

James Burnham, that these leaders of tomorrow will come from the managerial class, i.e. that our revolution is the managerial revolution. This has not been borne out by events. It would seem that in Russia there is a new aristocracy which is an élite of the technician, but this aristocracy has no great political power. The Christian's opportunity, and duty, is to work to become part and a dominating part of the new élite which has not yet emerged, but which must come very largely from among the workers. One of the elements in this ferment of revolution is the rise to power of the workers of the world. If they are not to be bound by chains of their own forging there must be a growth of leadership which will offset, and even arrest, the excesses of collectivisation. Moreover, the leaders who arise must have nothing of the demagogue about them, have no tinge of the *Führerprinzip*, but be leaders in virtue of their technical competence and their love of, and desire to serve, their fellow men. From their inspiration and leadership must come the communities of the future, and of these the most fundamental is the family.

The task of the Christian in politics is to work for security, justice and the conservation of all that is good, and as the method of securing these things at present is through a diminution of individual initiative he must be at pains to provide spheres of freedom where man's humanity and perfection can flourish, communities which will keep off the pressure of mass society and will enable men to overcome the atomising effect of the world of yesterday. But it must be begun quickly. 'The "children of light" are too often less clever than the "sons of darkness"'. This condition does not spring from any precept of the Lord. To be late with an idea may be a fact, it is not a virtue.'

JOHN FITZSIMONS .

RACIAL POLICIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

SINCE wartime days South Africa has been faced, both at home and abroad, with a rising tide of feeling and opinion which demands a solution to its problems of population groups, European, African, Cape Coloured and Indian, on lines in accordance with justice and Christianity. It is no longer possible to look upon the Non-White peoples as perpetually or indefinitely condemned to be servants and labourers; and such views, common in the press ten years ago, are now rarely seen. All parties realise that only a policy that gives full justice and opportunity will have any hope of

success. Hence the rival policies, which formerly tended to don the appearances of Liberal and Repressionist, now meet on grounds of fairness and practicability. Each claims to be the only policy which combines justice to all groups with practical feasibility; while all, in greater or lesser degree, claim to represent Christian principles.

Leaving aside, therefore, *political policies* of parties, which aim largely at political or commercial ends and which do not face the problem squarely, it will be useful to make a short survey of the *theoretical* policies at present being advocated in the Union. They may be classed as four in number: Apartheid or Separation, Parallelism, Trusteeship, and Assimilation.

APARTHEID

Apartheid or Separation is the policy talked about by the present National Party government. In general they are aiming in its direction, but the necessity of pleasing the voters and financing interests tends to make the actual policy pursued a mixture of Separatism, Parallelism, Trusteeship and Repression. We therefore speak here not of the Governmental policy of Apartheid, but of the policy as propounded by its theorists.

The kernel of the policy is a simple one: that the only solution in which White and Non-White will find justice and full scope for development, and therefore the only ultimately practical policy, is complete territorial separation. The Non-White peoples must gradually, but without delay, be removed (mainly by attraction) to parts of the country separate from the Whites. Here, at first under White guidance, they are to be given full opportunities for education, agriculture, industry and eventually self-government as independent national states. The White people, aided by suitable immigration, must gradually do without the services of Non-White labour. The most optimistic period in which this separation could be carried out is twenty years, while many think much longer. But all agree that a start must be made at once, otherwise it will be quite impossible.

The bases of this policy are various: but it enjoys a large measure of support from the White population of South Africa, especially from the Afrikaans-speaking section. It may be said that there are two principal bases for the Apartheid policy: theological and anthropologico-practical.

The theological school of Apartheid holds that it is the will of God: but here again there are three groups.

The first hold, on grounds largely drawn from the Old Testament, that it is definitely taught in Scripture that God made separate and distinct races, and that his blessing rests upon those who respect

and maintain that separation, while his curse falls upon those who yield to racial admixture. With the older type of Afrikaner, whose background is so Biblical, this conviction of the Scriptural basis for the policy of Apartheid is very powerful, and tends to close his mind to rational argument.

The second group holds that there is no explicit Scriptural basis for the policy, and that the Old Testament teaches a Separation of Pagan and Jew, not of races. The example of Israel, a peculiar people, cannot be applied to other nations. Nevertheless the policy of Apartheid can be based on Scripture by a deduction, principally from the commandments of honouring parents and of not killing. Every group, White or Non-White, is obliged to maintain its cultural heritage from its forefathers, and may not commit racial and cultural suicide by admixture with different groups.

The third group relinquishes all attempts to justify the policy by Scripture, but tries to do so on grounds of Christian justice and charity. The White Christian, who desires, reasonably, to maintain his racial identity and way of life, must also wish the same for his Non-White brethren. He must not try to Europeanise him, but must aid him to build up a true Christian civilisation of his own. There is no hope of this except in complete separation.

The theological school of Apartheid is chiefly represented by the Dutch Reformed Churches, who have already over a period of fifty years begun to carry out this policy in the ecclesiastical sphere by the establishment of separate Mission-Churches, now beginning to approach independence.

The anthropological school of Apartheid theorists together with theological and other supporters have recently become embodied in the South African Bureau for Racial Affairs centred at Stellenbosch University. The main contentions in favour of the policy are from the point of view of practical administration and development. It is admitted that there is no inherent known inferiority of the Non-White peoples in relation to the White, but only an historical and cultural one, which can rapidly disappear. The practical problem is how to enable the Whites and the Non-Whites both to live in South Africa as their only national homeland. South Africa cannot be regarded as a colony from which the White dominant (and usually exploiting) minority can eventually retire; it must remain, and if it is to retain its identity, it must make fair provision for the Non-White groups. Now in face of existing racial attitudes to hope for a real opportunity for development and for true justice for the Non-Whites, while mixed with the Whites, is illusory. The continuance of the present position of Domination tempered by

Trusteeship can only mean ever increasing tension, and eventual bloodshed. The Non-Whites are subjected to a multitude of discriminations and limitations with small opportunity for development; while the Whites suffer from degeneration due to the absence of that manual labour for which many are only fitted.

The objections against this policy are as follows: Against the Scriptural supporters of Apartheid a lively controversy goes on in the religious press and outside, and some of the leading Dutch Reformed theologians do not accept direct Scriptural arguments as valid. Most, however, support the policy on grounds deduced from Scripture, or on practical grounds of Christian justice and charity.

Against the anthropologico-practical school of Apartheid the arguments are many.

There is the claim that South African economy depends upon Native Labour. It is, however, true to say that actually it depends rather upon *cheap* labour than upon *Native* labour, and that the days of this cheap labour are in any case numbered. In the policy of Apartheid it will be necessary to divert or remove much industry to the proposed Non-White territories, only allowing the system of migratory male labour for industries of their nature only temporary, such as the gold-mines, and replacing it in White territories by White labour, immigrant or local. The possibility of White industries competing with Native industries in nearby territories is also a problem, which could be met by agreements or by the claimed superiority of White workmanship.

While the purely economic aspects of the difficulty might be susceptible of solution, it is much less certain that either White Capital or Labour, used to high profits on the one hand, and to easy jobs of supervision on the other, will acquiesce in the proposed change. Nor is it clear that Whites will be willing, or even able, to undertake the heavy manual work. If this is so, the policy of Apartheid tends to arrest the granting of justice and fair conditions to the Non-White population among the Whites on the grounds of a chimeric separation to come.

This the theorists of Apartheid admit, and they are making efforts to convince both White and Non-White public opinion of the necessity for immediate action and change of outlook. Otherwise, as they agree, there will be no alternative but gradual assimilation accompanied by great conflicts.

The Non-Whites are against Apartheid, and on the whole desire integration into European Civilisation on equal terms. They bitterly resent any implication of inferiority, and fear that Apartheid means

permanent condemnation to an inferior, or even uncivilised, form of life. These fears are grounded. Large areas of land would be needed, and not merely of second-rate land; all the Non-Whites cannot be farmers, and their territories must be such as to be able to support towns and industries. A vast scheme of education, both cultural and practical, would be needed. The hope that any South African Government will be able to undertake this seems small; yet only some vast scheme which would attract the Non-Whites to the territories destined for them by the visible advantages offered to them could effect Apartheid. The co-operation of other governments in Southern Africa would in fact be necessary in order to find suitable areas.

From a Christian point of view there are serious objections on the grounds of justice and charity to the policy as an ideal. The Non-White peoples have an equal right with the Whites to South Africa, and have contributed largely by their labour to all its amenities. Their present position of inferiority is due to force as much as to historical backwardness, and its maintenance is by force of one kind or another. Their claim to share in the development of the country before that of immigrants of any kind cannot be dismissed. They have acquired rights, which can only be lost by their own consent, or in face of great peril to society; it seems improbable that they can be attracted to consent to separation, and the risks of chaos are not so immediate as to justify enforced separation as the only remedy. The Catholic sense of the unity of the Church and of charity also tends against Apartheid, since it inclines to unite peoples rather than to separate. And where the White and Non-White live in such close contact as here, charity must tend to result in a dissolution of barriers. Hence it is difficult to regard Apartheid as a desirable policy in itself, or for South Africans of whatever group; it can only be defended as a lesser evil, to escape insurmountable difficulties and risks, and as the only hope of justice for the Non-Whites. But from the practical point of view it comes up against a multitude of obstacles which render the possibility of its execution extremely unlikely, and this is the greatest objection against it: it is illusory. Neither South African economic interests, nor White opinion, nor Non-White opinion, nor World politics, nor the development of Africa as a whole will really consent to it.

PARALLELISM

Parallelism is a policy which proposes not to impose a territorial separation, but to develop separate but equal institutions for White and Non-White. Each group is to have its own residential areas,

its own schools, churches, hospitals and social organisations; its own language and customs, and to a large extent its own industries and businesses; yet all groups will share a common citizenship and have an equal or proportionate share in Government.

This policy, if intended to be carried out to the full, meets with insurmountable practical difficulties; and, in so far as it is carried out, in almost every case results in not only separate, but unequal, treatment for the Non-White. Parallelism as it exists in a homogeneous country, as, for instance, in the case of girls' and boys' schools; or as it exists in South Africa between Afrikaans- and English-speaking Whites in the matter of language, supposes equal but divergent interests: while between White and Non-White the interests are largely co-incident, and parallelism is impossible. Nevertheless as a partial and practical measure for decreasing friction and for giving the Non-Whites some measure of opportunity, the development of parallel institutions, schools, etc., is useful and necessary. But it does not provide a full policy for the future.

TRUSTEESHIP

Trusteeship is a policy, or perhaps rather an attitude, which recognises the backwardness of the Non-White peoples and claims for the Whites the position of trustee for them as their wards. It recognises race differences and would foster different forms of human excellence, shunning a monotonous uniformity, but it demands, on a Christian basis, mutually agreed racial respect, and the recognition of the common humanity of all men.' (Mrs A. W. Hoernlé.) This policy aims really at eventual, though far off, cultural assimilation; in the meanwhile it seeks to give the greatest possible justice and opportunity to the Non-White groups and to lead them on the way to development, largely by way of parallel but equal institutions and residential areas. It is left to the future to decide the lot of the different groups as the process of assimilation progresses. As they advance they must take a proper share in government and gradually be admitted to all the rights of civilised men.

The Trusteeship attitude is thus in a way the lowest common multiple of the other theories, attempting to realise what is strictly practical. It accepts, at least temporarily, the idea of separation with all the sacrifices it would entail; it accepts racial and cultural differences as given facts with which it would be precarious to tamper directly, and proposes to preserve as far as possible the individuality of each group. This was the policy more or less definitely aimed at by the last, United Party, government; but in practice it deteriorated into a policy of *laissez-faire*. It is

also largely supported by Liberals of all types, the Anglican and other English-speaking Churches, and is embodied in the South African Institute of Race Relations which has done so much to enlighten public opinion in favour of the Non-White people.

ASSIMILATION

Assimilation means the full absorption of the Non-Whites into the same civilisation as the Whites with the abolition of all barriers: either without racial admixture resulting, or with it. In South Africa this policy is not a practical one: White opinion is utterly averse to it, and considers that any sudden or rapid admittance of the large Non-White majority to equality would result in the ruin of civilisation.

PROSPECTS

With Assimilation as outside practical politics for a long time to come, and thoroughgoing Apartheid faced with probably insurmountable difficulties, it would seem likely that in fact South African policy will necessarily follow a line of mixed parallelism and trusteeship, with a certain amount of attraction of the Non-Whites to separate areas accompanying it. This can only be accompanied by a growing unrest and dissatisfaction among the Non-Whites, which may lead to upheavals and violent solutions. It is impossible to foretell the future, as so much will depend on immigration; the birth-rate of the Whites, already very low; the development of Central and Portuguese Africa; and, indeed, world events. The hold of White civilisation on South Africa seems really very precarious; a wholesale emigration of the Whites is not outside the realm of possibility. The above summary of theories will give some idea of the general attitude of responsible White opinion to the matter of racial relations, and show that there is much good will, and much concern for justice and Christian values, in face of a situation of the most extreme complication. For while only White and Non-White have been spoken of, in order to present the theories clearly, it must be remembered that there are four groups in South Africa: White, Cape Coloured, Indian and Native Africans. Not only between White and Non-White, but also between Cape Coloured and Native, and between Native and Indian exist similar and sometimes even greater difficulties against assimilation or complete segregation. Before these problems any complete theoretical policy seems to fail: only a constant and inviolable will to justice and charity could find a solution and that only little by little.

OSWIN MAGRATH, O.P.