

present a proportion, possibly a large proportion, of the teachers in such schools receive no Government grants. We do not know to what extent the various schools are dependent on the Government grant for the payment of teachers. We can only conclude that the principle aims at embarrassing, or hindering, or crippling or destroying these schools.

"The parent community [is] to be given a place in the educational system through Parent Teachers' Associations, School Committees, Boards of Control, School Boards or in any other manner." The principle seems superfluous in that it is wide enough to cover the present practices of the different provinces. Three of the provinces have School Boards and Committees and Natal fosters Parent Teachers' Associations and similar organisations. But Natal, with some reason, fears School Boards and School Committees. There seems to be general satisfaction with the present varying systems of administration, and boards and committees are, to echo a well-worn C.N.E. phrase, foreign to our way of life. Also, "the parent community", the C.N.E. "parent in community", smacks of the parents regimented by the local Fuhrer or Party boss.

There will be universal agreement that "education must be provided in accordance with the ability, aptitude" (is there some subtle difference here?) "and interest shown by the pupil" and that "requirements as to compulsory education and the limits relating to school age must be uniform". A most unexceptionable principle. Extend it to all races and it will receive the approval of every Liberal.

Another principle aims at bringing about uniform conditions of service and salary scales. We here in Natal look with some distaste upon the possibility of conditions of service which, as in other provinces, may bring party politics into the classroom. In general, however, we should welcome uniformity in salary scales, leave conditions, completely-transferable pension rights and similar conditions of service. But such a principle could easily be implemented within the present framework and without disturbing the essential autonomy of the provinces. Yet another principle aims at "co-ordination on a national basis of syllabuses, courses and examination standards". We should welcome the co-ordination of examination standards, but the co-ordination of syllabuses and courses in, say, history offers us the most alarming of prospects.

The central and fundamental evil of the Bill, however, is the usurpation from the provinces

of the right to control education. The people of Natal should protest and resist in every way open to them. We quote from a man who is both a true son of Natal and a true son of South Africa, Edgar Brookes. If the people of Natal are not ready to protest, "they deserve what is coming to them. They are selling their own children and grandchildren down the river for the sake of immediate peace and comfort for themselves. As for the provincial system by which Natal has set so much store, there will soon be nothing left except the building of hospitals and the preservation of crocodiles. With the loss of control of education goes its main function."

---

## HAVE WE BEEN JUST TO THE NATIONALISTS ?

An attempt at a **positive** and **constructive** contribution to the great Bantustan debate, as recommended by the *Natal Mercury*.

by "Vortex"

LIBERALS have not always done perfect justice to the subtlety and complexity of the Government's thinking on the question of the Bantustans.

For example, Liberals often accuse the Government of refusing Africans the right to express their own views about their political future. But this is clearly an inaccurate accusation. The Nationalist Government believes profoundly in the Bantu's right to self-determination. Indeed it is so insistent that the Bantu shall have this right that it is certainly not prepared to allow the opinions of mere Africans to stand in the way of so great an aim. After all, if Africans are to say what they desire politically (a most untraditional concept anyhow), what will become of Bantu self-expression? No, the Government is determined to implement a policy of self-determination. (It goes without saying that the old African political parties became unpopular with the Government because, instead of putting forward the views of the Bantu people, they selfishly and rashly put forward their own views.)

Take further the question of separate development. The freedom that is being accorded to the Bantu is remarkable. Most Africans had wanted, oddly, to work and live by the side of the Europeans, and to remain cooped up within the boundaries of civilisation; but the Government discerned that the real desire of the Bantu was for a clean break, for the freedom that is their birthright, for the great wide open spaces. And, in spite of strong opposition from Africans (who have never been able to understand the Bantu), the Government is imposing its generous vision with its usual resoluteness. It has decided that nothing shall interfere with Bantu freedom. All sorts of valuable laws have been devised: wherever Africans infringe Bantu freedom by acting freely, or go against Bantu interests by consulting their own thoughts or desires, their consciences (and sometimes not only their consciences) are touched by the benevolent arm of the law. And indeed nothing is more "touching" in the great Transkei project than the way in which the Nationalist Government has been willing to reinforce it with vigorous and bracing emergency regulations. How many governments in the world would have been so thoughtful? The Bantu simply aren't going to be permitted to escape their deeply-desired separate destiny. Mr. Vorster's compassionate thoughts and officials are too powerful to be denied. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down a way of life for his friends."

But of course many liberal-minded people carpingly object that separate development

won't work, or even that it isn't meant to work. A typical over-simplification! The full and complex fact is this: it is traditional for Africans to live and work in the towns, but on the other hand it is of course traditional that the Bantu should live and develop separately. Thus the policy of the Government is that the Bantu should remain in the towns **and also** (here is the subtlety) be removed from them. Any sympathetic observer will appreciate the delicate flexibility of this arrangement. From the point of view of their work, the Bantu will be in the towns as ever, day and night; from the point of view of their personal separate development (their living, starving, voting and not being educated) they will be miles away in a Bantustan. The apparent paradox of the situation was summed up wittily the other day by a prominent Nationalist, who is reported to have said: "They're here because we want them, but they're not here because we don't want them. . . ." Some critics have protested absurdly that people can't be in two places at the same time; but such communistic debating tricks have been met by the obvious counter-arguments (banning, house-arrest etc.).

At every point in these processes, the will of the Bantu has been respected: as soon as an African has been prepared to agree with the Government's point of view, he has been allowed, and even encouraged, to say so. And occasionally — so far does Nationalist generosity and open-mindedness extend — he has actually been **paid** to say so.