasonable, therefore, to expect that they must now be prepared to share its land, its wealth and resources equitably with Africans and other non-Europeans. They must abandon all ideas of exclusive privileges for themselves.

Before Union as you know, the four colonies carried out different policies and showed different attitudes towards the non-Europeans or persons of colour. The Cape Colony had a common franchise, based on educational and property qualifications since 1854 for all Her Majesty's subjects irrespective of race or colour. The basic policy of the Cape Province was enunciated as "Equal rights for all civilized persons South of the Zembezi". The Natal Colony had a more complicated system of franchise which had admitted no more than three (3) Africans and less than 500 other non-Europeans by 1936 when the Africans were removed from the common voter's roll in the Union of South Africa. The two Northern Dutch Republics of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony summed up their attitudes and policy in their Grondwet or Constitution by stating: "There shall be no equality between Black and White either in Church or in State". At the Union's constitution Conference at Vereeniging an effort was made to reconcile these divergent attitudes and policies. The Cape of course pleaded for the adoption of its liberal policy but the delegates of the Northern Republics stood unswervingly for their own. As a compromise it was agreed that each colony should maintain its respective policy on the question of the vote or franchise hence the entrenching clauses in Section 35(1) of the Union Constitution . . . . "No such law shall disqualify any person in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope who under the law existing in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope at the establishment of the Union, is or may become capable of being registered in the Province of the Cape by reason of his race or colour only, unless the Bill be passed by both Houses of Parliament sitting together and at the third reading be agreed to by not less than two-thirds of the total number of members of both houses".

It was still the cherished hope of the Cape delegates that with progress and advancement of the non-Europeans educationally, economically and otherwise, their political attitude and policy would prevail. But, unhappily as we all will know, the opposite has been the case. The attitude of the Northern Republics has since prevailed even in the Cape Province. In 1936 the Constitution was tampered with by a two-thirds vote of the two houses of Parliament sitting together which removed the Cape African voters from the common roll. This victory for General Hertzog, it must be noted, was made possible by vote of most of the former members of the South African Party who were now cosily and comfortably seated behind General Hertzog, the then Union Prime Minister whom they opposed on principle and the possible dangers of tampering with the Constitution for close to 10 years. They had surrendered principle for expediency. They, the United South African Nationalist Party, had undermined the foundations of the Constitution by helping remove the pillar on which the franchise of the Africans rested. They had thus neglected to defend the Constitution, the only basis for the existence of the Union of South Africa, at this first line of defence of democracy and human liberties thereby rendering future attacks on the Constitution altogether indefensible on principle.

What difference does it make if a group is removed from the common voter's roll by one vote or by "a two-thirds majority of the two Houses of Parliament sitting together". They are removed anyway because the principle has been abandoned in any case so long as there is desire to deprive them of their rights whether constitutionally or otherwise.

To us the repeated attempts to remove the Coloured People of the Cape culminating in these extraordinary devices of the Appellate Division Act and the Senate Act which to us are flanking attacks on the same fortress. The principle was lost with the help of the United Party and the apathy of voters when the Cape Native Franchise was abolished in 1936. Heroic protests against Senate Act now admirable though they are, are of no avail, since the principle on tampering with the constitution was surrendered nineteen years ago.

Another important thing about the Union Constitution is that a colour bar was enshrined in it when the following condition was inserted in it: "Section 26. The qualifications of a Senator shall be as follows: He must (d) be a British subject of European descent". After this brief analysis it must be clear to all of us that the Constitution of the Union of South Africa, unlike that of the United States of America was unhappily established upon the loose and sandy foundation of expediency and compromise and not on principle. This was a weakness on the structure that was built and a temptation to shake down its foundation on the part of self-seekers and other opportunists.

I know it may be argued plausibly that without this compromise there would have been no "Union". Has there been, in fact, a 'Union' or is there a real Union now in spirit by accepting the compromise? Anyway, unless we South Africans return to first principle by calling a New truly National Convention with the representatives of all groups forming the population of South Africa we have paid a dear price with this compromise with no real security for the establishment of a truly South African Nation. By this compromise a way has been opened for the abuse of power of state for selfish sectional interest.

Because of this compromise, which is in effect the acceptance by the majority of white voters of the principle of no equality between black and white in Church or State, colour discrimination has thus been made constitutional and a state function. That is why the Union Constitution is retrogressive, restricting and denying liberties to dislike groups instead of growing progressively like that of the United States of America extending areas of freedom to all groups irrespective of colour. In the Union of South Africa because its Constitution allows it, it is the Union Government that legislates for discrimination and differentiation on colour.

In the United States of America and other democratic countries which recognize common citizenship irrespective of race or colour, discrimination is largely a matter of individuals and Central Governments are endeavouring to lead their states and citizens to live up to their ideal of democracy and national unity.

In this regard the XIVth Amendment, to quote only one of the amendments of the Constitution of United States reads: Article XIV (Section I) "All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law". No matter what lapses that might have been noted in the past with regard to this amendment, there is no denying that the United States Government has a moral ideal to live up and it is trying to live up to it through legislative bodies, its armed forces and now in its schools.

It is to be admitted that there is no perfection in human affairs but there is progress and inspiration in striving to live up to a high ideal of common and equal citizenship than the demoralizing effect of trying to suppress and oppress disliked groups.

In South Africa we have a social colour caste structure with the Africans forming the lowest caste and the Europeans the highest and most privileged. The Europeans alone legislate for and dominate the affairs of the Country. The non-European groups are the dominated groups. The caste structure in order of privilege and opportunity is - Europeans, Coloureds, Asiatics or Asians and Africans.

Politically in South Africa, the Europeans enjoy universal franchise whose only qualification is a white skin and twenty-one years of age with no criminal record. The Coloureds, Indians and Malays in the Cape enjoy a loaded franchise with an educational and property qualification which is not extended to the women of these non-European groups. In Natal also these groups have some loaded and complicated franchise. In the Transvaal none of the latter groups enjoy any kind of representation.

The Africans of the Cape were removed from the common franchise in Cape Province in 1936 after enjoying this right without abuse for eighty-two years. They are now allotted three seats with European Representatives in the House of Assembly for the Cape Province in a House of 156 representing 2,500,000 Europeans and four European Senators in the Senate of forty-four (44) to represent the eleven and half million Africans of the Union. In other words two and half million Europeans of the Union of South African and South West Africa have 190 representatives in the two houses of Parliament as against seven Parliamentary Representatives. This so-called representation is made under what is called the Representation of Natives Act, 1936, which under the circumstances should have been properly designated as the Misrepresentation of Natives Act, 1936. Under this system, the African has no direct influence over Parliament and Parliamentarians. It is the nature of the system which is at fault and not the Representatives who have been with a few conspicuous exceptions among the best and most outstanding representatives in both Houses irrespective of Party.

It is well to mention and to point out in this connection that there was also established, under the Representation of Natives Act, 1936, a Natives Representatives Council of twenty-one members, twelve elected, four nominated, the Chief Native Commissioner and the Chairman to represent the Government. Members of the Native Affairs Commission could speak but not vote. The Council's functions were advisory and not executive. Proposed legislation which affected Africans was to be placed before them for consideration before it was brought before Parliament and their resolutions were to be laid on the table in Parliament but Parliament was under no legal obligation to take them off the table for discussion as would be expected if the Council's advice was taken seriously at all. These resolutions, however, year in and year out, were ignored, remained on the table and parliamentary debates, on the particular legislation took place without reference ever being made to the Council's resolutions until its abolition in 1950. The Native Representative Council was abolished by the present Minister of Native Affairs, Dr Verwoerd on the grounds that the Council wasted time in discussing National Politics which were outside their function, instead of discussion on local welfare of Africans. The Minister suggested replacing the Council with local councils on ethnic grouping under new legislation which emerged as the Bantu Authorities Act later.

It was also thought the Bunga - The Council of the Transkeian Territories could also be usefully decentralized so that smaller ethnic groups may "manage their own affairs" under the direct supervision of the Native Affairs through the new concept of ethnic grouping of Africans. The 'Bunga', I may mention, is either dead or dying to give way to the ethnic group principle under the Bantu Authorities Act.

There are a few points I must call attention to in connection with what I have just said. Firstly, there is an erroneous idea that the interests of the Africans are essentially local. Secondly, it is being suggested African interests are separate, apart and even in conflict with the interests of the rest of South Africans especially Europeans. Nothing can be furtherest from truth or fact. It is implied in these proposals that you can deal with South African Affairs without influencing the so-called Native Affairs. This is an attempt to ignore the basic principle that there can be no South African Affairs without Native Affairs. South African Affairs are in fact Native Affairs and conversely Native Affairs are South African Affairs. This is proved in parliamentary debates where every Bill that is brought before Parliament touches upon the life of the African negatively or positively or in an implied manner. It is deliberately not conceded that any type of local representation or activity on the part of the African can any more become a substitute for municipal, provincial or parliamentary representation of Africans than it is for other sections including the Europeans. In other words, local representation for Africans is no substitute for their representation in other legislative bodies of the country. In democratic political theory and practice there can be no such a thing as a parliament for Europeans only where there are non-Europeans in the same area or country.

This concept of community of interests was long realized and recognized in the old Cape democratic system and political institutions were set up with due regard to it. The Bunga system both in the Transkeian Territories and in the Ciskei was a form of local or regional government suitable to the character of the population. In other areas, like the Western Province, Divisional Councils served a similar purpose. Membership or participation in these institutions in anyway did not preclude qualified persons irrespective of colour or race from exercising their rights as Cape voters in Provincial and Parliamentary elections from becoming candidates for elections into these legislative bodies. That was why European and African voters of the Transkei and the Ciskei participated in the local Councils and yet voted together for the same candidates for the Provincial Council and for Parliament. In fact, from 1911 the late Rev. Walter Benson Rubusand represented the voters of the Transkei in the Cape Provincial Council. For anyone to assume that the Bunga system was political segregation and a substitute for Provincial and Parliamentary representation betrays an ignorance of important democratic traditions in the politics of the Cape.

It is the policy of the present Union Government under the premiership of Mr J.G. Strydom that the African can only have the vote or representation "in his own area" whatever that means because Africans own no areas where they exercise autonomy. This view of the government is tacitly agreed to by the United Party which will "create separate spheres of activities for each race". The leader of the United Party, Mr J.G.N. Strauss suggests resuscitation of the Natives Representative Council with certain executive powers in the Native areas and the increase of the four Senators representing Africans to six but no direct participation in the National political life of the Country.

What I should have mentioned earlier is that after the 'Joint Sitting' in February, 1936 which removed the 'Cape Native Voters' from the common roll it was proclaimed abroad that the "Native question" whatever that means "had been solved for all time". Can any intelligent student of our South African National Affairs subscribe to such palpably mistaken opinion. We are told now according to the present Minister of Transport Mr B.J. Schoeman that the aim is "to remove the coloured people from the common voter's roll and to ensure that the sovereignty of Parliament was restored" as though the sovereignty of the Union Parliament was even in doubt. We are all waiting to discover what the new concept of parliamentary sovereignty is.

DISCRIMINATIONS:

This attitude of "no equality between black and white in Church or State" has manifested itself in various types of discrimination against the African under many laws or special provisions of general laws which create or establish crimes or statutory offences for Africans only and or exclude Africans from rights, benefits and opportunities, politically, economically, industrially, socially, legally, educationally and territorially.

Politically, I have pointed out, Africans have no direct representation in Parliament and do not enjoy a common franchise which would make possible for them to influence Parliament and Parliamentarians.

Economically and industrially, although Africans in 1946, according to the Industrial Legislation Commission, Africans constituted 79 percent of the Union's working population, 47.2 percent of the workers in secondary industry and 88.6 percent in mining and quarrying, they (the Africans) are the most poorly paid workers in South Africa whether they are skilled or unskilled. For instance, in 1940, Europeans in the Gold Mines received an average pay of £666.6.0. per head per year while Africans received only £47.4.0. per year per worker. Africans have very restricted facilities for training to attain skills and have restricted sphere for making use of their skills. Industrial Legislation largely excludes them from organizing into recognizable and registrable Trade Unions. They are denied the right of collective bargaining and the use of the strike weapon which have done so much to improve the conditions for workers all over the world including European workers in South Africa. A strike is a criminal offence for African workers.

Legally, they are subject to special laws which establish crimes for "Natives only". For instance in 1948, 295,499 Africans were convicted for special crimes and offences for Natives only under the following laws:

Native Taxation Act  
Masters and Servants Act  
Natives Urban Areas Act  
Native Pass Laws,  
Natives Labour Regulations  
Locations Rules and Regulations  
Registration and Production of Documents by Natives  
and under the Liquor Act for  
"Illegal Possession of Native Liquor" and  
Illegal Possession of other Liquor.

This special type of legislation might well be referred to as "factories of crime" in the way they criminalize the African.

Socially they are excluded from benefits and amenities enjoyed by Europeans and if given any in exceptional cases these need not be equal.

Educationally, only 34.7 percent African children of school going age that is between 6 and 16 years attended chiefly Mission Schools as there were no Government School in 1951 compared with 97.6 percent of European children. The total actual Provincial expenditure on education in 1951/52 was £21,858,316 or £48.88 cost per European child, £5,137,633 or £18.84 cost per Coloured or Asiatic child and only £5,882,689 or £7.58 cost per African child. In other words seven times as much money is spent for the education of a European child as compared with an African child and 2½ times is spent on Coloured and Asiatic children compared with the African child.

Lately under the Bantu Education Act 1953, there is being introduced what is known as Bantu Education with a special syllabus devised not by the Department of Education but by the Department of Native Affairs in order, according to Dr E.G. Jansen, "to see to it that the education will be on the .../-

the education will be on the right lines and will fit the native for his future life in the Country" and according to Dr H.F. Verwoerd, to give "a type of education calculated to fit them (Africans) only for a limited sphere of employment".

This so-called Bantu Education is being imposed on Africans who are opposed to it because Africans believe there is no such a thing as Bantu Education. Education is universal and indivisible and has nothing to do with race, colour or language of the people. Territorially, the so-called Native Reserves comprising less than 12½ percent of the area of the Union are supposed to be the "national home" of 9,000,000 Africans or about two-thirds of the total Union population. In urban areas Africans are largely confined in Municipal locations. In both areas there is no freehold ownership as a rule. The occupants of the plot of land or house are tenants of either the Government or the Municipality.

Lately, a move has begun to take away freehold rights from the few Africans who own properties in Urban Areas because according to Dr H.F. Verwoerd "It is the policy of this Government that the native shall not own any ground in a European area".

These are some of the discriminations imposed upon the African as an expression of the attitude "There shall be no equality between black and white in Church or State".

Although to many the varied aspects touched upon in this discussion might seem irrelevant, they are, however, essential in bringing out clearly the dominating groups attitudes and prejudices and group discrimination they give rise to.

#### MOTIVES:

Let us now seek the motives behind this attitude and discrimination.

Why should Europeans discriminate in this way against the non-Europeans especially against Africans. Why should they always offer unequal and inferior benefits towards the non-white groups. Are not some of them Christians? Don't they have ethical and moral standards believing that: "Whatsoever ye would that men do unto you, do ye also unto them". In other words what are the motives behind these attitudes and policies. I have already referred to some of them in the course of my discussion. I must, however, quote the highest authority to explain the motives behind the legislation and policies I have referred to in the course of this. The Prime Minister, Mr J.G. Strydom, said according to the Johannesburg Star of 20th April, 1955: "The laws of the Country made it impossible for the non-Europeans on merit or any other way to get the reins into his hands".

If the United Party based white leadership on white "baasskap" then there was no difference between it and the Nationalist Party.

White leadership, if not based on "baasskap" or power was meaningless. It would lead to the non-European having the right to say to the White-man: "We choose you to lead us or we reject your leadership".

The non-European could not do that now because White leadership was based on "baasskap" (domination) and therefore on power.

"The only way the Europeans can maintain supremacy is by domination and the only way they maintain domination is by holding the vote from the non-European. If it were not for that we would not be here in Parliament today".

In other words then the Prime Minister stands or falls by "die Witman moes baas bly".

The motive behind the mass removal of Africans and dispossession of freehold rights in Urban Areas is according to the Minister of Native Affairs Dr H.F. Verwoerd, "It is the policy of the Government - a policy which I consider sensible and which I will support through thick and thin - that the native shall not own any ground in a European area" and according to Mr F.E. Mentz, Nationalist M.P. Westdene, "We have decided once and for all that we will not grant proprietary rights to any of the Natives who will be removed in any of the locations falling within a European area in Johannesburg. We are not going to create a second Sophiatown there. We are not prepared to do that. Apart from that whether those honourable members like it or not this Government is going to carry out its policy of apartheid".

On the so-called Bantu Education, Dr E.G. Jansen as Minister of Native Affairs said: "The Government's policy with regard to education is that the necessary money to provide education for the natives will be provided but we will see to it that the education will be on the right lines and will fit the native for his future life in the country".

Dr H.F. Verwoerd, now Minister of Native Affairs, said: "Native education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the policy of the State". "Good race relations cannot exist when the education is given under the control of people who create wrong expectations on the part of the Native himself". Racial relations cannot improve if the results of Native education is the creation of frustrated people".

Sometime ago Dr H.F. Verwoerd summed up the motives behind the Government's Native Policy in question form to the leader of the Opposition, Mr J.G.N. Strauss as follows:

- (1) Does the United Party wish white towns to become giant non-European centres to lift the colour bar in industry and give Natives full Trade Union rights, Freehold Tenure, Political Representation, Compulsory Education as for white children and not the type of education calculated "to fit them only for limited spheres of employment" and admission to white Universities. If so, how will the United Party withhold full voting rights from Natives who have precisely the same opportunities as the white man?
- (2) If the United Party will not forever withhold the vote from Natives how will it prevent them with their numerical superiority from wresting political leadership from the whites?

In the field of labour and industry, restrictive legislation such as the restrictive clauses in the Industrial Conciliation Act, Native Labour ..../-

Native Labour Regulations, Masters and Servants Act, Natives Urban Areas Act, Pass Laws, Native Labour (Settlement of Disputes) Act, 1953 and the Natives Building Workers Act are all intended to protect the white work against the competition of the African worker. The restriction of field and areas of activities for the African worker is for the same purpose the fear of African competition. The motive in this regard has been summed up by the present Minister of Labour, Senator J. de Klerk as follows, "As far as he and the Government were concerned the only problem that existed was that the white man must be maintained in South African and that he must remain "baas"." That policy would be the basis of all his actions. His predecessors of all political parties before him have held similar views.

In fact, although I have quoted statements by members of the Government only in regard to these motives in fairness to them, I must make it abundantly clear that they are not the only party that entertain such attitudes and motives. Other political parties now in the opposition share similar attitudes and motives although expressed more mildly. To say our whole trouble is due to the Nationalist Government under Mr J.G. Strydom is to over simplify the issue and to misread or misinterpret South African history in group and colour relations. The Nationalists do express their attitudes more frankly and openly and act more forthrightly in group relations but they are neither the first nor the only Union Government to entertain and act upon them.

to maintain the status quo

#### EFFECTS OF ATTITUDES AND MOTIVES:

The natural and logical question is what effects have these attitudes and their motives underlying them, have or are having on the group relations, the progress of the country and its people. There is no doubt that the effect is adverse affecting the .../-



The other hopeful sign and great event was the unanimous rejection by the Board of Churches of the Federated Dutch Reformed Churches of South Africa of an 80,000 word report of a commission appointed to enquire into "the scriptural grounds for race relations". "Briefly it (the report) states that God divided humanity into different races, nations and languages. Equality between Natives, Coloureds and Europeans included a misapprehension of this fact. Far from the word of God encouraging equality, it was established scriptural principle that in every community ordination there was a fixed relationship between authorities etc. (Johannesburg Star 15/6/55)".

For the Board of Churches of the Federated Dutch Reformed Churches to have courage of its conviction to reject unanimously such interpretation of the scripture is significant. It seems another hopeful sign which seems to indicate re-awakening of the spiritual conscience of a powerful church organisation in South Africa showing its willingness to follow the light and to march with instead of against world spiritual thought. A change of attitude of this body in colour and group relations could have profound and most far reaching effects on such relations in South Africa.

In fact, our country in every sphere of our group relations must rethink the whole situation, re-examine its attitudes and restate its policies in group relations in the interest of South Africa as a whole and it is to be hoped the Church will be in the vanguard.

Before concluding my analysis let me briefly refer to certain trends and attitudes in other parts of Africa and elsewhere and see whether there is anything to be learnt from their attitudes and approaches to similar problems. The United States of America as I pointed although it has not reached its ideal has adopted political integration irrespective of colour. It has not only coloured Americans merely as voters but also as members of State Legislature and the Congress of the United States. Units of its Army and Navy have been integrated. An extensive programme of integration in education comparatively speaking is re-army completion. What this means is that the people of the United States of America of all colours are working together towards a perfect union.

The reply about the United States will be that the ratio between Whites and non-Whites is ten to one (10:1) in favour of the Whites so that the Whites have nothing to fear from the non-Whites. Granted. But the ratio of Europeans to non-Europeans in the Central African Federation, Countries in East Africa like Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda and the Belgian Congo is by far much higher than in South Africa and yet they had adopted progressive non-repressive policies. In South Africa the ratio of Europeans to non-European is 1:4; in Central African Federation is 1:35; Kenya 1:178 on the basis of 1952 figures. In the Belgian Congo it is even higher.

In spite of these high ratios these countries do not believe that a policy of white domination and a policy of suppression of non-European advancement is the best protection of the Europeans. For instance Central African Federation has adopted a policy of partnership between Europeans and non-Europeans. The shares and holdings in the partnership are not the most important things at the moment but the basic principle of the relationship is important. Mr Garfield Todd, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia has expressed their attitudes in group relations as follows: "I do not fear the day when the European and the African will both enjoy high standards of living when all in the Federation will have the opportunity of the finest education, when all will be civilized in Central Africa and the outstanding differences between the races will be, perhaps, in the colour of their skins".... "Unless a country had a stable and contented working .../-

contented working population it was not likely to get efficient workers and unless it had efficiency, it was crippling its own industry (Star 2/6/55)". And the Deputy Prime Minister of the Central African Federation, Sir Roy Welensky says: "It is realistic to acknowledge that as the African advances in earning power and spending power to his standards of living will rise, his outlook will widen, his social standards will draw nearer to those civilized people".

It is realistic to hold that the permanent repression of a vast mass of Native people is impossible (Star 17/5/55).

There are Africans who are members of the African Federation Parliaments. There are African members of the Legislative Councils in Northern Rhodesias and Nyasaland, Uganda and even in Kenya. While there are differences of opinion about the set-up in these areas those differences are expressed in inter-racial conferences on an equality and also in legislative bodies.

The University of Rhodesia in Salisbury will be opened to all races. The University of the Congo called Lovaninno near Leopoldville opened with three white students and 60 Congolese students. About 2,000,000 Congolese are detribalized town dwellers while ten millions are still in tribal areas. The Congolese are the artisan of the country, are bank clerks and fully integrated in industry. They, "captain river boats drive all locomotives", run power shovels and ply-precision instruments.

Mr M. Maurice Bayron, the French Secretary for Overseas France, recently announced in Brazzaville, French Equatorial Africa, special education facilities for Natives to attain higher posts in the public services in African Territories.

The Gold Coast and Nigeria are moving towards self-government. Sierra Leone, the Cameroons and even in Liberia there is reawakening. In fact, Mr Chairman, everywhere the African people are awake and awakening. The Africans are stirring to move with the world trends to get a place in the sun and to take their proper place among civilized men of the world to help formulate a programme of a new civilization in Africa in which men of all groups, races, colours and culture will recognize their unity and diversity, emphasizing common interests and using every means in their power to correct and harmonize undesirable differences.

These attitudes, approach and policies of our contemporary African States or Colonies and other democratic countries of the civilized world are positive, progressive and realistic while the attitude of white domination or 'baasskap' is negative, reactionary and unrealistic. The idea of partnership, integration, intergroup co-operation and participation in evolving policies acceptable to all concerned are democratic and are facing problems of group contacts and interactions constructively. The attitude of white domination, on the other hand, is dogmatic authoritarian and brooks no discussion or consultation, an attitude which must, of necessity, lead to group conflicts and antagonisms. It relies on the exhibition or exercise of force to intimidate and bring about submission or, at least, to suppress open resistance. It demands and accepts nothing short of acquiescence and conformity. It is the rule of a powerful clique or oligarch. It does not believe in partnership, integration or intergroup co-operation between the dominating group and the dominated group or groups. Its policy of apartheid or segregation of groups is an evasion or side-tracking facing the problem to facilitate differential treatment, lowering of standards, denial of equality of opportunity and, in short, subjugation of the dominated group or groups to claim or suggest interest or welfare of the dominated group is an attempt to deceive.

Domination of authoritarianism never solves any problem except that for a white it petrifies opposition, silences criticisms and compels conformity..../-

and compels conformity to give the appearance of satisfaction, peace and quiet. It is spectacular with appearance of strength but unlike democracy which relies on consent of the governed, it is shortlived, destroyed by its own methods.

There is another political cliché or policy in South Africa described as 'white leadership with justice'. This type of leadership like in "white domination" or 'baasskap' is self-appointed and does not draw its exalted position from acceptance and recognition by those it presumes to lead. There can neither be leadership nor justice when the self-appointed does not express the will and the wishes and the aspiration of those led.

This so-called "white leadership" with justice is like the type of Trusteeship which white South Africans talk in reference to their treatment or mistreatment of Africans. The trustee appropriates to himself benefits of the estate and does not prepare the ward for manhood estate. The ward never grows and must never grow into full manhood if the trustee can help it.

Both claims are mere clichés. They are a farce or travesty of justice and democracy and like white domination stand condemned on christian, moral and democratic principles.

If we are to move towards a New Africa we must recognize that Europeans, Africans and other non-Europeans are here to stay together. To suggest to dump them in the Protectorates as was suggested in a lecture at the Y.M.C.A. on Monday 4th July, 1955, is to refuse to make the proper and necessary adjustments for good group relations. It is to evade the challenge which civilized countries are facing up. The economic development and progress of Africa call for co-operation and harmony between Europeans and non-Europeans with equality of opportunity and freedom for all groups irrespective of race or colour or language. It must be realized that understanding is possible only through group contacts, working together and learning to know each other better. Apartheid, segregation or separation, preclude all chances of mutual appreciation and understanding. It creates suspicions and even antagonism and hatred from lack of knowledge of one another and facilitates the establishment and promotion of prejudices and stereotypes which some politicians manufacture, welcome and exploit for political expediency. Apartheid is adopted for fear that people who come together normally without restrictions and prohibitions in school and universities at play and in public activities are likely to appreciate one another's worth thereby robbing the politician of his favourable platform of exploiting group differences real and imaginary. These are the reasons why apartheid, segregation or separation should be rejected as the accepted policy of multi-racial or multi-group relations.

It must be the aim in the "New Africa" to emphasize the common interests of the groups without compelling uniformity while working together all the time to harmonize any differences between groups which tend to bring about conflict. Agreement should be sought through discussion and conversion, the democratic way instead of the dominant group imposing its will on others through intimidation.

The world has become one. The radio, the aeroplane, the telephone and other communications make it a neighbourhood. We cannot live in isolation. We are interdependent with the rest of the world. We must try to adjust our attitudes, our way of life, our policies to harmonize in mutual interests and benefits with others in order to promote goodwill, co-operation and peace among all groups.

Many talk: of ..../-

Many talk of excluding others in order to maintain the so-called "white civilization". There is no such a thing as "white civilization" it is a world civilization. Peoples all over the world contributed to and laid foundations for the development of modern civilization so far. The best way to preserve, maintain and advance modern civilization is to advance those who are still backward so that they will not drag it down. By increasing the number of torch bearers of this modern civilization irrespective of race, creed or colour is the only sure way of maintaining it. To exclude others on any basis is to strangle it and hasten its death.

To bring about a "New Africa" we shall need the right attitudes, adopt democratic policies that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number through equality of opportunity and freedom for all, working at all times on basic moral principles instead of political expediency and adopting the principle that "whatsoever ye would that men do unto you, do ye also unto them".

The University has an important part to play in the programme towards a New Africa by careful studies of group attitudes, prejudices and the discriminations they bring about as well as by trying to discover by research and experiment how to foster more positive attitudes in group relations. Among other ways the university would make a great contribution towards more harmonious relations among the groups by training them as university students together thereby teaching them indirectly how to live together, think together and work together.

This ladies and gentlemen, is "The African's Vision of Group Relations in the New Africa" for which we must work, remembering with H. Oldham that "Christians (and I would like to add and "All men and women of goodwill of all races and colours") may help to infuse the right spirit - the spirit which seeks the truth is afraid of no facts, harbours no prejudices, condones no injustices and sets the common good above all sectional and self-interests".

ABX 550714

Personal  
notes

July 14, 1955

Kitwe

N. Rhodesia

Dear Dr. & all -

It was good to see  
you in these last days - and  
am now looking forward  
to seeing Madie soon.

These are interesting  
days in the Copperbelt - such  
development! - mushrooming modern  
towns - roads - great power develop-  
ment - machinery of the very latest -  
+ rapidly growing urban populations.  
I've met some fine folk in the  
past 48 hours - especially in  
Luanshya I met about 10 alert  
forward looking women who  
would be a fine leavening  
influence in any community

+ with a responsive and open-hearted spirit that made me wish to know them all better.

I haven't had a chance to really get acquainted at length with any African women - but have met 3 very nice women doing social work in the area - a minister's wife etc. but fewer girls + women have had educational opportunities in this area - + English as a medium is not so common - so for a short visit language alone is a limiting factor.

There is keen interest even up here in the North over the new University in Salisbury - I really am sorry not to have a bit more time in the area for there is much to see + learn - the country dry - comfortably warm -

I promised I'd send our  
address for our 1st week in  
England.

It will be:

August 19-29-

Montague Hotel

Montague St.

Russell Sq. W.C.I.

London

---

I think I gave you  
the Geneva address airtight -  
World's YWCA

37 Quai d'Illan

Geneve Switzerland

---

In Paris Aug. 15-Aug 19  
the YWCA conference office is  
booking our reservations.

Take good care of your  
family Kuku! - & yourself  
too - Best always -  
Margaret

**Collection Number: AD843**

**XUMA, A.B., Papers**

***PUBLISHER:***

*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 is part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations, held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.