

reality

A JOURNAL OF LIBERAL OPINION

IN THIS ISSUE...

Editorial	page 2
The Brain Drain: by Edgar H. Brookes	page 4
Who are the Revolutionaries? by D. G. Gillham	page 5
The Middle East: A Liberal's Dilemma	page 10
A Liberal's Faith	page 12
The Urban Africans: People or Units: by R. N. Robb	page 14
African Writing in Danger: by Obed Kunene	page 17
The Washing of the Spears: comment by Alan Paton	page 18
This South Africa	page 20

EDITORIAL

ELECTIONS, 1970

Mr. Vorster has won the election, with as handsome a majority as any government requires. While he was fighting off the Herstigte peril, and "standing for South Africa", a naughty United Party stole nine seats from him. The fact is that Mr. Vorster, appearing never to lack self-confidence, and having promised publicly to trounce the United Party, has made a fool of himself. There must be a lot of disquiet in the ranks of the Nationalists.

The United Party is understandably jubilant, but it must not expect to improve much on its present situation. The Progressive Party has a right to feel downhearted, especially at having missed so narrowly a second seat in Parliament, and the chance of providing reinforcements for its brave but overburdened Helen Suzman. The Herstigte Party is no doubt bloody but unbowed, for they believe that they were chosen by an authority even higher than the volk. And they are burning with righteous anger, having been chastised by the whips that they made for the backs of others.

What do the results portend, not for this or that party, but for South Africa and all its peoples? Are they the heralds of change, or is this the mixture as before, with a slight alteration in the quantities of the ingredients?

It is this question that this editorial of "Reality" attempts to answer.

The annihilation of the Herstigtes is a gain for South Africa. They won 6.1% of the total Nationalist vote, and 3.6% of the total vote. It is however difficult to assess the strength of the herstigte element in Afrikaner Nationalism. There can for example be no doubt that many of the hooligans who assaulted and shouted at Herstigte candidates, were really attacking their spiritual kin, but did not know it. The herstigte element was there in 1910, and broke away from Botha in 1912, under the leadership of General Hertzog, himself a more civilised man than his son. They called themselves Nationalists. Within twelve years they had come to power, but when Hertzog joined with Smuts in 1934, the herstigtes broke away again, this time under

Malan, also a more civilised man than Hertzog's son. They were called Purified Nationalists. Within fourteen years they had come to power. The herstigtes did not break away again till 1969, and this time they broke away from a party itself Nationalist, under Hertzog's son himself.

Will they come to power within twelve or fourteen years? It seems improbable. It seems as though some change has come about in Afrikaner Nationalism, as a result of the influence of urbanisation, of the entry into big business, of increasing affluence, and twenty-two years of steadily growing power; and also, no doubt, a realisation that the English-speaking people might be needed in case of emergency. It appears that the herstigte element in Afrikanderdom, though it may long persist, will not repeat its successful history of the past. However it is worth while noting that in the past the herstigtes twice came to power after breaking away from parties only partially Nationalist. If the Herstigtes had done well in 1970, Vorster might have joined forces with Graaff, and history might conceivably have repeated itself. But improbably so, because the issues of republic and empire are dead, and on the main racial issues there is not all that much to distinguish Herstigtes from Nationalists and U.P.'s. They all believe in white supremacy.

Why has white South Africa appeared to move left? We should attribute it mainly to grievances, bread-and-butter ones, heavy taxation, high cost of land and houses, the Land Bank revelations, Ministerial arrogance, and occasional racial slights. Also some voters were revolted by the disgusting manner in which the Nationalist feud was conducted. For both these reasons U.P.-type voters who voted Nationalist in 1966, returned to the fold. And lastly there are more young voters than ever, and an increasing number of these are revolting against the dogmas and slogans that have dominated our politics for so long. They are concerned about the erosion of the rule of law, the cruelties of apartheid, and the abuse of governmental power.

Do the results give grounds for hope? Is there any hope for the abrogation of unjust laws? None that we can see. Is there any hope for their more humane implementation? Non that we can see. Is there any hope for the success of the outward-looking policy? Little that we can see. The unwritten truth is

that Maoris will only be welcome here if they are fair and few. Black diplomats will live in cocoons. And English-speaking politicians will have to behave like Senator Horwood to get even a lick of the Nationalist plate. Outspoken students will be harassed as before. The terrible wall of silence between black and white will be as frightening as before. The doctrines of apartheid in so far as they relate to trains and buses, housing, education, will remain immutable: but in so far as they relate to labour, jobs, shops, and servants, they will be tampered with to suit our white convenience. Our country will become richer, all of us will have a little more money (before tax), but black income will be the same fraction of white income as it is now. The myth of separate development will remain as strong as ever; more money will be spent on it, but the magic return to the homelands, if any part of it is to be effected, will be achieved only at the cost of more legislation, more restriction, more suffering. The chances for a black man to enter the modern world, to become a big engineer or architect or scientist, are negligible. He has only one hope of achieving prominence, and that is by becoming a Chief Minister of a homeland; otherwise his name will never be heard.

Will the increased strength of the United Party mean any improvement in the fields of civil liberty, of the administration of the law? It is doubtful. The Nationalist Party is notorious for disregarding all opposition when its caucus has decided on any new law. Will the United Party ever become a government? Never, that we can see. One can only hope that it will be a stouter defender of liberty than in the past.

Is there no hope at all for change? Change brought about by a changing world —yes, to some extent. Change of heart—yes, but mainly in the young, and that is not so much a change of heart as a revolt against the dogmas of a hide-bound and blinkered society. It is no doubt partly due to this revolt that the Progressive Party, while failing to gain a new seat, acquitted itself with credit. No one can predict how fast this vote will grow, and whether there will be twice as many nonconformist young people at the next election, but it is not unreasonable to expect it to be so. There is a time to sow, and a time to reap. This is a time to sow. Harvest is still a long way off. And sometimes the rain won't fall.

THE **BRAIN DRAIN**

by Edgar H. Brookes

One of the strangest political phenomena of South Africa to those who remember the great days of the old Cape Parliament is the almost complete lack of English-speaking political leadership. What has happened to these inheritors of a great political tradition?

More than one explanation can be offered of this baffling development, but one certainly is the skimming off of the cream of the community in the two World Wars. Were the men who fell in 1914-18 and 1939-45, or the sons whom they never lived to beget, with us today, the political scene in South Africa would be very different. Twice in forty years war has taken the best of our manhood. War is defended by some muddled thinkers as ensuring "the survival of the fittest". In fact the voluntary system means that the most adventurous and most physically fit are sent to the front to be shot, while the unfit survive.

In the second World War the Army was made up of Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking in almost equal numbers. We may therefore re-word our problem and ask why in the South Africa of Saul Solomon, J. W. Scuer, James Rose Innes and W. P. Schreiner the number of liberal thinkers is so small.

And that brings us to the third great skimming-off of our history — the brain drain since 1948.

ACADEMIC EMIGRATION

The existence of this academic emigration is not in doubt. In recent visits to Canada I found South African Professors in Newfoundland and British Columbia, and almost everywhere in between. It seemed that one could not visit any Canadian University without finding at least one able young South African on its Faculty — men whom South Africa could ill spare.

A certain amount of international interchange is unavoidable in academic life. But this is usually not very numerous and it is a two-way movement. The present process is very different. Our men are going out in considerable numbers and we get very little intake in exchange.

What is it that has caused this unprecedented emigration of University men? Some, of course, were in actual danger, such as the

able young lecturers imprisoned without trial during the State of Emergency in 1960. Some felt themselves restricted in their teaching, speaking and writing. Some feared that their children would be indoctrinated at school. Some felt that the contest for freedom and equality was hopeless, and so they left, while others felt it their duty to stay and fight. Every man must be his own judge in a case like this: at least we can say that they left in no cowardly spirit.

There has also been a student emigration. That South African students should seize the opportunity of continuing their University studies overseas is not only permissible but laudable. Such a movement of students has been going on for years. The present situation is different: students are leaving us who can never come back.

REFUSED PASSPORTS

In a significant number of cases, outstanding students who have earned scholarships to overseas Universities have been refused Passports by the Government. They must in these circumstances either give up the hope of further study in one of the great Universities of England or America, or apply for an Exit Permit. The issue of an Exit Permit means that they can never come back. It is not refused.

For — and this is the most shattering aspect of the brain drain — the Government is glad to let them go. This is the more striking because these are all outstanding young men: their selection for scholarships shows that. The service which they might have rendered to South Africa is of incalculable value. But mediocrity, if combined with political apathy or subservience, is much more pleasing to the authorities. **The sad fact remains that the Government not only does not mind these brilliant students going, but it actually welcomes their departure.**

In some cases students who already held valid passports had them withdrawn. In at least two recent cases, students had their South African citizenship withdrawn. (There were certainly passport irregularities in both these cases, but quite obviously these could have been got over had the students concerned not been liberal thinkers. Both had been Presidents of S.R.C.'s, one had been a President of Nusas.)

There are cases of Rhodesian students having been ordered to leave the Republic, although South Africa's general relationship with Rhodesia is friendly and though scores of Rhodesian students are studying in this country. One had held a high position in his S.R.C., one had been Deputy Vice-President of Nusas.

GOVERNMENT'S SATISFACTION

What has been said about the Government's satisfaction in seeing liberal-minded students of ability and influence leave South Africa for good is equally true of the emigration of Professors and Lecturers. No regret has ever been expressed at the loss of these able men. No effort has been made either to retain them or to induce them to return. As to the

general public it surveys the whole scene with apathy. Yet the loss, spiritual and intellectual, to South Africa is beyond computation.

From all this we deduce certain political conclusions. The first is that the Government of South Africa rates conformity high above originality, ability and force of character. The second is that it sees so little hope of converting liberal academicians that it is glad to let them go away; surely this is to confess its own intellectual bankruptcy. Liberals believe in no force but arguments: the Government knows no argument but force.

Thus deprived, we who are left must fight on and not succumb to discouragement or despair. Our responsibility is all the heavier now that we are left in diminished numbers to face an increasingly grim situation. After the 11th November, 1918, the warring countries had to face life courageously despite the fact that the names of many of their best would be recorded not in history but only on War Memorials. Twenty-seven years later the same act of faith had to be made in face of searing bereavement. So it is with us in South Africa in 1970. Like the Roman Senate after Cannae, we must "not despair of the Republic."

WHO are the revolutionaries ?

by D. G. Gillham

The true revolutionary refuses to negotiate or to compromise because the reforms he wishes to introduce would come too slowly or not come at all if he were to turn aside from his object or fail to destroy the fabric of established institutions. Destruction is a necessary part of his programme because society presents to the reformer, so he says, a blank and unmoveable wall of bureaucratic procedures that defy his efforts to be heard or be effective. The reformer is confronted, not by people who are opposed to him and arguments which are contrary to his own, but instead by institutions which are deaf to him and people who are indifferent to what he has to say.

MACHINERY

Society is a massive piece of machinery, the cogs and levers of which are procedures and rules, prejudices, stereotypes, customs, conventions, and habits. It is stupid — a great unwieldy bulk that is incapable of hearing criticism or of improving itself because it is a senseless automation concerned only with running itself — a lumpish monster of procedures and ingrained habit that blunders along on its sightless way. If intelligence is to enter

this situation, the revolutionary suggests, then it is no use trying to introduce it by intelligent means, because the monster has no brain to absorb it. If reform is to come, and reform is an attempt to apply intelligence — someone's intelligence — to the situation in which men find themselves, then it can come only through revolutionary action, which is destructive. Only if the monster is smashed is there any possibility of men being forced to look at their situation, listen to the voice of

reason, reassess their needs, and institute an era which is rational and, because it is rational, truly humane and liberal.

REAL GRIEVANCE

One feels a good deal of sympathy with what the revolutionary says. His frustration is akin to the frustration that all thoughtful people must feel who live in a society they cannot wholly approve of, and which they wish were better ordered. The revolutionary carries his argument to an extreme but that reasoning is based on a real grievance: the recalcitrance of the established order of things; its inaccessibility; its inability to hear the pleas of the enlightened. It is a man of poor spirit who has not, at some time, wished to take the neck of the established order, if it conveniently had one, wring it and set things going on a footing acceptable to his own idea of right and justice. There are, of course, two dangers in this desire: one being that one's conception of a better world may be a mistaken one, and the second being that one's zeal may incline one to be intolerant, for even the most liberal idealism may lose sight of the means for the sake of its end; may wish to force freedoms on people that they do not want, by the use of methods that are arbitrary and illiberal in the extreme. We need look no further than Africa to see that this is so, and looking at History we see that nearly all revolutions are started by men with the best of intentions and the most humane ideas, but are usually taken over by men whose humanity is lost in fanaticism.

DIFFERENCES

There is a great difference between the revolutionary who shows zeal and the revolutionary who shows fanaticism: the zealot wishes people to share his ideals and tries to convince them to freely accept his view, while the fanatic is determined that people shall accept the good he offers, at the point of a gun if necessary. There is also a difference between a responsible conservatism and an irresponsible one — as great a difference as between the zealot and the fanatic, for while a zeal to change what exists and a responsible love of what exists seem to spring from the same impulse (to be not incompatible, and to be beneficial in their operation), a fanatical desire to impose change goes together with an unimaginative and bigoted determination to have things as they are. These last two go together because they both



spring from a selfish impulse, they pay no regard to the needs or wishes of other persons, and they do often exist side by side in the same mind, incredible though it may seem that they should do so. As we drew a distinction among revolutionaries between the zealot and the fanatic, then, it is necessary to draw one amongst the conservatives — we might call them appreciators and bigots — because the one category, having come to what seems to them a just appreciation of what exists, sees what is good in itself and wishes to retain it, while the other category of persons, finding that the present state of affairs suits them very well, are determined to maintain the **status quo** so that they can continue to exploit their circumstances.

BURKE

The most thorough study of revolutionary thinking is, perhaps, that undertaken by Burke in his **Reflections on the French Revolution** written in 1789, three months after the taking of the Bastille. It was expected that Burke's pamphlet (or book) would endorse the Revolution, for a number of reasons: firstly, he was a Whig, a member of the liberal party of the time; secondly, as a member of Parliament he had spoken up for the American colonists,

prior to their revolution and the Independence, gained in 1783; thirdly, he had spoken up for the Catholics in Ireland; fourthly, he had attempted to curb the King's corruption of the English Parliament; fifthly, he was opposed to slavery. In short, he appeared to be a most thorough-going 'agitator', and it came as a surprise to many when Burke, instead of speaking out in favour of the Revolution in France, proved most disdainful of it and attacked it sharply.

As a commentary on events in France Burke's book is not of great interest. He is too close in time to what took place, and is frankly prejudiced against the Revolution.

In addition, he is using the events as an excuse to discuss the principles of revolution in order to influence thinking at home (in order to influence thinking about the state of England), so events in France are at the periphery of his attention, while possible future events in England are what really concern him.

CONSERVATIVE

No one was more aware than Burke that there were matters that demanded reform in England, but no one was more determined to set about rectification in a conservative way — in a way, that is, that would not destroy what was valuable. He is certainly not prepared to approve any change made for the sake of a mere principle, that is, for the sake of an -ism, and not even for the sake of liberalism, because, for Burke, practical consequences are a better guide to the judgement of political acts than all the principles in the world. Liberty, he says, is a fine principle, and something to be striven for, but so is government a fine principle, and if the acquisition of liberty results in a chaotic ordering of civil affairs then no good, on balance, has been gained. Thus the Burke who had approved the freedom gained in America and who could advocate self rule for Ireland deplored the effects of democracy in France and could argue against the full extension of the franchise in England, (though

in favour of some reform). He sums up his wary attitude towards France:

I should . . . suspend my congratulations on the new liberty of France until I was informed how it had been combined with government; with public force; with the discipline and obedience of armies; with the collection of an effective and well-distributed revenue; with morality and religion; with solidity and property; with civil and social manners. All these (in their way) are good things too; and without them Liberty is not a benefit whilst it lasts, and is not likely to continue long. The effect of liberty to individuals, is, that they may do what they please: we ought to see what it will please them to do, before we risk congratulations, which may be soon turned into complaints.

CLAIMS RIGHT

The revolutionary claims the right to alter the state of government and to alter the social and economic pattern of his country, basing the right on two ideas: firstly, on the idea that sovereignty stems from the people, and that they may, therefore, determine the form of their government, and secondly, on the idea that the revolutionary has a better knowledge of how the state should be run than the present governors. Most revolutionaries, of course, entertain these two ideas simultaneously. Burke denies the right of the people to alter their constitution at will, and he denies that any man, or set of men, however wise or numerous, can possess the wisdom that entitles them to prescribe wholesale renovations of the fabric of government or society. On Burke's view, rights are an outcome of civil life, they flow from the fact of being governed, and, they have no other basis. Changing the form of a government against the will of those who govern (to limit the powers of a King, for instance, or to alter the structure of a parliament), is an achievement of force, not an achievement of right. Burke does not exclude the possibility of a government reforming itself in a constitutional

manner, and affirms that 'A state without some means of change is without the means of its conservation.' But, for reasons that we will go on shortly to examine, even those persons in power at the moment, if they are wise, will effect their changes with caution and within the limits of what the constitution allows. Changes beyond that allowance, whether they stem from the people or the government, are an infringement of rights; are, in the latter case, a revolution from above, and so a matter of force, not entitlement. The point at issue here is the location of the source of human rights. It was being claimed that these rights **inhered** in the will of the people, and Burke asserts that rights are an acquisition of the people, vested in, and guaranteed by, the control exercised over the people by the government and by the constitution, and it is by the continuance and permanency of government that rights continue to be effective. There is, he states, no other source of rights and to say that they stem from the people is to talk in terms of non-existent abstractions. Rights are, briefly, an outcome of our institutions and not their basis; we do not possess rights 'naturally' but receive them as an inheritance, and the advantages of looking on them as an inheritance, Burke says, are numerous. Firstly, as he puts it:

the idea of inheritance furnishes a sure principle of conservation, and a sure principle of transmission; without at all excluding a principle of improvement. It leaves acquisition free; but it secures what it acquires.

Men are able to point precisely at what their rights are, and know exactly what is theirs to defend. In addition, an inherited constitution has acquired, during long years of trial and error, its own built in checks, with a balance of power between conflicting interests. In a balanced constitution no party or interest can exert its will in defiance of other interests, but must convince opposing elements of its wisdom, so that government becomes a matter of reason, not of force.

DISADVANTAGES

Opposed to the advantage of an established inherited constitution are the disadvantages of a raw, untested constitution in which arbitrary power has full sway, such as that which Burke sees as now set up in France. The disadvantages are numerous.

Firstly, the power, which is unchecked, is placed in the hands of men without experience of government. Secondly, government will be that of theoreticians, interested in the establishment of principles and theories, instead of in seeing to the practical wants of the people they govern. Thirdly, the leaders are forced to bow to the most ignorant of their followers as it is by pandering to them that they must hope to remain in power. Fourthly, the followers must 'become subservient to the worst designs of their leaders' because in such designs the apparent interests of the ruling group are seen to lie.

Plainly, in the absence of any of the traditional restraints, such as those imposed by an inherited constitution, no one has any rights at all except to what they can grab for themselves and hold on to. Burke predicts that the rights that are being squabbled over by the National Assembly will soon be seized by some dictator because there is nothing to guarantee their possession. And he was quite right, of course.

TEMPERED BY SUBMISSION

Such evils would be tempered by submission to the tried procedures of a long established constitution with its built-in checks, but these, alas! have been abandoned by the French; their Assembly, says Burke:

... since the destruction of the orders, has no fundamental law, no strict convention, no respected usage to restrain it. Instead of finding themselves obliged to conform to a fixed constitution, they have a power to make a constitution which shall conform to their designs. Nothing in heaven or upon earth can serve as a control on them.

This is one of the chief hall-marks of revolutionary government: the governors can brook no opposition, and they make it their business to ensure that no effective opposition to their will shall arise. A government with an -ism to uphold cannot afford to be tolerant, and even so high-sounding a principle as that of the rights of man is, for Burke, a dangerous ground on which to construct a constitution. The science of Government is, for him, a practical one, dealing with practical needs and not theoretical, though he assumes that the governor will be better if he is a man of good faith and of high principles. Constitutions are a growth, the outcome of time and of a process of trial and error. The revolutionary believes in his ability to construct a constitution on the grounds of the -ism he happens to believe in, and this belief is a second hallmark of the revolutionary. He is directed by abstract ideas and not by the real needs of the community he lives in — indeed, Burke explains, the high principles and superior concerns of the revolutionary make him incapable of the 'tedious, moderate, but practical resistance' which brings about improvement of lasting value. The third hall-mark of Burke's revolutionary in power is that he busies himself remedying names not vices. They give new names to old things in the hope of remedying them, but all the old evils live on in a new guise, and, in reality, revolutionary government changes forms and fashion without changing the substance. There, then, are three of the chief characteristics of the revolutionary according to Burke: his inability to brook opposition, his reliance on abstract theory and his concern with outward form rather than real needs, and, of course, these are of particular interest in South Africa, where revolution and subversion are much discussed topics.

INSTITUTIONS

The conservative governor differs from the revolutionary because he sees that rights

and wisdom lie, not in the -ism but in institutions. Burke puts it:

We are afraid to put men to live and trade each on his own private stock of reason; because we suspect that the stock in each man is small, and that the individuals would do better to avail themselves of the general bank and capital of nations and of ages.

Burke argues that no man or set of men are wise enough or omniscient enough to say what the best future course for a nation is, or to say what constitutional changes are necessary. The happier consequences of past trials are embodied in our constitution, and we abandon the principles and precedents contained in our constitution at our peril, taking a chance on our own wisdom instead of that which has been accumulated. Wisdom does not lie in the fabrication of principle, but in taking the methods and customs available to us and turning them to good practical use.

PLEADING THE CASE

It is clear that I have been pleading the conservative case against the revolutionary in putting Burke forward as I have, but one must remember that Burke was no bigot — not a diehard conservative hanging on to things because it suited his purse or his position, but a disinterested, intelligent, and passionate observer, defending what appeared valuable to him, though unafraid to denounce abuses when he saw them, and to speak his mind at all times. His convictions are of the conservative variety, but he was a wonderful reformer also, patiently and untiringly working for what was just, through the institutions and mechanisms society placed at his disposal. His views were liberal in the extreme, but they were not those of a stereotyped liberal, and he placed too high a value on order, decorum, continuity and flexibility to embrace a revolutionary cause. It seems to me that there united in him both the zeal of the true reformer and the capacity for reverence of the true conservative.

At one time liberal support for the Israeli side in the Middle East conflict was wholehearted. Recently however, some liberals have begun to feel doubtful about their allegiance. We present two views.



THE MIDDLE EAST A Liberal's Dilemma

It is not necessary for one to go as far as Mercutio and say "A plague o' both your houses" in considering Israel and the Arab States. What is difficult to avoid however, is the situation whereby one is faced with intolerable actions and indefensible attitudes on both sides; and a certain point is reached whereby to maintain one's own standards and values it becomes necessary to question and perhaps abandon the cause one most supports. The issue is most real for the liberal, and particularly so for the South African liberal.

LIBERAL SUPPORT

For obvious reasons, the vast majority of South African liberals, whether Jewish or not, have supported the State of Israel, in regard both to its creation and its subsequent struggle to exist peacefully. This is so even with set-backs such as the Israeli involvement in the 1956 Franco-British commercial conspiracy over Suez. Only the unbearable harassment of Israel for a lengthy period before that can explain her participation in what is almost universally recognised as an appalling 19th century type act of imperialism.

It is also fair to say that the vast majority of South African liberals supported Israel in the 1967 War. In fact they went further than that. Despite the intense emotionalism with which South African Jewry reacted to the war (even after it was over), most liberals were prepared fully to associate themselves with the Israelis. Admittedly many Africans sided with the Arabs as they said this was a

Coloured-White War, but this view must be dismissed as based on ignorance (particularly of the colour of most of the Israelis).

However, since the war much has occurred which has caused liberals to question the conduct of Israel, and many liberals have in consequence withdrawn their support from Israel — a situation which confuses and hurts the Israelis and sometimes confuses and hurts the liberals. This article will try to examine some aspects of the conduct of the Israelis which has resulted in this present state.

ZIONIST NOTION

Within a matter of weeks after the 1967 War, Jordanian Jerusalem was absorbed into Israel and became "non-negotiable". What had been a war of survival resulted in territorial additions. Then there was talk of more territories being added, and later of occupied territories being colonised. Slowly but surely

the picture resembles the right-wing Zionist notion of Israel "both sides of the Jordan."

The deplorable act of savagery against an El Al plane at Athens was given as the "excuse" for the hooliganism against Beirut Airport — and a flimsier basis for this act could hardly be found. The really active use of the Lebanon by Arab guerrillas in the anti-Israel hostilities can be traced back to that event, and the Israelis are directly to blame for the weakening of governmental control in the Lebanon. Whatever legitimate basis the Lebanon had for resisting the demands of the Arab Guerrillas for bases in the Lebanon now fell away.

COMMUNITY PUNISHMENT

Within the occupied territories themselves, the Israelis have assumed the classic attitudes of occupiers, and have adopted some of the methods so familiar to occupied Europe. Community guilt and community punishment have become the norm. Whilst the Israelis have not taken the lives of those suspected of knowing the perpetrators of acts of violence, the demolition of homes differs only in degree and not in principle from the horror of Lidice. The Israeli technique becomes all the crueler when it is realised that the civilian population has to fear not only the Israelis, but also El Fatah.

In recent weeks the intensity of Israel's attacks on Egypt and Jordan bears a stronger similarity to active belligerency than to defensive actions — a similarity which cannot now be dismissed with the trite statement that attack is the best form of defence, however true that might have been in the circumstances of mid-1967.

"NOT PEOPLE"

The Israeli cause is furthermore weakened by its seeming indifference to the cause of the refugees. If the arguments used by South African Jews in regard to these refugees is in any way a reflection of Israeli thinking — official or unofficial — then one must indeed ponder sadly on a people which has so quickly forgotten its own ghastly history, especially in the last forty years. These remarks are typical: "The Arabs are not people". "They ran away and forfeited their right to return". "No one asked them to leave". "The Palestinians were not a nation". "The Arab states could have absorbed them". "Most of

the refugees are the children of the original refugees — not the refugees themselves." These "arguments" are so palpably feeble that they do not bear serious analysis. The refugee question is indeed immensely difficult: but it is the apparent contempt for the refugees which is so disturbing.

These views are of the same type as the attempt to justify the annexation of Eastern Jerusalem. "It was never Jordan's under the partition scheme". Was West Jerusalem Israel's? I can hardly imagine even the most anti-Israeli politician (outside the Arab States) advocating a return to the partition boundaries. Then the South African Zionist says that "Jordan was an artificially created State." Was not Israel? And almost all of Africa? Israel needs to be preserved from its supporters almost as much as its enemies.

DISILLUSIONMENT

Perhaps one feels so strongly about the Israeli conduct because it represents the great disillusionment. For a country whose creation was a moral and political imperative after the 1939-1945 war (whatever may have been the position before), whose right to exist in peace as a viable political and economic unit is, in the view of the writer, absolute, whose moral role is unique, to conduct itself in a classically imperialistic way towards both territory and conquered people is intolerable to liberals.

Also, perhaps, one's views are partly a reaction to an uncritical belief (aided by an uncritical press) in the total truth and justice of Israel's cause by Jews in South Africa, many of whom have become indifferent to the needs of their own society and who demand a conformity of thought amongst all other Jews. Israel can do no wrong, the Arabs no right; criticism is tantamount to treason; non-contribution to Israeli causes is a legitimate basis for social blackmail. An example of this uncritical approach to Israel is the absence of any understanding of the role of the Arab guerrilla. In any other situation of territorial occupation South African Jews would accept that an underground is legitimate; and that civilian populations (including children) do get hurt, as these sectors of the population cannot be part of the State for some purpose and not for others. The conquering country has no right (or power) to determine how the conquered must fight back. The tragedy is less what the guerrillas do, than that they have to exist at all.

GENOCIDE NO SOLUTION

Israel is the great disillusion. But how is it possible to back the Arab States in their determination, avowed by clear implication and expression, to destroy the Israeli State and slaughter its people? It is not a question of "liberating conquered territory" (i.e. the territory occupied in 1967), as all of Israel is "conquered territory" to the Arabs. It was so in mid-1967 and remains so. The claim for the return of the territory occupied in 1967 is surely valid, as is the claim for a just settlement of the refugees question. But genocide is not, and can never be.

There is no question of peace for the Arab States, even those which were not in the least affected by the creation of the Israeli State, and which are remote from the Israeli boundaries. Prior to 1967, at most the Palestinian refugees had a cause for war; and the pious protestation of "Arab brotherhood" must be dismissed with the scorn it deserves.

If the Arab States did succeed in destroying Israel, it would hardly be the Palestinians who would benefit as Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iraq carved up the territory and in turn warred over the spoils. One shudders at the thought of the Arabs being successful in their

aims, and wonders at the indifference of countries such as the U.S.S.R. and France at such a prospect. At times it is difficult to avoid a sneaking suspicion of Russian and French regret at the creation of Israel, and a faint idea that these countries would welcome the disappearance of Israel as a separate political entity, leaving the Middle East wide open for direct inter-Arab conflict by which only the big powers could benefit.

Differences have regularly been resolved in other ways than by sitting down at the same table. You don't have to like or talk to the man with whom there is a practical necessity to resolve a dispute; and the Israeli insistence on sitting down to negotiate peace is little more than an intention to humiliate. But it becomes a different matter when one party either pretends that the other does not really exist; or, make the essence of its settlement the other's subsequent non-existence.

The Middle East does not permit neutrality. The liberal, however, may soon be hard pressed to find a side to support; and there is already the danger that liberals have switched their sympathies. The moral cause conducted immorally soon becomes as bad as the immoral cause itself.

THE MIDDLE EAST A Liberal's Faith

The writer of this article is a Christian, not a Jew, and can therefore not be accused of "thinking with the blood". He avows himself to be a partisan. It was difficult not to be a partisan in the years when the State of Israel was in the process of formation, when Hitler's prosecution was destroying millions of Jews in Europe and when the little spot of ground in what was then called Palestine seemed to be the only secure refuge for those who could escape. Deep feelings were aroused at that time and they have been and still are difficult to shake off.

The writer, however, is not a blind partisan. There are things in the policy of the State of Israel with which he disagrees, particularly the reluctance to grant full recognition to those Jews by birth who have embraced the Christian faith. He is not at all convinced that every single Israeli action is right, but he feels that he should come out strongly in favour of Israel and against the Arab States, who are trying to destroy it. Some of the considerations which make him feel in this way are detailed below.

Where in the whole world is a Jewish State to be established if not in the present territory of Israel? Are the Jews the only race in the whole world who cannot have any sort of State of their own? The whole extent of the State of Israel, even at its widest, is the merest fraction of the vast territories occupied by the Arabs.

FANTASTIC SUGGESTION

In the past the fantastic suggestion was put forward that Uganda should become a

Jewish State. Just think what would have happened during the 1960's if this had been done. Moreover the State of Israel was fully recognised and approved by the United Nations. That recognition is one of the few points in the history of the United Nations where the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. agreed. The fact that the Soviet Union has now altered its mind cannot destroy the moral fact of that agreement. The highest international body in existence approved a Jewish State in Palestine and has never revoked that approval.

In the second place Israel is a very striking example of a democratic society and therefore should be supported by all Liberal thinkers. It is not only that genuine elections on a wide franchise determine who shall govern Israel, but perhaps even more deeply it is the attitude of life to be found in the Kibbutzim. Work on the land in the daytime followed by Bach or Beethoven in the evening, sharing the financial burdens without Communism, an equality of status among the inhabitants -- these are tremendous affirmations of the Liberal ideal. There is nothing like them in the Arab States. What is there under Nasser's regime which can give any Liberal any sort of satisfaction or pleasure? With the possible exception of Lebanon can any Arab State be described as truly democratic?

MAGNIFICENT EXAMPLE

Thirdly, Israel has given the world a magnificent example of how land, ruined for centuries, can be reclaimed. One is thinking here not only of the Negev but of Israel generally. Under Arab rule it was allowed to go to rack and ruin. The hard-working and scientifically minded Israelis are indeed carrying out the ideal of one of their own prophets. They are making the desert blossom like the rose.

They have at least as much right to the State of Israel as the United States has to

areas like Montana or Oregon, which were once Indian hunting grounds.

There is a certain type of so-called "Liberal" who feel obliged to oppose the State of Israel because it is alleged to be white colonisation in a "brown" area. Allowing for the fact that not all Jews are white and that many Egyptians are not very brown, we must none the less protest against arguments of this kind. To decide the issue between Jews and Arabs on the basis of colour, even if that basis were correct, is not Liberalism: it is South Africanism run mad. The pyramid is made to stand on its apex instead of its base, but it is still the pyramid of racial differentiation.

AGGRESSION

It is claimed that Israel is taking up an attitude of aggression towards the Arab States. It should be said that in the main this apparent aggression is really a measure of defence. Who started the aggression? It is claimed by some that Jerusalem should be an international and not a Jewish city. As a Christian, the writer would be pleased if this were possible, for Jerusalem is the capital of three Faiths, not of one. But this should have been suggested earlier. Now that Israel has conquered Jerusalem by its own efforts and without help from the outside world, it is rather late to bring up the question of internationalising it. The situation is exactly like that of Rome after Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi had captured it.

The first step towards solving this and all the other difficulties of the Middle East situation, including the boundaries of Israel, is for the Arab States to recognise Israel and be willing to sit down and negotiate with it. So long as they stubbornly refuse to give legal recognition to a State established and guaranteed by the United Nations, so long will any agreement on lesser issues be impossible.

The writer remains a partisan but he thinks that he has shown good reasons for doing so.

The Urban Africans

People or Units

by

R. N. ROBB

Director of the Athlone
Advice Office for Africans,
Cape Town

Since the first diamond was discovered in Kimberley in 1869 industry in South Africa has been vitally dependent upon African labour and yet the State has never regarded urban Africans as permanent residents. Today, one hundred years later, the African industrial worker is still looked upon as a migrant worker with his real home in the 'Homelands', and this is made the excuse for underpaying him and giving him no civil or political rights in white areas which constitute 87% of the land of his birth.

For a short time after the Second World War the then Government faced up to the fact that economic development during the war years had brought about the need to reduce the African agricultural population and to create a more skilled and therefore stabilised African industrial force. Smuts had indeed pledged himself to act upon the advice of the 1948 Fagan Report as regards Native Policy. However the advent of the Nationalist Government in 1948 put an end to a short period of enlightenment and the State has consistently closed its eyes to the **fact** of African Urbanization while doing a great deal to end the chaotic conditions of housing and administration which it inherited from the Smuts Government. The State has assumed greater and greater control over the administration of the African urban population until today the local authorities are without any real power at all, any discretion they once had having been whittled away.

CONSISTENT

Since 1948 State Policy has been devastatingly consistent and carried out by a succession of restricting amendments to existing legislation. The Native Laws Amendment Act 54/1952 made Section 10 of the Urban Areas Act 25/1945 applicable to all Africans, women as well as men, so that no African was allowed to remain in an Urban area for more than 72 hours without a permit to do so, the onus being placed on him to prove that he had not been there longer. It became an offence to employ an African without such a permit. However there were three classes of exemption to Section 10 (1) — (a) those Africans who had been born in the area; (b) Those who had worked for 10 years for one employer or for 15 years continuously in the

area, and (c) the wives and minor children of men who were exempted. In 1957 this Act was further amended to provide that the exemptions would only apply to those Africans who had resided uninterruptedly in the town since birth or those who having qualified under (a) or (b) continued to reside in the particular urban area.

In the same way the Native Labour Regulation Act of 1911 has been repeatedly amended, a network of Labour Bureaux set up all over the country and regulations passed under which all employers have to notify the Bureaux of all vacancies and may only employ male work-seekers registered at these Bureaux. Under new regulations which came into effect on April 1st, 1968, gazetted as R. 74, all African work seekers in the Homelands must register at their local tribal bureaux and may only leave the Homeland on work contracts of a maximum duration of one year after which they must return home for a minimum of one month. No longer may they go to an urban area in search of work, no longer can they accept work offered there and no longer can they, by remaining for 10 years with one employer or 15 years in one area, earn the right to have their families with them. The Deputy Minister of Bantu Affairs said in Parliament in 1969 that in July, 1968, over 1½ million 'single' Africans from the Homelands were working in 'white areas'. In the Western Cape a permit from the Labour Department must be obtained stating that there is no Coloured labour available before an employer can apply for African workers. Only an African qualified for permanent residence may be employed in the better categories while contract workers may only be employed in unskilled work, e.g., as builders' labourers, farm

labourers or unskilled employees in factories and industries.

VERY CLEAR

State policy as regards the Urban African population is very clear. Dr. Verwoerd said in the House of Assembly in May, 1952,¹ "I accept that those (Africans) who are present in the cities are only entitled to be there if they are prepared to work and there is work available for them." Successive Ministers of Bantu Administration and Development have emphasized that only Africans actually in employment are welcome in 'white' areas — those who are unemployed (even temporarily), ill, disabled or too old to work must return to "their own areas". The fact that many, having been born on white farms or in white urban areas, have no 'Home land' is no longer a reason for not "endorsing them out". Such displaced people are arbitrarily settled in one of 46 resettlement villages such as Sada near Whittlesea, Mnxesha near King Williamstown, Illingi near Queenstown or less developed ones like Limehill in Natal and Stinkwater and Klipgat near Pretoria. Those who are entitled to live in urban areas are to have no civil or political rights in those areas and are to live in segregated townships which are not to be part of the white towns — they must be as far away as possible and, if practicable, separated from the white town by an industrial area.

MILES FROM THE CENTRE

In these locations Africans may practice professional trades, though not own their own business or professional premises, but they may not do so in the white part of the town. Advocates are to have their chambers in the location miles from the centre of town where the court is and where no clients are from early in the morning until late at night. The State is adamant — if Africans wish to work in white areas they must be content to have no civil or political rights there — if they want these they must return to their own homelands and practise their skills there where they may enjoy full civil and political rights. If they wish to own land or have any feeling of security they must go to the 'Homelands'. While they 'temporarily' reside in African townships they must be adequately and hygienically housed and supplied with the essential services but local authorities have been warned not to make the amenities too luxurious as this will "tempt the Africans to remain in the towns". Dr. Verwoerd said "The



Native residential area in the town is the place where the European in **his part of the country** provides **temporary** dwelling for those who require it of him because they work for him . . . ². Inside the African townships the different ethnic groups are to be separated so as to facilitate mother tongue education in the schools and to perpetuate tribal distinctions. The Advisory Boards, provided for in the Native Urban Areas Act of 1923, are being replaced by Urban Bantu Authorities which have a limited authority in the Bantu locations but are under the jurisdiction of the white town council to which the township is attached. These Urban Bantu Authorities have a liaison with the homeland of the ethnic group concerned and every effort is made to keep contact between urban dwellers and the homeland to which they are, however tenuously, attached.

CITIZENS

Under the Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act, introduced late last year and passed early in 1970, "every Bantu person in the Republic who is not a citizen of a self-governing Bantu territory in the Republic, nor a prohibited immigrant, will be a citizen of one or other territorial authority area where he will exercise such franchise rights, enjoy such rights and privileges and be subject to such duties and responsibilities as are accorded to or imposed on him in terms of any law". This

means that those Africans born in white areas who have never had any roots in the homelands will be attached by citizenship to one or other of the existing homelands and will only exercise civil and political rights there regardless of the fact that they may never, in the whole of their lives, reside there.

During the last few years the onslaught upon the urban African has been stepped up. New regulations governing African townships, promulgated on August 1st, 1968,³ lay down 9 conditions governing the allocation of houses. Only South African males, over 21, who qualify under Section 10 (1) (a), (b) or (c) of the Urban Areas Act, who are in regular employment in the area, who are, in the opinion of the Superintendent, fit and proper persons to reside in the township, and whose family normally resides with them, may be allocated houses to rent — not own. No women may be placed on the waiting list for housing on a family basis. There are 14 ways in which a man may be evicted from his house, once he has acquired one; if he is not, in the opinion of the Superintendent a fit and proper person to reside in the township, if he is convicted of an offence and sentenced to imprisonment, without the option of a fine, for a period exceeding 6 months, if he is unemployed for more than 30 days in cases of genuine illness, if he works in another area for more than 30 days, unless still employed by his original employer who has merely transferred him temporarily, if he leaves the area for more than 30 days, or if his wife and family leave the area. It is quite common for a wife to leave the area for several months to look after an aged relative in the homelands and to return to find the house has been taken away and her husband moved to 'bachelor' quarters.

The Bantu Laws Amendment Act, debated last year and finally passed early this year, makes it possible for the Minister, by notice in the Gazette as from a specified date, to prohibit the performance of work by, or the employment or continued employment of a Bantu (a) in a specified area; (b) in a specified class of employment; (c) in a specified trade or (d) in the service of a specified employer or class of employers. Such a prohibition may be applied either in a specified area or generally.

UNEMPLOYED

This means that Africans may become artificially unemployed as a result of a notice

in the Gazette and unless they are able to get other employment may after 30 days be evicted from their houses. Only Africans who qualify under Section 10 (a), (b) or (c) of the Urban Areas Act would be allowed to look for other employment — all others will be endorsed out of the area and only allowed to return on contract of a maximum of one year's duration. The Act also gives the district or municipal labour officer power to refuse to sanction the employment or continued employment of any African on a number of grounds including that there is no adequate housing accommodation available. The Deputy Minister stated that his Department was mainly opposed to the increase in the number of Bantu typists, receptionists to doctors and others, and counter assistants in white areas serving the white public.⁴ Such people will either have to accept much less well paid and much less skilled jobs, if they can find suitable ones, or they will be forced to leave the area. This Act removes all security, not only from the African urban workers, but also from the employers of African workers.

A draft Bantu Administration Boards' Bill was circulated to local authorities during 1969 but was never tabled. Most of the Bill concerns the establishment of Bantu Administration Boards for specified areas which may include one or more urban areas or portions of such areas, but one clause states that urban residential rights which have already been acquired under Section 10 (1) (a), (b) or (c) of the Bantu Urban Areas Act will not be done away with but that from the time the Act comes into force no further Africans will be able to qualify for such urban residential rights. The result of this, in some families, would be that older children born before the Act is promulgated, would qualify to live and work permanently in the urban area concerned, whereas younger children, born afterwards, would have no security whatever. It also means that no future wives will qualify to live with their qualified husbands and that they, too, will be liable to be 'endorsed out' at any time. This Bill is likely to be re-introduced this year in an amended form and one can only hope that, in its final form, the last clause will be omitted.

NO LONGER SHOCKING

The human tragedies caused by the implementation of this policy are so common that they are no longer news. It no longer

seems shocking that widows, who have lived legally with their husbands and children in an African township should, on the death of their husbands be evicted from their homes and forced to take their children out of school to go with them either to a place in the homelands from which they or their husbands originally came, or to a resettlement village with which they have no ties whatever, and where there is no employment available. Who cares that an African couple who were married by Christian rites 20 years ago and have lived together with their children ever since, are torn apart, the man being moved into 'bachelor' quarters and the wife and children sent to the 'homeland' from which he came thirty years ago? And this because the 20 years' residence was in two different nearby towns. In March, 1969, Mr. Froneman, in a political speech, said that there were still nearly 4 million Africans in white urban areas who, in his opinion, were "superfluous"; they were the dependents of breadwinners.⁵ It seems quite normal to South Africans that 80,000 African men should live as bachelors in townships outside Johannesburg and that their wives and families should be refused permission to join them in the place where they work. The fact that the policy of migratory labour which has been condemned by most of the Churches, including the Dutch Reformed Church, by economists and social welfare experts, is leading to the breakdown of African family life, to illegitimacy, homo-

sexuality, malnutrition and its attendant diseases of tuberculosis and kwashiorkor, to delinquency and an increase in crime to an unprecedented level, is ignored by the present government who have repeatedly stated their intention of extending the system.

LABOUR UNITS

So it is obvious that by steady, gradual erosion of their rights in urban areas, Africans are becoming the labour units visualized by Dr. Verwoerd — only welcome in 'white' urban areas while actually in employment. It is not often appreciated that it was the Nationalist Government itself which introduced the famous Section 10 (1) of the Urban Areas Act by which Africans have rights of permanent residence in white urban areas and it is only this section which has, until now, prevented the fulfilment of Dr. Verwoerd's dream. It will remain a million dollar question forever: "Why introduce legislation giving residential rights to urban Africans in June, 1952, only one month after Dr. Verwoerd had made it so clear that he regarded the African workers as temporary sojourners in urban areas, only welcome there while they were of service to whites?"

- 1 Verwoerd Speaks, M. Pelser.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 R. 1036, gazetted 4/6/1968.
- 4 Hansard, 19, Col. 8480, 1969.
- 5 Rand Daily Mail, 28/3/1969.

AFRICAN WRITING IN DANGER

Seven years ago a young, Durban-born African journalist, with the help of influential Black and White friends, launched a small quarterly magazine in Johannesburg called *The Classic*.

In the first number Mr. Nat Nakasa, whose brainchild the magazine was, wrote: "It will be the job of *The Classic* to seek African writing of merit. Particularly welcome will be the work of those writers with causes to fight for; committed men and women who look at human situations and see tragedy and love, bigotry and common sense for what they are . . ."

by OBED KUNENE
an African Journalist
working in Durban

Hardly two years later Mr. Nakasa, who had left the country on an exit permit to take up a scholarship at an American university, killed himself by jumping from a New York skyscraper.

It was a further crippling blow to the local African literary scene. For, although he was in exile, Mr. Nakasa had, through his thought-provoking writings in White and non-White

journals here, become an inspiring example to other African writers.

CONTRIBUTION

Through The Classic he hoped to lift African writing to a new level where it could be accepted as a serious and worthwhile contribution to the South African heritage.

The Classic still exists, albeit in a somewhat shaky form.

But in present-day South Africa it has become increasingly difficult for the African writer with a creative bent — the man who may regard himself as "committed" and in a position to portray human situations as he sees them — to practise his profession in a free, uninhibited atmosphere.

The last decade saw a steady decline in the standard of African writing. It started with the exodus to foreign countries of several talented writers who had begun their careers as newspapermen.

Many, if not all, cannot be quoted, nor can their writings be read in this country.

Furthermore those who remain within the borders of the country and fall in the category of the "aware"; those with searching minds and a sensitiveness which are elementary qualities of a creative writer, must feel terribly constricted.

Because of the peculiar South African emphasis on the colour of a man's skin, his culture, political leanings and level of sophistication, the African writer would almost in-

evitably find himself involved with these issues.

OBJECTIVITY

This involvement need not necessarily be in the form of protest writing, nor should it deviate from objectivity and a clear sense of judgement.

But in a country where fear, distrust and apathy are the dominating features, the writer who would seek to portray these issues as he sees them, as they affect him and his fellow men, would in the nature of things have to tread warily.

He might be well advised to steer clear of contentious topics, lest he offend officialdom. Fear of reprisal might even result in a form of self-imposed conformity.

The tragedy is that a completely misleading picture might be painted as a result. Indeed, there is enough evidence already of gross misconceptions about things affecting the African.

An even worse tragedy is that, because of the many restrictions and inhibiting forces, African writing today has been reduced to a pious, stereotyped state. In fact, Black writers of any merit in the English language are a fast-disappearing breed.

A vital, unalloyed contribution by this sector of the community is needed if South African writing in general is to have a full meaning.

(Reprinted from The Daily News.)

“The Washing of The Spears”

A Literary Review with a Political Postscript

by Alan Paton

The only excuse I offer for reviewing Donald Morris's "The Washing of the Spears", four years after its publication in Britain, is that I have only just read it. The only reason I offer is that there will never be another book quite like it. Just why this should be so, I shall try to examine.

COMPULSION

In his foreword Mr. Morris thanks his wife, "whose warfare against bad writing I resisted only to my own disadvantage". The writing is quite extraordinary. It lacks any kind of flourish. An undiscerning critic might say that the events were so exciting that the writer

could not fail to do them dramatic justice, but he would be wrong, for bad writers can kill exciting history with great despatch. What Mr. Morris did so superbly was to let these events convey their excitement through the medium of simple and direct and unembellished prose. There is one prerequisite for

such achievement, and that is that the events must first have excited the imagination of the writer. This is clearly what happened. The second thing that happened was that the writer was able to convey his excitement to his reader. It is this that was done in an extraordinary manner. There is no sensationalism, not even any poetry, except that of course which is implicit in the senseless and magnificent struggles of man. What happens is that the reader falls under a kind of compulsion, and one of Mr. Morris's achievements is that the compulsion grows as one reads on. One is left wondering how much of his skill is conscious, and how much a natural uncultivated gift, by which I mean a gift that would not improve with cultivation, like a *sequoia sempervirens*. Yet one supposes there must have been some kind of cultivation, under the watchful eye of the author's wife.

SUPERB

I do not suggest that Mr. Morris's writing is artless. A writer requires more than the gift of words. He must also give form to his work. For some reason not fully understood by us, the giving of form to content increases many times the effectiveness of the communication. Mr. Morris has this gift also, and these two gifts have enabled him to produce a superb history.

Mr. Morris however says he does not claim for his book an academic status to which it is not entitled. What does he mean? That his book was not dull enough? That history should not be exciting? That his story is not full enough, detailed enough, definitive enough? I may say that my historian friends do not have these misgivings about his book.

Before I discuss the political meanings of this history, I wish to pay one other literary tribute. I was told by many that I would find the chapter on Isandlwana magnificent, and so I did. But the chapter on Rorke's Drift excelled it, partly I suppose because the action was confined, and partly because the attack is expected and the suspense therefore much heightened, and partly because the narrative is superb. It must be one of the most exciting chapters to be found in literature. One extraordinary fact emerges. The Zulus called off the attack after they had lost about one-eighth of their force. Had they expended another eighth, they would probably have overwhelmed the defenders. They must have

been utterly exhausted, in both body and will.

THE RUIN OF ZULULAND

Why did the Zulu nation fall? There were many reasons. The white settlers of Natal were afraid of it. To Sir Bartle Frere it was an obstacle in the way of his dream of confederation. To Sir Theophilus Shepstone it was an obstacle in the way of his success as pacifier and ruler of the Transvaal Boers. Nor can there be much doubt that he now regarded himself as a maker and breaker of kings, and would revenge himself for any slights endured at Zulu hands. Faced with these three, Frere, Shepstone, and white Natal, the Zulu nation was doomed.

Yet in a way it was doomed before it was born, when the first white men came to the Cape. Its fall was only a part of the tremendous drama of the expansion of Europe, the Conquistadors, and the destruction of the Aztec and Inca civilisations, the conquest of India, the parcelling out of Africa. For some of these countries reparation would come, but not for Zululand. Her power was destroyed. In 1897 Britain handed over Zululand to white Natal, who opened up the country for white settlement, and set aside reserves for the tribes, just as Shepstone had done south of the Tugela. Mr. Morris calls this chapter "The Ruin of Zululand", but except for the title, he holds himself back, for what reasons one cannot tell. It is the only criticism I have to make of this book, that the last act of the tragedy is underplayed. The Zulu men of today are domestic servants, stevedores, filling-station attendants, factory hands, manual labourers; some are teachers, earning half the salaries of their white counterparts; a lucky few are doctors. The Zulu women and girls, if they are not at home, are domestic servants and factory hands; some are teachers, earning less even than the men; prestige comes mainly to nurses and doctors. The percentage of illegitimate births, once punishable by death, is extremely high, and the infant mortality rate is high too. It is a broken nation, that has learned to bear its servitude with shouts and laughter, which help us to forget the magnificent and tragic story of its rise and fall.

RAGS AND TATTERS

According however to the Nationalist Government's theory of Separate Development, reparation will now be made. The rags

and tatters of this carved-up country are by Nationalist magic to achieve a new harmony and integrity. Zulus are going to learn again to be proud to be Zulus. Zululand's rags and tatters are going to become the noble robes of a proud nationhood. The wildest dreamers (some of them Cabinet Ministers) even promise some kind of autonomy, power to make alliances and treaties, and the freedom to seek contact with the other nations of the world.

All this is fantasy. It is true that Zululand is going to be given a new and modern port, but no Zulu will have any part in it, except that of domestic servant, filling-station attendant, and stevedore. The only hope for some kind of qualified independence would be if all white areas in Zululand were returned to the new nation, but that could happen in only one set of circumstances, namely if white South Africa faced such a crisis that it would consent to partition. White Natal would retreat, perhaps south of the Tugela, perhaps even over the Drakensberg, as the Boers did more than a century earlier. Short of such a crisis, separate development for Zululand is

politically, economically, and territorially impossible. Short of such a crisis, there will never be another Zulu nation, and for the same reason that the first one was destroyed.

SOUTH AFRICA THEIR HOME

That some of the believers in Separate Development honestly desire to give to the Zulus, and to all other non-white people, a life and being of their own, a pride and self respect, one cannot doubt. But the truth is that no Zulu, and no other non-white person, will ever gain life and being and pride and self-respect, until he is accepted as a citizen of South Africa, and until every barrier is removed to his emancipation and self realisation.

For better or for worse, it is South Africa that has become our home, the home of every man and woman and child who lives in it, of whatever race or colour they may be. The Zulu can never return to Zululand. He can return only to those rags and tatters that Frere and Shepstone left him, styled grandly his "homeland". But the truth is he has only one homeland, and that is the homeland of us all.

This South Africa

Mr. Coetzee (Minister of Community Development) several times warned interjectors that no hooliganism would be allowed at the meeting and they should "keep their mouths closed as politicians not university students are speaking".

—*Daily News report.*

Articles printed in Reality are available for republication provided that the acknowledgement is made and a copy of the republished article is sent to the address below.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chairman: Mr. A. Paton.

Board: Prof. E. H. Brookes, Mrs. M. Corrigall, Mrs. M. Dyer, Mr. C. Gardner, Miss S. J. Lundie, Mr. L. Marquard, Mr. J. F. C. Mitchell, Mr. J. Unterhalter.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: R1.00 (12/-) for 6 issues.

Send to:—

Miss S. J. Lundie,

Flat 2, Temple Chambers,

Carlyle Arcade,

Pietermaritzburg,

South Africa.