

was allowed to enter because it showed freedom fighters as unsavoury characters; who would want integration if these are the people who fight for it?

One must not think that apartheid and authoritarian control of thought and education are separate entities. They are one and the same thing. Without authoritarian control there could be no apartheid. Both of them powerfully influence the culture. Some years ago African education was largely in the hands of missionary bodies, who gave what one could generally describe as a liberal education. Today, with the exception of the Transkei, it is firmly in the hands of the Bantu Education Department.

Greatly against the desires of the parents, primary education is given in the vernacular, whereas parents want it to be in English. They believe, and university teachers confirm, that their children are retarded by one or two years by this vernacular teaching. What is more, they want their sons and daughters to be at home in the Western, or shall we call it the modern, world. They (though not often publicly) deride the idea that their culture must be preserved by others and say that they will preserve what they choose to.

TIGHTER CONTROL

There are already signs that the Government would like to exercise a tighter control over the education of white children also, which at the moment is controlled by the provincial administrations. Although white unity is thought to be necessary in the face of threats from within and without, Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking children are educated in separate schools. They may later co-operate in commerce, industry and other spheres, but during their impressionable years they must be kept apart. The Government has also given signs that it is preparing to exercise greater control over university affairs.

Finally, apartheid has had a calamitous effect on that part of culture which has to do with moral ideas. Here I shall confine myself to the moral ideas of the white population. Apartheid, because it has been elevated to the status of the supreme value, has wrought devastation amongst the other values. The rule of law is one of the outstanding casualties; people are banned, banished and detained in solitary confinement for periods up to 180 days without any recourse to the courts of law. White South Africa, with laudable exceptions, accepts this procedure on the grounds that such people "must have been up to something".

ONE CRITERION

Certainly the proposition that the end justifies the means is not now much debated. Such things as the rule of law, university autonomy, parental rights to choose the language in which children are educated,

the freedom of the churches, have all suffered erosion. The value of any thought, any activity, is officially judged by one criterion and one alone — does it further or does it impede the cause of apartheid?

The Press, especially the English-language, is under continuous fire. Although as yet no direct steps have been taken to curb it, the editing of a paper is, in the words of one of our leading editors, "like walking blindfold through a minefield".

Therefore, although one of the main aims of apartheid is to develop the cultures separately, its effect is to ossify them separately, and to make them resistant to the entrance of new ideas. Whether the State will be in the long run successful in maintaining its hold on culture, or whether culture has some inherent and independent life of its own, remains to be seen.

GIGANTIC SELF-DECEPTION

One takes hope from the knowledge that there are South Africans of all races who reject apartheid as a gigantic self-deception, who reject what is called the "traditional way of life", and who speak and write openly, and boldly present their ideas for the consideration and criticism of younger generations, though it may be dangerous for them to do so.

Nor should one overlook the fact that despite the laws and the conventions, and despite the attempt to preserve the separate racial cultures, a great deal of cultural assimilation has already taken place, and though attempts are made to reverse the process (as in making the vernacular the medium of school instruction), there are grounds for believing that they will not be successful. The forces that make for apartheid and those that make for assimilation will continue to fight each other, in a struggle that is as old as South Africa itself.

— Reprinted from
THE UNESCO COURIER, March 1967.

NATIONALISTS, LIBERALS AND APARTHEID

By LEO MARQUARD

LIVING in Cape Town has a number of advantages. To start with, it is not Pretoria. In the second place, we get our political news oven-fresh, as the bakers say, and not through the S.A.B.C. Whichever way one gets

it, of course, it is fortunately still possible to extract a good deal of humour even in contemplating the rather depressing political scene.

I don't know what's happened to my fellow-Afrikaners that they have come to take themselves so seriously. The day before the Worcester by-election "Die Burger" solemnly told its readers it was not often that a by-election was internationally important, but in this case it was. Expressed differently, in my own words, the eyes of the world were on Worcester. Can you imagine Moscow, Washington, London, Paris, Chairman Mao, or even Maseru waiting breathlessly to hear the news that the Nationalists have retained a safe seat by a slightly smaller margin? There is now a provincial council by-election to elect someone to take the place of the man who was promoted to Parliament. One wonders if the world is once more poised between heaven and earth, awaiting the glad tidings.

The thing seems to have spread down to some of the universities. Recently the Afrikaanse Studente Bond was hauled over the coals for supporting Mr. S. E. D. Brown, who doesn't support some good Afrikaners. So, of course, there is nothing to do but create a new image. A press conference is called because "South Africa and the world have the right to know where the A.S.B. stands". Well, well.

BREAKTHROUGH

And every little minor happening is called a "breakthrough". Our new Popeye the naval man, Mr. P. W. Botha, has only to make the most obvious remarks on defence strategy for it to be hailed as a breakthrough. We don't find oil, but the machinery we use constitutes a breakthrough. It is announced as a breakthrough that we can now produce aeroplanes here — all, that is, except the compass and a few of the more intricately machine-tooled parts which we still have to import. All, that is, except the bits that make it fly.

Incidentally, I see that Mr. P. W. Botha has been taking a big part in celebrating what is called the "twenty-first birthday of the South African Navy". Let's see — that makes the birth of the S.A. Navy 1946. A convenient date — the end of the war against Hitler, and so there is no need to mention South Africa's little ships on the Alex-Tobruk run nor the part played by the combined British and South African Navies in defending our shores. But what of that? Some years ago an Air Force Memorial was unveiled near Pretoria and the "South African Digest" managed to describe the story of some of South Africa's great airmen without once mentioning the name of "Sailor" Malan.

One of the amusing things about all these images and breakthroughs is to watch the predicaments into which Nationalists get themselves. They want outsiders

to see the new images — that, after all, is the object — but they are terrified that Dr. Albert Hertzog, Mr. S. E. D. Brown and the Prime Minister's brother will tell the Nationalist rank and file about it in their own inimitable words. So the new image has to be disguised for home consumption as the natural and logical result of true apartheid. There has been no departure from that. When someone in Parliament mentioned the "concessions" Mr. Vorster had made, there were cries of "There are no concessions". I believe them. There are, in sober fact, no concessions. I'll begin to believe in new images when Peter Brown and Robert Sobukwe and Chief Luthuli and Mrs. Helen Joseph are released. Meanwhile, I think one may be forgiven for wondering whether, among all the images, the Nationalists are not, even unwittingly, creating a graven image. And we know what happened to the chaps who did that.

ALMOST TWENTY YEARS

We have now had almost 20 years of consciously-applied National Party rule. Let's have a look at where it has led us and where it seems to be going.

In the first few exuberant months after the lucky win in 1948, Nationalist M.P.s were often asked: "What is apartheid?" No one seemed to know, though there are plenty of people today who will tell you that we now have what was intended all along. To one such questioner in Parliament the then Minister of Railways replied: "Go down to the railway station and see." And what did one find? Plenty of freshly-painted notices saying "Whites Only" and "Non-Whites Only" (in those days it was still Europeans and Non-Europeans). But no one paid much attention since everyone — white, black and coloured — was intent on getting home by the five-fifteen. After twenty years the Government has almost succeeded in separating the colours on the station. True, they have had to build a colossal new station at a cost of millions in order to achieve their aim of preventing non-whites from crossing the path of whites. There is one tiny gap. They had to take account of the white man's incurable inability to do such things as carrying his own bag. So there are counters for whites, counters for non-whites, and counters for non-whites in the service of whites.

However, don't let's delude ourselves into thinking the Nationalists are ineffective. Before the General Election of 1948 a committee of the Party under Mr. Paul Sauer worked out plans for the Party's racial policies. It was that committee that invented the word apartheid. I think they are sorry about it now. The word is altogether too easy for foreigners to pronounce, or slightly mispronounce. So now the Nationalists prefer the more difficult "algehelegebiedskeiding". But

as an election slogan the word *apartheid* served its purpose. It could mean anything or everything to the voters. Chiefly it was intended to scare them into voting Nationalist. But the point I want to make is that the programme laid down by that committee has been carried out with considerable consistency. There is one exception: the committee believed the Indians could not be assimilated and should therefore be repatriated — that is, sent to a country most of them had never seen.

RECORD

Here is the record of what has been done:—

(a) The Group Areas Act and the Population Registration Act have broken up families, destroyed communities, deprived men and women of the right to make a living where and how it best suited them, increased the cost of transport for workers, and created a large army of small officials to prevent South African citizens from freely buying or selling or renting property. The Acts have also been used to try to prevent whites and non-whites from joining in cultural pursuits such as listening to or performing opera or watching ballet, or even playing games together.

(b) After a shameful period of what one can only call constitutional and legal legerdemain, two Acts of Parliament destroyed the rights of Coloured voters at the Cape to have their names registered on a common roll and removed altogether the right of Africans to be represented in Parliament. I need hardly remind you of the latest development. When it became clear that the Progressive Party would win the four seats representing Cape Coloured voters, the Improper Interference Bill was hastily produced. Only under great pressure, which, I am glad to say, included pressure from its own Party, did the Government send the Bill to a Select Committee, which still has to report. I have little doubt that the Government will have its way and that a Party such as our own will no longer be allowed.

(c) Then there was legislation that took away the right of universities to decide whom to admit — a very ancient and important right. Instead, separate university institutions were set up so that Xhosa, Zulu, Tswana, Asian and whites would never mix when studying the sciences or the humanities or anything else.

Incidentally, the cost of *apartheid* at the railway stations is high, but, comparatively, it cannot be anything like what it is for separate universities. It costs the State two and a half to three times as much to maintain a student at a tribal college as it does at one of the white universities. And I know that the older universities could certainly do with the money.

(d) The Suppression of Communism Act and a host of other Acts have seriously damaged the very foundations of liberty — the rule of law. Mr. Vorster, when Minister of Justice, seemed quite incapable of understanding this — so incapable that one tends to suspect, not that he couldn't but that he wouldn't. As he explained, he was always careful to act strictly according to powers granted him by Parliament, according, that is, to a law passed by Parliament. That, of course, is not the rule of law. Now that he has become Prime Minister, Mr. Vorster may possibly come to understand that Parliament itself can destroy the rule of law. Thus far, however, he has shown no signs of changing his image in this respect.

PAID MOST DEARLY

It is under these Acts that South Africa has to my mind paid most dearly for the privilege of having an Afrikaner Nationalist Republic. Think, for instance, of the Treason Trial by which, for more than four weary years, the lives of 156 South Africans were disrupted, in many cases irrevocably, while they were being tried for treason. They were all found not guilty, but when you begin to enquire about what has happened to them since, you find that an astonishing number have been banned, banished, house-arrested or dealt with under powers freely given by Parliament to a Minister. Some of them escaped. One now represents Botswana at the United Nations and has been putting in a good word for us there. That is Prof. Z. K. Matthews, whom we tried for high treason, hounded out of his job as a university teacher, and refused a passport to go to an international conference on race relations in Hawaii. Mind you, as things are going now, I don't despair of seeing him back here, attending State banquets.

Think, too, of the thousands of Coloured men and women who have emigrated — to Canada alone there have been some thousands — and in almost every instance they are people with professional and technical qualifications for which our country is crying out.

Then there are our own Liberal Party friends and their families: Peter Hjul, Ann Tobias, Ruth Heyman, Walter and Adeline Hain, Barney and Daphne Zackon. They have left South Africa (as Mr. Vorster boasted they would) because life had been made economically impossible for them. And there are the people who by any standards should be playing an active role in running this country but are prohibited from doing so by the whim of a Minister: they have not been accused and they have not been tried. They have been silenced by the Minister. I refer, of course, to such people as Mrs. Hill, Chief Luthuli and Peter Brown.

WHAT ARE WE PAYING FOR?

I have been dealing with the price we have paid and will continue to pay to implement apartheid. And what, when you come right down to it, are we paying the price for? Is it not so that political power can be consolidated in the hands of a minority of the white citizens of South Africa?

(a) One and a half million Afrikaners may have been united. Everbody else has been divided. Nationalism, everywhere in the world, must be exclusive. In a multi-racial country it naturally excludes all the other so-called races; in South Africa that means that Afrikaner Nationalism excludes all non-whites. In the beginning is excluded English-speaking South Africans and, in the Transvaal, Jews. It is still not very happy about these groups or about Roman Catholics. It excludes with particular virulence South Africans such as Dr. E. G. Malherbe, Gen. Smuts and Jean van Riet, who are Afrikaans-speaking but not Nationalists.

This exclusiveness divides instead of uniting. It tries to divide white, black and coloured from one another. It divides black into tribes and tries to run everything on a tribal basis. It divides families. And in every case — that is, among white, black or coloured — it divides them into those who will not accept apartheid at any price and those who must accept its hateful racial doctrines for the sake of their jobs and the security of their families. No matter how narrowly or widely you define the human word "brother", Nationalism has set brother against brother.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

(b) What about our external relations? Just as the Nationalists have isolated themselves in South Africa, so they have isolated South Africa in a world that detests our racial policies. We have been told by a few overseas and South African journalists that there is a new look about all this. Mr. Vorster and Dr. Muller are, it seems, leading South Africa once more into the world. As evidence, look at the way we entertain visiting African Ministers. I am of course delighted that we should be on friendly terms with our neighbours, but I am inclined to agree with the Nationalist press when it says, rather angrily, that there is nothing new in this. It is merely the logical conclusion to apartheid. As "Die Burger" columnist explained, this could never have happened had apartheid not been accepted. "Without apartheid", he said, "every cup of tea across the colour line has the appearance of a demonstration. I must confess that when I have had the good fortune to have a cup of tea with some of my non-white friends I never felt that I was demonstrating anything except that I like tea and my friends. It never struck me that there might be a further reason.

I agree with "Die Burger" on one point: we should not delude ourselves or the world that there is an easing up of apartheid. On the contrary, the machinery for implementing it moves ruthlessly on. I welcome most heartily the new international contacts that Dr. Muller has made and may still make. But I am not prepared to accept that as a sign that apartheid has reached its limit. Once you embark on colour discrimination there are no limits.

NOT WITHOUT HOPE

It is necessary and good that we should remind ourselves of what has happened in nineteen years. The penalty for those who forget their history is that they have to learn it all over again in bitter experience. But that does not mean we need to despair. The past and the future are not without hope.

In the first place, it is a matter for thankfulness that, despite the attractions of conforming to Government policy and the penalties for failing to conform, there are still, after two decades, a considerable number of South African who oppose. I believe it true to say that the great majority of South Africans have not been reconciled to apartheid though they may have been forced to accept it for the time being. I also believe that the longer apartheid is applied the more evident does it become that it cannot succeed. Does it sound too facile to say that policies that run so counter to the basic conceptions of civilisation, that inflict so much cruelty and hardship on individuals in order to advance or protect the supposed interests of a minority group, cannot succeed? I don't think so. It is fundamental to a liberal belief that what is morally wrong may have much temporary success but cannot, in the long run, triumph. How short or how long the run is depends on how vigorous and vigilant those who realise what is happening are.

Even if we should cease to be a Liberal Party we remain liberals, and it can never be the part of liberals to sit waiting idly for evil policies to fail. The work of liberals in South Africa, as I see it, is twofold: constantly — always and everywhere — to protest against racialism and to put forward reasoned alternative policies; and secondly, to prepare consciously and seriously for the time when present policies fail and different ones are called for. We as individuals may not be around when that blessed time comes; but what we do now will, we believe, make it easier for those who are around to do what has to be done.

APPEAL OF LIBERALISM

This may not sound like a rousing call to action. If you want dramatic events you must join the kind of Party that promises action and quick results — and

very often gets them. We can't do that. We can't offer a kind of cops-and-robbers attraction; that can only be done by the Nationalist Party, that is forever fighting with its back to the wall and urging people to get inside the white laager. Except in the overheated minds of the Security Branch we have no cloak-and-dagger stuff. The only appeal of the Liberal Party and of liberalism is to ask South Africans of all races to join in applying their minds to South Africa's problems. This is not glamorous. And it is emphatically not easy. Seventy years ago Keir Hardie told the Labour Party in Britain to think. "It will hurt like hell at first", he said, "but keep on trying."

Years ago a friend asked me: "Can't we have a militant liberalism?" You can't — by definition you can't. What liberalism asks is a much harder thing. It is the intellectual equivalent of "blood, sweat and tears" that it calls for.

Thus far, in history, liberalism has never called in vain. South Africa has never been without men and women of all races who have devoted themselves to liberalism. So, let's not waste time on dramatics, but let's get on quietly with what we have to do.

I have, in the past, quoted John Morley and I shall no doubt do so again:

"Let us not be afraid of our own shadows. We have principles we believe in, we have faith, we have great traditions, and we have a great cause behind us and before us. Let us not lose courage and straightforwardness."

— From an address to the Annual Conference of the Natal Provincial Division of the Liberal Party — May, 1967.

WILL BOBBY BOB TOO ?

By "Vortex"

I

IN spite of South Africa's so-called isolation from the rest of the world (in fact, of course, it is the rest of the world that has isolated itself from South Africa), our country manages to keep abreast in many fields of human achievement. One such field — one that is sometimes neglected, surprisingly, by our otherwise enterprising propagandists — is philosophy.

The philosophers and psychologists of the so-called West were given a rude shock recently when they realised that a most significant philosophical truth had

been enunciated, and with remarkably little fuss, in maligned South Africa. And it is an indication of the intellectual vitality of the Republic, of the wide diffusion of probing and profound thought, that the great formulation was made not by a professional thinker or research worker, but by the Prime Minister himself. Happy is the nation that is ruled by a philosopher-guardian of the sort that Plato used to dream about!

In a fine speech Mr. Vorster pointed out (modestly and casually: he gave no sign that he was breaking through one of the big mental sound-barriers) that human intercourse is in one respect far more complicated than most people have naïvely supposed. He took the case of a meeting between two Prime Ministers. Until now most people have assumed that such a meeting would be, to put it in layman's language, both a personal confrontation and a matter of international relationship. What Mr. Vorster demonstrated — brilliantly, and with his usual lucidity — is that such a meeting may often be EITHER personal OR international. . . . Now this newly-discovered truth is clearly of tremendous importance: it is staggering that the world has not come upon it before.

II

GREAT VALUE

In considering the great value of Mr. Vorster's discovery, let us stick to the instances, the experimental data, that he cited, and to his own field of reference.

A white South African cannot (it is axiomatic) have a social relationship with a black man. But his relationship with a black man from another country can be of a decently unsocial, cleanly international nature. And once things have been put on a properly inhuman footing, great freedom of intercourse is possible: a white man can, without any unnaturalness, drink tea with a black man, take a meal with him, even (some progressive thinkers daringly affirm) pass food to him. In older days people would have suspected that ugly feelings of friendship might creep into such an event; but Mr. Vorster has now shown that this is not so — that the personal and the international are different in kind, not merely in degree. A white man may, then, have dealings with a foreign black man — and even perhaps with a foreign black woman — without compromising himself in the slightest: the conversation between them is tainted by no trace of affection or esteem; their handshakes are touchingly free of sincerity.

COROLLARIES

Once an intellectual achievement has been announced to the world, it is of course seized on and developed by many alert minds. No people have been