

home in a quieter and happier country. But I would not dream of answering that question for anyone else.

I say to those of you who are here, stand firm by what you believe, do not tax yourselves beyond endurance, yet calculate clearly and coldly how much endurance you have; don't waste your breath cursing your rulers and the S.A.B.C.; keep your friendships alive and warm, especially those with people of other races; beware of melancholy, and give thanks for the courage of others in this fear-ridden country.

MORE ON AFRICAN NATIONALISM

By Dr. EDGAR BROOKES

I have been asked to state more fully my views on this subject, and I do so gladly. I would emphasise that what I am doing is to state my own views for careful consideration by other Party members, not to make an *ex cathedra* statement on behalf of the Party.

In most political discussions, much depends on the meaning of the terms used, and many such discussions are wars of words, when each participant in the discussion is using the controversial phrase in a different sense.

"African Nationalism" may be used—in my opinion incorrectly used—for the struggle for equal political and social rights. This the Liberal Party is bound to support, but it is not African Nationalism or African anything else: it is quite simply liberalism. For this we are all struggling.

Even here, however, the Liberal Party should make its own decisions and frame its own policy. It cannot be dragged at the chariot-wheels of a purely African organisation, for the Liberal Party embraces men of all races. No man, no association of men, can be asked to live and die for principles in the working out of which he has no share.

EASILY TWISTED

"African Nationalism", again, may be the perfectly sound pride in one's own parents and ancestors and one's own past. In this sense Winston Churchill could be described as an "English Nationalist". In its positive aspects this is a determination to be one's self, not someone else. But it can easily be twisted into

mere conservatism and a refusal to accept the modification of national life by new culture contacts, which is a condition of all progress. Such a conception would appeal to the Nationalist Party, but hardly to Liberals, who stand for a pooling of racial riches in the service of a common country.

"African Nationalism" can mean, finally, the African counterpart of Afrikaner Nationalism. It would then stand not for African equality but for African domination. If this is what we are asked to approve, what answer have we to the critics of "one man, one vote" who argue that our policy means the domination of white by black instead of the reverse? By what strange magic does racial domination which we as a Party condemn as immoral suddenly become moral because black men are the dominators? **The argument that it becomes moral because the Africans are in the majority would justify the "Aryan" domination over Jews in Germany.** The Liberal Party has Indian and Coloured as well as European members, and we are asked to throw these to the wolves if we support **this** type of African Nationalism.

When we are asked to "ride the tiger" of "African Nationalism" of this type we must remember the old limerick:

There was a young lady of Riga
Who smiled on the back of a tiger:
They returned from the ride
With the lady inside

And the smile in the face of the tiger.

What is more, we are asked to support something which is quite incompatible with liberalism.

It may be that earlier correspondents have had in mind something different. If so they should be asked to define their terms.

UNIVERSITAS BOUND—

UNIVERSITY CHIEF TAKES LEAD IN ATTACK ON UNIVERSITIES

On March 8 students from all the Afrikaans language Universities and Colleges of Education in the Transvaal gathered in Pretoria for a "protest march" against Communism and Liberalism, ending at Church Square, where speakers also attacked NUSAS and the Roman Catholic Church.

The Rector of the University of Pretoria, Professor C. H. Rautenbach (who was amongst the speakers), had addressed a pre-march meeting at his University the previous evening

on the question of Academic Freedom. In the course of his address (in which he strongly supported Apartheid and dismissed overseas criticism of it as slanderous) the Professor ridiculed opposition to the 90-day detention-without-trial law and to the dismissal of Professors Roux and Symons as "two great hulla-baloos", and stated that the University of Pretoria does not believe in granting academic freedom to Communists in South Africa.

JUSTIFIED ?

In justification of his views he asked three questions: "Firstly, what will happen to the so-called rule of law after the Communists take over? Secondly, what right will any university have to appoint and dismiss staff under Red rule, and, thirdly, how can any university pretend to be against Communism when it houses Communists?" At first glance these questions may seem plausible enough; on closer examination, however, they disclose a paucity of logic and a fundamental misapprehension of the true nature and purpose of a university, and of the meaning and importance of academic freedom. Both these matters were investigated in a booklet called "The Open Universities in South Africa", issued by a conference of the representatives of the Universities of Cape Town and the Witwatersrand, which was called in 1957 to discuss the Government's proposals to refuse access to non-Whites.

In examining "The Idea of a University", the conference had this to say: primarily a university exists for the pursuit of the truth. A university is characterised by the spirit of free enquiry, its ideals being the ideal of Socrates—"to follow the argument where it leads". The concern of its scholars is not merely to add and revise facts in relation to an accepted framework, but to be ever examining and modifying the framework itself. A university ceases to be true to its own nature if it becomes the tool of Church or State or any sectional interest. The pursuit of truth is as unending as the universe is inexhaustible.

In discussing Academic Freedom, the report listed the four freedoms which are essential to a university for the free pursuit of truth: freedom to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted for study. It went on to state that any limitation on admission for other than academic reasons hampers the search for truth, and that diversity in membership "itself contributes to the discovery of truth, for truth is

hammered out in discussion, in the clash of ideas." If, the report stated, "some are excluded for non-academic reasons—whether it be religion, sex, race or colour—or are kept out by the fear created by such a policy, the discovery of truth is hampered and the community loses the fruit of their talent. The whole experience of eight centuries of university life makes it clear that the loss is not only to the excluded group, but also to those excluding them. Indeed, the loss is to the whole community".

HOLLOWAY COMMISSION

The conference also quoted the report of the Government-appointed Holloway Commission of 1953-4 on academic freedom: "The members of a university should therefore have the right, so long as it occurs on strictly scientific lines, to think freely, to seek the truth without restraint, and to give free expression to their thoughts and finding, even if these should be erroneous. The only way to show that a view is wrong is to answer it by refutation and not to stifle it by authority imposed from above. Whatever trammels academic freedom hampers the universities in the execution of their task."

This then is what a free democratic society means when it speaks of "a university" and of "academic freedom"; this is certainly the concept that exists in those countries in Europe of which Professor Rautenbach has said, "We in South Africa are their legal heirs"—Britain and the Netherlands. **On the evidence of the Professor's talk it is equally certainly a concept that is alien to him and to the institution of which he is Rector.** The concept that truth "is hammered out in discussion, in the clash of ideas" obviously has no place in an institution which denies access to students because their ideas are repugnant to the authorities that control it. Neither, clearly, has the belief that the only way to show that a view is wrong is "to answer it by refutation and not stifle it by authority imposed from above."

The foundation upon which this concept of the place of a university in a free society is based has been succinctly summarised by John Milton thus: "**And though all the windes of doctrin were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licencing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; whoever knew Truth put to wors, in a free and open encounter.**" The open University provides such an encounter.

A university cannot be "against Com-

munism" (any more than it can be against Nationalism) and remain true to its calling. The unbiased search after truth demands not only the refusal of blind acceptance of a doctrine, but also the refusal of blind rejection of that doctrine. Certain aspects of Communism will not commend themselves to the members of a university, and a student body acts wisely that expresses itself strongly against the denial of academic freedom in Communist-ruled countries; but it forfeits the right to do so when it concurs in the same restriction of freedom on its own campus.

No university can support arbitrary banings and detentions without trial and yet remain "true to its own nature", for, apart from the injustice towards the individuals concerned, the whole truth can never be discovered when but one side of a question is heard. **To support these measures is to buy a temporary political advantage at the expense of a timeless moral principle.**

LACK OF FAITH

The principal virtue of a free society is its ability to maintain itself through the truth (and therefore the strength) of its ideas, without recourse to the stifling by authority imposed from above which authoritarian societies always find necessary, whether they be primitive tribal ones, or sophisticated modern Fascist, Communist or Nationalist ones. **The adoption by a society of the weapons of authoritarianism, the refusal to allow Falsehood and Truth to grapple in a "free and open encounter", constitutes an admission of lack of faith in the validity of its ideas, and no society which does this can thereafter truly be called free.**

In actively encouraging the University of Pretoria towards becoming a tool of the State and of a sectional interest, and of abrogating academic freedom, Professor Rautenbach is clearly prejudicing its standing as a university, at least amongst the free nations of the world. The Communist countries (though they will no doubt condemn him) will understand his actions, for this is the type of action which they themselves indulge in.