suggestions in regard to policy to be followed. It was followed by Mr. X. J. Adams, the Union Registrar of Co-operative Societies, who explained the administration of the Co-operative Societies Act, and stated that his office was ready to assist the formation of co-operative societies by Africans.

Mr. N. E. Jenkins of Witwatersrand University had submitted a report on the Agricultural Credit Scheme of the Transvaal, and Mr. S. Mampuru gave some information concerning the three consumers' co-operative societies which are the only African co-operative stores in the country. From these statements and from the discussion it was clear that the possibilities of co-operation among Africans have yet to be proven. The attempts so far made are valuable as indicating the difficulties and weaknesses encountered, not for any solid success yet achieved. There is lively interest in the idea of co-operation among both rural and urban Africans, and there is goodwill and active assistance available at the office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. It remains to be discovered in what ways co-operation can be developed usefully among the African people. Clearly indicated needs are:

- A simple detailed statement of procedure with regard to the formation, registration, and conduct of a co-operative society; the commercial training of suitable personnel; and the making available, to any co-operative endeavours of Europeans with knowledge and experience to act as advisers. On this subject, a special conference will be organized, and it is hoped that the publication for sale of the reports of the Board will encourage the formation of such bodies.

The discussion that followed the address raised many points, such as the extension of industrial protection to industrial workers, the making of the African Industrial Union an official trade union, the adoption by the Government of wage rates no less than those laid down by the Board, the extension of Wage Board determinations to all industries, the making of the South African Native Labour Act a law of the land, and the extension of social welfare services rather than poor relief.

The Rev. A. W. Blaxall told of the development of work for the non-European Blind at Ezemeleni and, while pointing a serious picture of the incidence of blindness among Natives (in some areas one per cent. of the population being certified blind), also gave Council the good news that the Native Affairs and Union Health Departments are making £8,000 per year available for investigations and service for the prevention of blindness amongst Africans.

The Institute has been active in the formation of the National Council for the Care of Cripples, by which non-European as well as Europeans will be cared for. It was in another connexion, at the close of the meetings, that the Council was brought face to face with the racial problems in their stark reality. What action should be taken when a national social welfare organization closes its doors to non-European delegates? Opinion differed.

Throughout the discussions, which lasted two full days, it was apparent that what Council saw was not the whole work of the Institute but only glimpses, typical and impressive, of its many-sided far reaching activities.

The South African Institute is too "academically monumental" for popular reading, a comment that might be usefully considered by the new publications committee. Those who are fortunate enough to attend the meetings of the Institute Council come away stimulated and encouraged. It is good to know that the Institute is playing so notable a part in South Africa's great racial problems, and there is cause for deep thankfulness in the knowledge that the Institute has been able to gather to its service persons of high qualifications and clear purpose.
After urging that there shall be no relaxation of effort "to improve the native conditions" and the conclusion adds that "it must be accepted as a fact that the occupation of land, whether for stock or crop production, will never again suffice to make a genuine and prosperous community in South Africa a fact. This is a result of increasing on Union labour markets and by weakening the bargaining power in these markets.

To return, in conclusion, to the question of farm labour: there are, broadly, two methods by which the supply of labour can be increased. It can be increased either by the use of force, or by making the conditions of labour sufficiently attractive. The Committee cannot, in a city, recommend force; and it is doubtful whether the recommendations to improve the conditions of employment will have such practical effect. In any case, they are not sufficiently far-reaching because the Committee, as practical men, realized the necessity of prescribing measures to which Parliament would not agree.

The colour-prejudice may be illogical, doubtless partly due to fear, but it must be regarded as a factor which cannot be minimized and one which will persist for some time yet. It must therefore be accepted as an overriding influence in any short-period solution which may be suggested.

Another factor which requires careful study and intelligent handling is the influx of groups from outside. Workers from mining areas and from the country increase the so-called "drift to towns". For Indians, as for Europeans, this is due less to the offer of attractive employment, or even to any employment at all, than to economic pressure driving them off the land. The reduction of such "drift" is not to be solved by drastic restrictions but by the creation of agricultural possibilities for Indians, in sugar, tobacco, and market gardening.

The above factors resulted in a 19 per cent increase in the Asiatic population in urban areas in the Union (largely Natal, and largely Durban) between 1921 and 1939. Indian population was nearly trebled in this period, to 1938. The increase in the Asiatic population in urban areas is due partly to its natural increase of population, partly to incorporating existing population areas, and partly to the "drift to the towns". These are disturbing forces to which must be added the losing of residential areas in the centre by business premises, shops, and offices. Strains and stresses are only to be expected.

Such changes are seen in every city development, but Durban's growing pains seem worse than those of other towns because they involve a shifting of racial as well as other groups.

A study of the problem must refer also to the movements of various groups of people. As a rule, human beings like to form themselves into groups based on some common factor, such as similar habits and standards of life. The greater the number of common cultural associations, the greater the homogeneity of the locality. Differences in education, culture, race, or religion will, in our present state of civilization, cause friction and probably difficulties.

Reasons for objections to neighbours are that they may be less tidy or may be noisier, or may have different customs. But this is noticeable even in the of its expanding municipal responsibilities. The 1932 incorporation in particular gave Durban an enormous task, if only because it increased the Indians in Durban by over 50,000.

Hence, Durban's growth is due partly to its natural increase of population, partly to incorporating existing population areas, and partly to the "drift to the towns". These are disturbing forces to which must be added the losing of residential areas in the centre by business premises, shops, and offices. Strains and stresses are only to be expected.

Such changes are seen in every city development, but Durban's growing pains seem worse than those of other towns because they involve a shifting of racial as well as other groups.

A study of the problem must refer also to the movements of various groups of people. As a rule, human beings like to form themselves into groups based on some common factor, such as similar habits and standards of life. The greater the number of common cultural associations, the greater the homogeneity of the locality. Differences in education, culture, race, or religion will, in our present state of civilization, cause friction and probably difficulties.

Reasons for objections to neighbours are that they may be less tidy or may be noisier, or may have different customs. But this is noticeable even in the of its expanding municipal responsibilities. The 1932 incorporation in particular gave Durban an enormous task, if only because it increased the Indians in Durban by over 50,000.

Hence, Durban's growth is due partly to its natural increase of population, partly to incorporating existing population areas, and partly to the "drift to the towns". These are disturbing forces to which must be added the losing of residential areas in the centre by business premises, shops, and offices. Strains and stresses are only to be expected.

Such changes are seen in every city development, but Durban's growing pains seem worse than those of other towns because they involve a shifting of racial as well as other groups.
especially in the old borough.

(A) Individual Feasibility. It would be difficult to find an instance where a European had elected to buy property and reside within an accepted Indian area. The reverse has taken place to the extent of some ten properties so purchased and occupied.

Very briefly the motives that prompt individuals to remove from their own areas to others, for residential purposes, are as follows:

1. The desire to improve their social standing. The European has done so much in Natal to impress the Indian with his superiority. The desire to be able to look down on the Indian in business, while the removal of all Indian labourers with their ability to perform delicate mechanical and semi-skilled work would be disastrous to industry as a whole.

2. The right of the rate- and tax-payer to enjoy the amenities of his town, whether naturally or municipally provided. This is particularly so where there is an absence of adequate sites, houses, amenities of roads, or lighting.

3. Resentment at any restriction freedom of choice in the matter of the neighbourhood of one's home.


4. Resentment at any restriction on freedom of choice in the matter of the neighbourhood of one's home.

There is of course the political aspect of Local Government. Indian owners of freehold property and Indian tenants are not allowed to participate in electing the Council which is solely responsible for the expenditure of money derived from rates and taxes. In Westville, Indian rate-payers probably constitute 70 per cent of the total.

**Remedies**

1. If Europeans do feel very strongly about so-called penetration then they and the European property agents should jointly undertake not to sell property within the borough, without ascertaining whether their decision would harm the relations of the two communities. Similar undertakings could be made by the Indians.

Any drastic prohibition of acquisition of property by Indians would be unjust. Where this was practised, but where there was a desire to, it would be easy for a European to lease at exorbitant rentals to Indians.

2. Improvement of roads, lighting, and other amenities in the existing Indian localities, combined with steps taken to raise the Indian standard of life, especially in the old borough.

3. Other obvious remedies would be the building of sub-economic houses for Indians, and the granting of municipal loans to Indians for house-building. It might even be possible to encourage Indians to build on municipal land, using municipal plans and working instructions, perhaps using material either made by the municipality of Indian labour or bought in larger quantities, and working under the supervision of municipal engineers and architects (as is done in Stockholm). Municipal Indian employees might be given a sample site to lead the way.

Further, enthusiasts in the Indian community might seek the help of the City Council in establishing well-planned and well-managed suburbs for various classes of Indians, something on the lines of housing corporations and public utilities.

**The Present Position**

The agitation between the two communities has resulted in the intervention of the Government.

The Minister has appointed a judicial Commission to investigate the facts of alleged penetration. If, as one section of the Indian community contends, there has been no penetration, then the Indian need have no apprehension about the findings of such a Commission. To the European it will mean the allaying of unfounded fears.

If the allegation is borne out, then on its extent will depend the measures necessary to deal with the situation. It is unlikely that it has assumed proportions to justify a statutory settlement.

As there was a danger of speculative purchase of property during the interim period, the Minister suggested a Joint Committee instead of interim legislation, its whole purpose being to maintain a status quo pending the investigations. The Joint Committee would not merely try to prevent Indian purchase in predominantly European residential areas, but also it would provide the machinery for consultation and collaboration in regard to housing in general.

Machinery has been set up which can usefully discuss housing, sites, and amenities. This must be a step more in the right direction than in the wrong direction. This is an advance on the voluntary undertaking to endeavour to restrict purchases by Indians given by the Natal Indian Congress in June 1936. The Council and its Housing Committee would certainly obtain a greater insight into the housing needs and other difficulties of the Indian community.

The only solution to our problems is a move towards greater co-operation. Hence, any co-operation between an Indian Committee and a Committee of the City Council will not only be useful in its own

sphere but it may easily mark the beginning of very important machinery of contact between the two communities. Both will learn from the other and in the process acquire not only knowledge but tolerance.

**Facing the Facts**

Even if we were able to contemplate compulsory deportation of Indians, it is clear that no master has grudgingly we may admit it, we owe them a debt of gratitude, since the prosperity of the coal mines and the sugar industry is founded on the indentured Indian labourer.

Such a plan would not be feasible, since more than half of the present Indian population were born here and have no other home. Further, the spreading power of nearly 200,000 Indians in Natal is important to business, while the removal of all Indian labourers would result in the intervention of the Government.

**WHAT SOUTHERN AFRICAN NATIVE POLICY AND THE LIBERAL SPIRIT**

REVIEW OF PROFESSOR R. F. A. HOERNLE'S PHELPS-STOKES LECTURES

I had the pleasure last year of meeting Professor Hoernle during the time that he was re-delivering the series of lectures which form the contents of the above volume. At the conclusion of the series I was unexpectedly invited by the Chairman of our Public Lectures Committee and put to the task of thanking the lecturer. Whether my impromptu remarks then did justice to the lecturer I cannot very well confirm to-day; if my second effort should fall short of the mark I hope Professor Hoernle will blame those responsible for falling to suddenly upon me for a review while heavily engaged in an effort to reconcile not between Black and White, or Boer and Briton, but between Afrikaner and Afrikaner. That difference has in the meantime been happily conciliated. Without the deadlock among Afrikaners settled there remain our other inter-racial problems. The struggle between Boer and Briton, politically and culturally, is on once more, but remains, as ever, silhouetted or projected against the European v. Non-European background. With the coming of the White man to South Africa a new era was inaugurated, which, after passing through many vicissitudes of collaboration and conflict, is, with the advance of the twentieth century, rapidly assuming a critically decisive stage.

The time has arrived when the question of the relation between European and Non-European in our sub-continent will have to be fairly and squarely looked in the face, when great decisions will have to be unflinchingly faced. With the rapid spread of civilization and modern technique the old liberal policy is giving way to the new. The old liberal policy was based on the assumption that all the races of the world, whether in Europe or Africa, Asia or America, would share in the benefits of modern civilization. But with the rapid developments of the twentieth century, rapidly assuming a critically decisive stage. The time has arrived when the question of the relation between European and Non-European in our sub-continent will have to be fairly and squarely looked in the face, when great decisions will have to be unflinchingly faced. With the rapid spread of civilization and modem technique the old liberal policy is giving way to the new. The old liberal policy was based on the assumption that all the races of the world, whether in Europe or Africa, Asia or America, would share in the benefits of modern civilization.
His very thorough analysis of the technique of domination and his discussion of the implications of a capitalist society are very thought-provoking and a welcome relief from the hollowness of the racial jargon of the political hustings. He has made a scientific study of the subject and has presented his results in the approved scientific manner, even to the extent of stating his results on a thread of hypothesis, the doctrine of the liberal spirit.

Professor Hoernlé couples his study of South African Native Policy with the Liberal Spirit in an effort to give it a politico-philosophical basis. I am not so sure that he has been wise in doing so. Such a procedure may enhance its value as a scientific treatise, but in view of practical considerations, with the doctrine of Liberalism in rather a bad way, especially in South Africa, he would have been wiser to eschew such a line of advance. The same analysis, synthesis, and the same conclusion, but argued on a different sub-stratum of politico-philosophical outlook would have given Professor Hoernlé his work an impetus and a trajectory that would have carried it much further in our political firmament than it will now achieve, which will be a great pity. For I thoroughly believe that, shorn of their superfluous liberal paraphernalia, the ideas he develops in these four lectures, the facts, illustrations, and implications, represent a considerable advance in politico-philosophic thought, and as such should form the stock-in-trade of all Afrikaans- and English-speaking public men in South Africa. Our public men need a little more solid study of such works as this. They cannot but be fair, I will have to invert the argument too. Our study and then we will have less empty talk. But, to watchword. May the times call forth a leader worthy of the occasion and the task.

I commend Professor Hoernlé's book very heartily to all those interested in our racial problems. Even if his method of approach may not meet with their approval, his analysis and conclusions are sure to merit their attention. My own predilections have always been for "long-range" note on which the book closes has made me overlook much of the "short-range" liberal thought with which the book is studded. I wish it a wide circulation and it's liberal author the courage of a sincerer judgement upon them. The result, however, is not always satisfactory. More often than not these investigators find they are compelled to decide very much wider issues and then—many of them shrink from the task! Desisting from ultimate analysis, their work, like the tinkling of a very tiny bell. It is implied in frustration that, if we cannot move forward socially, we must go back to some older social structure. Out I do not accept the idea that Professor Hoernlé will leave it at that. As a logician he knows from the very fact of his frustration that his premises must be wrong.

As a man deeply interested in race relations he sets out to examine "the domination of Whites over Blacks". But is there any such thing? The Native bus-owner and the Native landlord tend to become "little kings" in the location. They "dominate" their fellow-Blacks far more obviously than do all the Poor Whites in the Ruiterbreek district put together. Poor-White domination is simply a misapprehension of the facts. "No development", says Professor Hoernlé, "can take place in South Africa except with the consent of the dominant White group." Yet modern history abounds in examples of the development of Poor-Whitism and many other things take place without any such consent. Indeed, the rapid "as-similation of Native to European and the steadily increasing indiscrimination even of "Hottentot" blood" into the "European" ranks goes on in spite of the direct opposition of the "dominant group". The idea that Whites, or such, are in control is a democratic illusion, not a fact.

Domination is a class concept. It rests not with a race qua race. Every owner of the means of production is to that extent a dominator of those who sell their labour. Their right to exploit them is to the same extent a result of their entry into the established relationship of mutual service and the division of labour. For us, the binding force of society is the free market where men must sell their goods, if they have them, or their labour-power, if they have no goods. It is that the owner of the means of production becomes the worker the subservient, citizen. In South Africa, it is not even clear that at any one time all Whites were owners and all Blacks were not. To-day, with the progressive concentration of wealth, the worker his wealth, the more in fact that the masses of Europeans have joined the dispossessed Africans. The history of African and European proletarianization from Kimberley onwards has still to be written and to Professor Hoernlé it remains a sealed book.

His failure to appreciate all this is in the great defect of his lectures. He does not realize the extent to which the total product of the country is a Black product, profitably produced because it embodies African labour—a fact that one blow renders "separation" and "aggregation" so much sunshine. When he speaks of taxation from White and from Black sources, he overlooks that the "White sources" are largely mere conduit pipes of wealth from Black sources. Ignoring this pyramid of production and its essential character, affecting all our social correlations, he tends to attach primary importance to psychological attitudes and secondary importance to real external developments. He does not see that men's minds must and inevitably will come into correlation with the facts outside them, and that the mind cannot influence real developments unless it does so. Thus, while he speaks of the "spirit" of this and the "ideal" of that, he confines the very basis of "domination".

Indeed he labours under the astonishing misconception that "class" is a matter of heart. One of the pages on Bourgeois Democracy, but as a "sacred" duty (if parliamentarians, whomsoever they are) must and inevitably will come into correlation with the facts outside them, and that the mind cannot influence real developments unless it does so. Thus, while he speaks of the "spirit" of this and the "ideal" of that, he confines the very basis of "domination".

Indeed he labours under the astonishing misconception that "class" is a matter of heart. One of the pages on Bourgeois Democracy, but as a "sacred" duty (if parliamentarians, whomsoever they are) must and inevitably will come into correlation with the facts outside them, and that the mind cannot influence real developments unless it does so. Thus, while he speaks of the "spirit" of this and the "ideal" of that, he confines the very basis of "domination".

To-day, with the progressive concentration of wealth, the worker his wealth, the more in fact that the masses of Europeans have joined the dispossessed Africans. The history of African and European proletarianization from Kimberley onwards has still to be written and to Professor Hoernlé it remains a sealed book.
"S.A. NATIVE POLICY AND THE LIBERAL SPIRIT"

Rate R. A. Armstrong

"nastiness", that makes oppression and low wages the central feature of South African policy.

Professor Hoernle touches very lightly on the economic side of the matter. Low Native wages, one would imagine, are more or less the Will of God: he therefore says very little about them. Here men like Mr. Pinet see far more clearly when they speak of South Africa's greatest asset, viz. cheap and abundant supplies of Native labour'. It is an "asset" for the dominators, not for the European workers, and, since it is cheap, it is not much of an asset for the Africans. Yet in all this book has to say about domination, political, educational, social, and even economic, one would never suspect that the process of exploiting this asset is a central feature of policy and that it controls all other aspects. In his conclusion of "class" with rich and poor, the lecturer refuses to see all this. He disdains the idea of antagonism embodied in such a view of policy, and, understated, he dismisses it as the view of "doctrinaire extremists".

It is exasperating to find him comforting himself by embarking on a diligent search for one or two redeeming features under the tawdry camouflage of "White trusteeship". The mines want healthy and vigorous workers who would have to have higher wages to attend to their own health and diet. It is therefore cheaper to give them hospitals, hospitals, diets, and even games and cinemas upon a collective and dictated basis. A moment's conversation with a medical officer on a mine should indicate how much of all this is real "trusteeship", and how much is really enlightened profit-seeking. If we must look for noble motives—as if these mattered—we are apt to overlook the contradictory developments that flow from the practical motives, which do matter, and which in reality govern the situation. "Married quarters" for Africans on the mines would be more expensive than homes in the Reserves. The Compromise is the solution. I do not like the dogged optimism with which Professor Hoernle spins out the "brighter side" of his "odds and evens", that we so zealously maintain with the approval of Church and State.

To hail the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936 as an example of the real spirit of Trusteeship, because it makes allowances for the African's sentimental attachment to the graves of his ancestors and maintains tribal cohesion, is to be taken in by the legislator's preamble. It does not constitute towards an understanding of the more important features of Native policy. The vast spaces available in South Africa are a fine substitute for does and unemployment relief as well as "married quarters". They serve as a sponge that absorbs, and returns when required, the reserve army of African labourers. Its titled tenure is a guarantee that the land will never be properly worked and will therefore really belong to the Natives. Cheap labour must have a cheap breeding place, and so it is furnished to the Africans at their own expense. Our dominators do not say, and some of them do not even think, that "our" interest is what has the two liberty-loving White groups made, of what they are making, of their historic task of governing a multi-racial community?"

In the first chapter, an account is given of the methods used by White South Africans for maintaining White domination over non-White groups—a domination ranging from exclusive White control of political and military power, through preferential educational and economic privileges, to devices for establishing social distance between Whites and Blacks as well as preventing miscegenation, or race mixture. Many may argue that there is nothing new in this chapter, that it is merely a statement of the obvious, but it is entirely salutary that these facts which come into the everyday experience of every South African should be set out as clearly and as calmly as the author has attempted to set them out. If he has space and reform are to be brought about in South Africa, the "policy of White self-protection through domination" in all its ramifications must be accurately described and recognized for what it is, as far as is humanly possible, without that emotionalism and sentimentiality which "engender more heat than light".

The author then proceeds to deal with those influences which have operated, however unsuccess-fully, to mitigate the harsher effects of the Union Native Policy of White domination over non-White groups. These forces, consisting in the main of Missionaries and Humanitarian Liberals, have found expression in the principle of trusteeship whose influence the author traces in various aspects of South Africa life. "Present-day South Africa owes it to these two bodies of men more than to Government policies that there is, as a fact of history, a strain of liberalism in its traditions, which, however much South Africans nowadays resent that strain and strive to drown it in". The acid test of the principle of trusteeship is its ultimate aim. Judged by this test, the principle of trusteeship in South Africa turns out to be nothing more than a "disguised instrument of White supremacy", "the alpen glow over the steady hand of domination".

Having given a faithful description of the framework of South African society and the rationalizations that have been propagated in support of it, Professor Hoernle goes on to analyse the concept of Liberalism and to draw up what constitutes a practical and defen-sible interpretation of it in the development of human society. The liberal spirit is shown to have worked, wherever it has been given scope to express itself, for the liberation of individuals and groups by the abolition of restrictions in order to make a fuller life possible. Even vague generations, it has aimed at securing certain definite liberties both for individuals and groups, calculated to improve the quality of their lives in a definite historic context. But the principles of classical liberalism were first worked out and applied in countries with fairly homogeneous populations, where differences of culture and race were not as pertinent as they are being today in the world in general and in South Africa in particular.

The question therefore arises, and is discussed in the last chapter, as to whether a liberal policy is possible in South Africa, "a multi-racial State internally divided by the tensions and frictions resulting from the mutual antagonisms of four major groups... differing from each other in race", "when in such a society the race is dominant over the others and determined to maintain that dominance at all costs." In the view of the author, two courses are open to a liberal in such a society. Firstly, he may adopt a "short-range" programme, viz. to "press constantly for a liberal interpretation of trusteeship and to use the elasticities of the present system, such as they are, to turn into an instrument of the liberal spirit as can", without seeking to undermine the policy of White domination except by constantly advocating his ideals, criticizing the official policy, and working for a change in public opinion. Or a liberal must work for a "long-range" programme which envisages "an alternative to present-day South African society which is admittedly incompatible with the liberal spirit". In searching for an alternative type of society, Professor Hoernle suggests three possibilities, namely, (a) Parallelist, which, while maintaining the framework of South African society, substitutes within it the co-ordination of racial groups for domination of the rest by one group, i.e. it envisages separate institutions for separate racial groups, without the White group being the dominant group; (b) Assimilation, which also maintains the multi-racial society but abolishes race differences within it by the complete possible fusion or amalgamation of the races with each other; (c) Separatism, which breaks up the multi-racial society and organizes the several racial components as mutually independent social units. Actually, present-day South African Native policy is an "odd patchwork, exhibiting traces of Parallelism,"
Assessment, Separation.

In other words, South Africa has not made up her mind as to which way she intends to go.

An examination of the practicability of these approaches to the solution of the problem of a desirable form of racial and political organization for South Africa would seem to project Parachute Realization on the ground that Parachute, as it is now practiced, does not eliminate White domination, and that no other form of Parachute is likely to lend favour in White eyes. He also rejects Assimilation, on the ground that "White South Africa as a whole, is opposed to Total Assimilation with a fierce determination". It might be pointed out here that the evidence shows that the Native population, at any rate, is no less opposed to social and racial assimilation than the White population, though being a subject race Natives are naturally less articulate about it. The solution which Professor Hofmeyr favours is that of Separation which envisages "an organization of the warring sections into genuinely separate, self-contained, self-governing societies, each in principle homogeneous within itself, which can then co-operate on a footing of mutual recognition of one another's independence". This implies making the Native Reserves economically self-sufficient, the "Instrumentalities" of Native society, education, and other forms of separation. The advantages of the scheme include the fact that racial tension and friction would thereby be avoided, the separate groups would genuinely develop along lines of their own choosing, and would have separate "areas of liberty". Some scheme of this kind must be adopted, in Professor Hofmeyr's opinion, if South Africa is to develop a stable community, bearing in mind that "the non-European groups will not for ever accept or tolerate with good will a caste-structure in which they are permanently subjugated to the unprivileged position of the lowest classes".

Professor Hofmeyr's book shows that he must be counted among those who are well qualified to deal with the subject of race relations in South Africa. Apart from his distinguished career as Head of the Department of Philosophy in the University of the Witwatersrand, he has always been intimately associated with the work of bodies such as the Johannesburg Joint Council of Europeans and Africans, and the Institute of Race Relations, of which he has been President for several years—both being bodies which have played an important part in informing our understanding of the real meaning of Union Native policy and its significance for the welfare of the country as a whole. The most curious preface of his book shows that he has brought gifts to bear upon one of the most delicate problems of South Africa. His straightforward, incisive style, his type knowledge and experience, his ability to maintain an objective point of view in matters over which there is such wide disagreement in this country, will be welcomed even by those who do not wish to accept his conclusion and his suggested solution of our problems.

We are indebted to Professor Hofmeyr for his appeal to liberals to re-examine the truth of their faith with a view to discovering how they can best apply them in a multi-racial society. It is this that is done seriously. Liberals will continue to lose ground, as it is done to-day, not only among the White but also among the non-White sections of our population. Rightly or wrongly, there is in Non-European circles to-day a growing feeling against so-called liberals, owing to the conviction that most of them stand and work exclusively for what Professor Hofmeyr calls "their short-term ends". It may be said, however, that this does not satisfy the play the role of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in the body politic of South Africa, with the Non-Europeans as its dumb friends. Clearly, this will not satisfy the more intelligent sections of the Non-Europeans who are determined to hold their position in human society, to follow within them the South Africa and to leadership of their own groups by themselves.

On the other hand, one wonders what sort of reception Professor Hofmeyr's suggested solution of race relations in South Africa, viz. the organization of our racial groups into self-contained, mutually independent units, will receive. As far as the Non-Europeans are concerned, they will be inclined to dismiss the principle of separation as simply another form of segregation under which they will receive the worst of the bargain. They have never objected to separation as such, but to the injustice which is invariably associated with its application. The Native people do not object to separate schools as such, but to the fact that the needs of the schools receive scant attention, especially from the devotees of the segregation faith. The same applies to other separate institutions for non-White groups. At the same time, they have learnt that the more being together with White people in the same institutions is no guarantee that even-handed justice will be meted out to them. When they belong to the same churches, the same schools, the same inter-racial groups of different kinds, the same local and national councils, the same trade unions, they always find, it is not unfair to say, that all these institutions, which apparently have no colour bar, are none the less dominated by White opinion and White leadership. In the net result, there is no difference between segregation with injustice and the appearance of an absence of segregation with White domination. "Total Separation" into mutually independent racial communities, such as Professor Hofmeyr advocates, is not open to either of these objections, for it eliminates both injustice and continuing White domination. Hence, the present writer has no hesitation in saying that Professor Hofmeyr's sort of separation deserves the serious attention of all those who are interested in the development, here in South Africa, of stable "areas of freedom" for all the racial groups in the population. For, as Professor Hofmeyr observes, the "caste-structure of South African society has no intrinsic stability and permanency". In a young country such as this, which is faced with entirely new problems of adjustment and adaptation or with old problems in a peculiarly difficult set of circumstances, it behoves us not only to rely on a unhinging advocacy of so-called well-established principles on this or that question, but rather to adopt the scientific attitude of open-mindedness and wise and careful experimentation in our search for a social structure which will satisfy the hopes and aspirations of every section of our population. As a work permeated by that spirit, South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit richly deserves the serious consideration of all liberty-loving South Africans.

Z. K. MATTHEWS

IV

Liberalism connotes freedom of opinion and democratic principles, but liberty to be worth having must mean more than the absence of compulsion. It must embrace a sense of responsibility, and foster loyalty and good citizenship. Its precise interpretation, of course, depends on a particular historical setting, and perhaps the nineteenth century doctrine of liberalism did not envisage a multi-racial society. But the true liberal spirit must value liberty for all groups and peoples, regarding it as an essential ingredient for human development.

Such an ideal of universal liberty does not require that differences of race, culture, and ideals should be ignored. But it does require that differences should be respected and tolerated also to make separate contributions to the total achievement of mankind.

White South Africa is proud of its love of liberty, and its history is eloquent of a practical urge to preserve freedom and democracy. But are we succeeding in the task of building up a multi-racial community?

Professor Hofmeyr, in taking stock of the rights, duties, and opportunities of our Native peoples, suggests that the fundamental fact is the predominance of a White minority upheld by political power, (legislative, administrative, judicial, educational and economic privileges, and the steps taken to preserve social distance.

But there is a high price to pay. Native preoccupations in their work and leisure are inevitably coloured with fear, suspicion, and occasional hostility. There is the resentment of the more thoughtful and informed Native, and there are the fears of the White group.

As a caste-society based on race is in any case contrary to liberal ideals, it becomes necessary to re-examine our principles in the light of present trends. Fortunately in a democratic community we are free to advocate our ideals, criticise official policy, attempt to change public opinion, and press for a liberal view of "trusteeship". The situation is always hopeful and a better system is always possible, because White South Africa is still a democracy, and policy is still open to the influence of public opinion.

Professor Hofmeyr then outlines his liberal alternatives as follows—

1. "Parallelism", a development of similar institutions in the various racial groups, accepts the fact of race differences, condemns no racial group to legal or other discrimination, and credits each of them with the right to preserve its own integrity and its social distance from the others. But any genuine "parallelism" must be ruled out as impracticable at present.

2. "Total Assimilation" would mean that race conflict would disappear by gradually abolishing race differences. Cultural assimilation, implying the disappearance of the more primitive type, would lead to economic, then political, and finally racial assimilation. It must be admitted that a good deal of cultural and economic assimilation has already taken place. Europeans differ on the precise point where they begin to object to this process. But it is safe to conclude that total assimilation would be extremely dangerous. Hence this alternative also is impracticable.

3. "Total Separation" is suggested because of the conviction that a caste-society which involves perpetual friction, conflict, and bitterness is not worth preserving. The suggestion of genuinely separate, self-contained, and self-governing communities is envisaged in marked contrast with certain "segregation" proposals which would merely block Native progress and development,
while escape from White domination would still give the Natives access to European culture. Professor Hoernle is well aware of the many and serious objections to total separation. The economic entanglement of Whites and non-Whites is of course one of the oldest facts in our history. Only half of our Native population live in the Reserves, a large percentage of them also earn money wages outside their areas, and large numbers of Native workers must be recruited from outside the Union. Whites and Natives depend on each other so closely that the links could not be severed without disaster to both.

Hence Total Separation seems no more practicable than the other alternatives.

Hence not one of the theoretically possible escapes into a social, economic, and political order more in line with liberal ideals is practicable at present. Yet Professor Hoernle thinks that such a choice must be made, even if there is no hope of it being realized in the foreseeable future, for, in addition to existing liberal activities in sections of all three alternative fields, we must have a long-range goal with blueprints for the right ordering of race relations.

For this purpose Professor Hoernle chooses “Total Separation” as the long-run goal. Yet he admits that the goal is unrealizable, because White South Africa is never likely to agree to sacrifice its power, prestige, economic advantage, and convenience. But its choice as a goal would ease inter-racial tension, and make possible useful co-operation with all those favouring the development and enlargement of the Native Reserves, with those who do not oppose European culture for Natives, and with those who welcome a development of a self-reliant national spirit. The effort would at any rate clear our minds about the application of liberal ideals in a multi-racial society and be a test of our conscience, wisdom, and humanity.

We would agree with Professor Hoernle that some hard thinking is urgently necessary, however dim and distant any chosen goal may be.

Professor Hoernle’s ultimate goal of Total Separation is too far distant to be worth discussion in details, especially of the economics of such separate racial groups. Perhaps if we keep this object in mind, however, our thinking and the experience we gain may suggest useful subsidiary positions to capture and perhaps modify the original long-range goal.

It would also appear that the racial and political problems which might be solved would be greatly outweighed by new economic difficulties which would follow even a tentative approach to the separatist goal.

Other possibilities therefore might well be considered at the same time in the spontaneous thinking which is ahead. In large part the future welfare of the Native will depend largely on the success or otherwise of White economy. In this connexion the future of South Africa is and must continue to be largely bound up with the future of world trade and overseas investment. Some of our common difficulties could therefore be best attacked from the international flank by the cooperation of liberals in every country. It is probable, too, that our most serious obstacles to South African progress are due less to Nature’s niggardliness in her provision of natural resources (other than gold), than to the shortcomings of the human inhabitants. Blueprints for a common sense tackling of the causes of the friction within the White groups are urgently necessary, if only because the future is so very much more important than the past.

Careful consideration should also be given to the possibility of large-scale immigration. A larger population would give our farmers a wider home market, assist the more economical development of home industries, ensure a safer racial balance, and, by reducing White fears of numerical superiority of non-Whites, make it possible to raise the efficiency of Non-Europeans. The greater productivity and greater purchasing power of the half million Native labourers on European farms and the 600,000 Natives employed in urban areas would be a landmark in South African progress. Immigration, too, could be combined with a policy of encouraging the maintenance of South African population growth, requiring long-range programmes of housing, educational facilities, health, medical services, and no doubt a drastic revising of the policy of subsidizing the exports of food while ignoring the nutritional requirements of our poorest groups.

Before widening the circle of liberal principles and practice, it might be wise to examine the degree of freedom and democracy now present in the favoured minority. Freedom and democracy can have little significance, perhaps even no meaning at all, for those who are haunted by the fear of economic insecurity, ill health, and poverty. Perhaps it might be as well to see that there are no gaps in the foundations of civilization and then to build up a comprehensive plan of constructive social and economic reforms.

But the difficulties of any long-range goal should not discourage the smaller but more immediate possibilities.

Common sense suggests that neither European health nor European industry can be built on Native malnutrition and disease. Further, there are obvious advantages in Non-European labour becoming more skilled and more diversified. In this process Native education is not a luxury, but a necessary basis for increased productivity, and the growth of a more thoughtful and useful people. With so much at stake, the present indifferencce of White South Africa is unbelievable.

Fortunately an improvement in social services, especially education, health, and housing, is becoming more feasible in view of a growing public conscience, and a dim realization that South African industrial expansion on economic lines will depend partly upon the widening of a home market in which the Native will be more valuable as an intelligent consumer than as a cheap and ignorant unit of labour.

South African resources and qualities must be developed to the full, and every individual in South Africa, of whatever race or colour, should be given a full opportunity of realizing the best of which he, or she, is capable.

Affording opportunities to the many will not only be the best way of maintaining a civilized standard for the few but also make it possible for the many to enjoy some of the benefits of human progress. It is doubtful if Total Separation would achieve this desirable result.

Of course some of the above points would require a little less faith in economic freedom and a little more faith in the assistance, even interference, by public authorities or central boards than the average liberal would care to admit. At this point he might be invited to consider very seriously the possibilities of working out a little planning for an enlightened democracy.

Certainly, Professor Hoernle challenges us to think. At the moment we are no doubt floundering without any definite objectives. Such hazy suggestions as are put forward in the name of “Segregation” are so obscure as to have little or no meaning. They claim attention because in some mystical way they seem to ensure that not only will Natives still work for the Europeans and yet be kept out of sight, but that their continued poverty will safeguard “civilized” standards.

“Mëre is 'n ander dag.”—But the times we now live in and the tides of ignorance and prejudice wait for no man, not even a South African!