

GIPE-PUNE 03380

EUROPEAN

Versus

BANTU

In the Union of South Africa

By W. A. RUSSELL



Printed and Published by

MASKEW MILLER, LIMITED
CAPE TOWN

EUROPEAN *versus* BANTU

IN THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

By **W. A. RUSSELL**

THE important legislative proposals which are being brought forward by the Prime Minister of the Union have directed the attention of the people of South Africa to what is commonly called "the Native Problem." The "Natives" are beginning to ask why it should not rather be called the "European Problem." The question ought certainly to be considered from the standpoint of both races. In the following pages an attempt is made to discuss the problem from a non-party and a non-partisan point of view in a spirit of justice and fair play.

In the first place a widely prevalent misconception must be corrected. In the *Cape Times*' account of the great international missionary conference held two years ago at Le Zoute, the address of M. Franck, the well-known Minister of State for the Belgian Colonies, was summarised as follows :—

M. Franck summed up the ideal of his own country as being "Central Africa a black man's country" with Europeans as the leaders for the present, giving them new visions, not of a Westernised Africa, but of their own land animated by new ideals.

Incidentally M. Franck repeated a conversation he once had with General Smuts. The General told him he wanted South Africa to be a white man's country, to which he replied: "That is your affair," a remark, the full significance of which is irreproducible apart from Mr. Franck's slight shrug and smile of courteous disapprobation.

The first object of this article is to show that the insinuation evidently implied in these remarks is unfair, and that the position of the European race in South Africa is very different from its position in Central Africa. The following quotation from Lord Selbourne's University address on the Native Problem will carry conviction to the minds of most fair-minded people :—

The impression of some philanthropists in Europe that all the land owned by whites in South Africa has been wrested by them from the natives who now live on the spot is, of course, historically untrue. In Cape Colony, for instance, the present natives, that is, the Kaffir tribes, never came as conquerors west of the Kei rivier. When the white man landed in Cape Colony, the inhabitants of the land were Hottentots and Bushmen, races which have now practically disappeared, but whose destruction the white man postponed rather than hastened, as it was the presence of the white man alone which kept the invading tribes of Kafirs to the east of the Kei River, tribes which would otherwise have overrun the whole country and exterminated the Hottentots and Bushmen. Similarly, when the emigrant farmers trekked across the Orange River, they found what is now the Orange River Colony, practically a desert; it had been swept clean by Umzilikazi and his Zulus in their great northward raid to escape from Tehaka. Again, when the emigrant farmers crossed the Vaal River, they found the scattered tribes now living in the Transvaal in danger of extermination from that same Umzilikazi, and they saved these Transvaal tribes from annihilation. Therefore, while it is true that certain parts of South Africa have been wrested by force of arms from the ancestors of the natives still living in these territories, it is also true that the greater part of South Africa has been occupied by white men without ousting therefrom the ancestors of any of the existing tribes, and that, further, in certain cases, the existing tribes owe the fact of their existence to the presence of the white man.

The national title of the European to possession in South Africa is as sound as national titles considered rightful elsewhere.

But the question is argued often now in a different manner. "Africa is one," it is said, and "Africa for the Africans"; the underlying assumption being that the only true Africans are negroes of Central Africa.

But Africa is not one. Mommsen, the great historian of Rome, in an illuminating sentence says North Africa is not a part of Africa at all. Geographically and climatically and historically it forms a unity with South Europe—the great Mediterranean region of geographers. It is cut off from Central Africa by the most effective of all barriers, the great desert of Sahara. The Sahara is one of the deepest dividing lines in geography. Different worlds lie to the North and to the South. The people living on the North are generically of the same race as the people of Spain and Italy—*homo Mediterraneus*. South of the Sahara in Central Africa is the true home of the negro race to which the Bantu belongs.

Now South Africa occupies relatively to Central Africa a geographical and climatical position similar to that of North

Africa. It is a different country from Central Africa, cut off by the barrier of the Kalahari desert, which does not, however, extend right across the continent to the Indian ocean, but leaves a passage of considerable breadth between it and the sea. It enjoys a climate of the Mediterranean type. And the original inhabitants, Hottentots and Bushman, were a race quite distinct from the negro or Bantu. They were a very sparsely scattered people, inferior to the Bantu in culture and in warlike prowess. Accordingly the early white settlers spread rapidly over South Africa from the west, and it was in the east they first encountered the Bantu tribes who had been pressed down from the North. Though a brave people the Bantu were conquered without great difficulty. Generous treatment was accorded to them, and they were settled in lands at the time more than amply sufficient for them.

From all this it follows that the Bantu cannot claim the territory of the Union as justly the heritage of their race. The white man was settled in it before the Bantu. It is well demarcated by natural boundaries from Central Africa. It has a climate in which the white man can work and thrive and bring up his family. Indeed the physique of the European seems to improve in it.

Accordingly the slogan "Africa for the Africans," though it sounds plausible, is really meaningless. If it is translated into "South Africa for the Bantu," it is a claim that cannot be made good on just and reasonable grounds.

General Smuts is therefore justified in desiring to preserve South Africa "as a white man's country." That is not to say the Bantu have no rights in it. They have acquired rights and those rights ought to be respected. But within the Union the white man's interest is justly paramount on the same principle as that on which the British Government has decided that native interests are paramount in Central Africa.

When, however, we turn our attention from the discussion of theoretical and historical rights and survey the actual situation, it will be seen that the position of the white man in the Union is being undermined. General Smuts has declared that the future of South Africa "is dark and uncertain." Most thinking people who know the country agree with him. The grounds for these apprehensions are to be found in the excessively rapid growth of the Bantu population. During recent years the Bantu have been overflowing from the territories and lands assigned to them in large numbers, and have been entering areas hitherto regarded as European. There has been in fact a peaceful invasion on the part of the Bantu. They have not only bought land or, more frequently, "squatted" on land belonging to Europeans; but they have also made their way into the dorps and cities of the country in ever increasing numbers. General Hertzog has

expressed his apprehensions that if things go on as they are going, it will not be long before the white vote in the Cape Province will be outnumbered by the Bantu vote; and has stated it as his conviction that the granting of the Franchise on the Cape basis to the Bantu in the other Provinces would mean the ruin of the white population and the extinction of European civilisation in the Union.

In my opinion there are reasonable grounds for both these apprehensions.

In the first place let us consider the questions of the Cape Franchise. The qualifications at present required are virtually a sham. Theoretically they sound all right. Education, and wage earning capacity or the possession of a certain amount of property; but let us look at them more closely and see what they amount to in practice.

The educational requirement is ability to read and write, and this might well be deemed sufficient. But how is this ability tested? Would-be voters may be required to write their names and addresses, occupations, but they may not be asked even to indicate which word is the name, and which the occupation. Bantu labourers, obviously uneducated, have voted in the Cape whose sole literary accomplishment was the ability to reproduce with a pen the curves and strokes that represented these three or four words—a trick that may be taught in two or three hours.

The wage earning qualification is placed at a minimum of £50 per annum; this works out at 3/2 a day. Forty years ago this was quite a respectable wage. To-day it would be regarded as a starvation wage to be rejected with contempt by an unskilled European labourer. Even for a Bantu labourer in any of our large towns, it is not a proper living wage. In the Cape Peninsula he earns more than 3/2 to-day, often 4/-, sometimes 5/-. In my opinion a Bantu labourer in any of our larger towns is underpaid if he gets less than 3/6 a day.

But how does all this great fall in the value of money affect eligibility for the franchise in the Cape, when taken in combination with the sham educational qualification. It means that the existing qualifications, as laid down and interpreted by law, are no longer an effective barrier to exclude persons who would have been regarded as quite unsuitable for franchise rights at the time when the qualifications were fixed. At the present time a very large number of Bantu, many of them very poor specimens of their race, might be legally placed on the voters' roll provided some political organisation took up the business, and made a sustained effort towards that object. In the near future this number will be largely increased, if that "peaceful invasion" of the Cape Province, already referred to, continues unabated.

I am in favour of promoting the material, moral and mental welfare of the Bantu peoples : I desire also that there should be friendly feeling and a good understanding between them and Europeans. One of the conditions for such good understanding is sincerity of speech ; and I must frankly say that I believe the transference of political power at the polls from the Europeans to the Bantu would initiate a serious decline in all that is best in European civilisation in South Africa, and would finally cause its extinction.

My reasons for this belief will now be given.

The Government of the Union of South Africa is of the ultra democratic representative parliamentary type, so far as the European population is concerned. According to Professor Bryce, this form of Government, in order to be successful, requires the fulfilment of three conditions. In the first place, the people must be capable of producing leaders of superior mental power. In the second place, there must be a fairly high average of intelligence and moral character amongst the voters, and thirdly there must be in the people a certain degree of homogeneity. These conditions are more or less adequately fulfilled in Great Britain and the United States and some of the British Dominions and in the States of North West Europe, but it would seem hardly anywhere else. In the Union of South Africa, if a large mass of Bantu voters were added to the European voters, the fundamental conditions of successful democratic government would certainly be violated.

The negro races of Central Africa, to whom the Bantu people belong, do not attain the average standard of intelligence or of character requisite for the maintenance of democratic representative government. The grounds, scientific and historical, on which this statement is based, will now be given.

Almost everyone has heard of Intelligence tests. First used in France some thirty years ago for the purpose of discovering children below normal standard, their application has been greatly improved and extended for the classification not only of children, but adults in respect to their natural intelligence. In the United States they are very largely used, and apparently with success in public education, in the administration of justice, and in large commercial and industrial businesses. Here attention is directed to certain comparative results on which American investigators are agreed. The intelligence of the average white man is found to be very considerably above that of the average negro. This does not mean that every white man is the superior of every negro ; far from it. The conclusion is stated thus : Only 25 per cent. of negroes rise above the average standard of whites ; 75 per cent. fall below it. If they were equal, 50 per cent. would be above the average, and 50 per cent. below.

Two facts seem to be clearly established by the American investigators.

1. The negro race does not produce anything like the same proportion of men of superior ability that the white race produces.
2. The average ability in the negro race is a great deal lower than that in the white race.

Many people, however, will not be convinced by the results of Intelligence-testing. It is too recent a thing yet to command general confidence. But let us therefore go to the lessons of history for even more convincing confirmation of the unfitness of the negro race for democratic representative government.

Haiti and Liberia are the two black republics of the world.

Haiti is a small state with a population of 1,500,000 composed almost entirely of pure blooded negroes. The island is one of the most fertile in the world, and, if it had had an enlightened and stable government, it would be prosperous. A century and a quarter ago it became a republic in theory at least, on the model of the French Republic, but in reality the so-called republic quickly degenerated into a military despotism, even though the head was styled President. The story of the island is one of corruption, cruelty and bloodshed, revolution following revolution in rapid succession. At last, after the people had abused their so-called constitutional freedom and sovereign independence for over 125 years, the United States intervened two years ago, and took over the administration of the Government. In every important respect the country had steadily retrograded for 125 years under its negro administration, yet where could negroes have got a better chance ?

Liberia. The State of Liberia was founded in West Africa, 1822, over 100 years ago by friends of the Black Race, for liberated slaves from America. It was hoped by its founders that it would prove a centre for civilising and christianising the negro peoples of Central Africa. After being some twenty years under tutelage, it was recognised as a Sovereign Independent State with a republican constitution modelled on that of the United States. What has been its record for the last eighty years ? Even its warmest friends have to admit that it has been profoundly disappointing. The most shocking fact is that the State which was founded for liberated slaves, which has in its constitution express provisions that there shall be no slavery and no dealing in slaves, and which has the proud motto : " Love of Liberty brought us here," now openly practises slavery and deals extensively in slaves.

It has constant wars with its inland tribes, and Sir Alfred Sharpe writes : " In Liberia the military force is accompanied by a large contingent of native allies whose operations consist in

finishing off the work carried out by the military, looting and seizing all the people they can, who are afterwards disposed of either by retaining as serfs or selling over the borders to other tribes."

He writes again : " The purchase of young people is quite common in Liberia : it is called ' pawning.' The person pawned becomes the property of the purchaser, but is supposed to be redeemable by payment of the price originally paid."

Concerning the traffic in slaves, ' boys "' they are euphemistically styled, Mr. Reeve, C.M.G., late Colonial Secretary, Gambia, writes : " There was hardly an official of the Government from the President downwards, who did not possess a ' boy ' in his household ; and, moreover, there were underlings who descended to deeper infamy, and purchased girls who were hired out to houses where there were no women as wives or servants, and in some instances where there were wives who tolerated the relations between the husbands and the ' girl ' servants."

Mr. Reeve concludes : " While all other governments of civilised nations in West Africa have practically eradicated slavery in all its worst forms, it still flourishes in a small negro state which only exists on sufferance because of its highly advertised purity of purpose towards the African races."

To say the only good thing that can be said in this connection, it is admitted that Liberians generally treat their slaves in kindly fashion.

Again the Administration of Justice in Liberia is very corrupt. In 1907 the British Government warned the President " That the Judiciary must be reformed, as an ignorant and corrupt Judiciary is intolerable." After this certain reforms were carried out, but after a few years things reverted to their old condition, a new President ruling that the Judiciary must act in harmony with the Government.

Sir Alfred Sharpe writes : " Perhaps the worst example of Liberian Government is the Inland District Administration. There are few—if any—honest District Commissioners, and many are hopelessly corrupt and unscrupulous." He concludes : " There will be little hope of proper treatment of the inland tribes, of just treatment of the population, of honest government, or of any advance in civilisation, and development of the country's resources, till every branch of administration is taken over and supervised by some civilised power or powers."

These are British witnesses, let us hear a French witness.

M. Delafosse who was French Consul in Liberia, writes :

" The spectacle that offers itself to-day to the eyes of the visitor is that of a nation in decadence."

Cuba. But, it may be said, these two republics are purely black ; if there had been a strong European element in the population, things would have been much better. In Cuba, the two races are in the proportion of two to three, but this circumstance has not sufficed to give them an honest and stable government. In the permanent treaty with Cuba, the Government of the United States of America, has reserved to itself the right of intervening in Cuba at any time for the maintenance of orderly government and the protection of liberty and property. This right they have had to exercise since the liberation of Cuba from Spain. They had to intervene and take over the administration of the country for three years.

The U.S.A. Let us now consider the political position of Negroes in the United States. Since the abolition of slavery some 60 years ago, the negroes have made good progress, both economically and educationally in the States. Some—very few—have even distinguished themselves. In the field of politics, however, an invincible antipathy among the whites against the negro vote has largely prevented the negro from exercising the franchise. Unscrupulous tactics, as well as open violence, have been employed. The right to vote has even been taken away by law. No law may be passed in the States that discriminates between people by reason of their colour, but this difficulty has been evaded, and a law has been passed taking away the franchise from anyone whose grandfather being resident in the U.S.A., had not the franchise.

What is the reason for this profound feeling against allowing the negro to vote ? It is due to the bitter memories of the government in the Southern States after the Civil War, when a low class of politicians, the carpet-baggers as they were called, came down from the North and captured the public offices through the votes of the newly enfranchised negroes. There ensued a regular orgy of graft and corruption.

It has been said that of recent years there has been an improvement in the relations between white and black in the United States, and I believe this to be true, though the American negro problem is not yet solved. But there is an immense difference between the "colour problems" in the United States and the Union of South Africa. In the States the numerical ratio of whites to blacks is 10 to 1, in the Union it is 1 to 3. In America there is no danger of the Europeans being swamped with the negroes ; here there is great danger.

Great Britain. Let us now observe the manner in which Great Britain governs those of her colonies where the negro vote predominates. The beautiful island of Jamaica will furnish an excellent example. The population of this island is 860,000 of whom only 15,000, less than 2 per cent., are Europeans ; 160,000 are coloured and 660,000 are of pure African descent.

Notwithstanding all this disproportion in population the European rules. A glance at the Jamaican constitution shows how this result is achieved :

There is a Governor, an Executive Council, and a Legislative Council. The Executive Council, as well as the Governor, is appointed by the King of England. The Legislative Council is made up of the Governor as President, five *ex officio* members, ten appointed members, and fourteen elected members. Thus the white majority in the Council, coupled with the veto power of the Governor, insures that, even if all of the fourteen elected members were blacks, the white would still be in control of the island administrative affairs.

On this constitution, an American critic somewhat caustically remarks :—

By this arrangement the negroes can always have the fun of the political game without harm befalling the island thereby.

Great Britain certainly does not believe in the fitness of the negro race for democratic self-government. What negro state within the British Empire has ever been granted responsible government, or is within measureable distance of obtaining it ?

For all the foregoing reasons I am convinced that it would be disastrous in the Union of South Africa to admit the Bantu people to anything like political equality with the European population. But this is not to say that the Bantu people should be treated with injustice.

Professor Jabavu has asserted that the taking away of their present franchise rights from the Bantu in the Cape Province would be a breach of "faith." This assertion misstates the case. By the Union constitution the franchise rights of the Bantu in the Cape Province cannot be rescinded except by a two-thirds majority of the Union Parliament, and the bill must further stand over for a year to be considered by the King. If the King gives his assent the bill becomes law. The franchise rights of the natives are therefore strongly entrenched, but, if all the above conditions are duly carried out, it cannot be truly said that there has been a breach of faith in rescinding them.

The native problem will now be viewed from the other side—from the standpoint of the interests of the Bantu people.

Since the attainment of what is known as "the Higher Status," the Union of South Africa exercises "imperial" power over the native races within its territory. "Imperial" is not a popular word in South Africa, but it is the only word that truly describes the position. It must be admitted that the native peoples have lost something of value by reason of "the Higher Status." They have no longer even in theory the right of appeal to the Government of Great Britain. The question to be faced, therefore, is the following : "Is the Union of South Africa fitted by its present constitution and its present mode of parliamentary government to rule justly over the native races subject to it. Indeed it stands committed to more than bare justice. It is a member of the

League of Nations which has laid down for civilised nations the principle of trusteeship with regard to backward peoples; and on this understanding it has undertaken to administer the mandated territory of South-West Africa. Is the Union of South Africa prepared to acknowledge and to carry out its responsibilities of trusteeship for the native races over which it exercises sovereign power?

It must be confessed that it is very difficult for a democratic state with a party system of government such as the Union of South Africa possesses, to exercise imperial rule wisely and justly over backward peoples. Still, the very fact that hitherto the Bantu population has increased so rapidly proves that there has been no policy of cruelty and oppression. There are, however, certain important matters in which our treatment of the natives at present is open to grave reproach.

1. In the Union of South Africa people are supposed to be equal before the law irrespective of colour as regards security of life and person and property, and as a rule natives get justice in cases that are decided by a judge or magistrate. But almost invariably under the jury system of trial a European who is charged with the murder of a native or with a serious assault upon him, no matter how strong the evidence may be, either is not convicted, or is very inadequately punished.

This grave indictment has been denied by the present Minister of Justice, who says that in South Africa, as in all countries, there are occasional miscarriages of justice, but things are no worse in South Africa than elsewhere. The following facts which are stated on good authority show that the administration of justice so far as the native is concerned is much worse than the Minister makes out.

During the last hundred years in the Cape and the Free State and the Transvaal many whites have been hanged for murdering whites, and many blacks have been hanged for murdering blacks, and many blacks have been hanged for murdering whites, but no white has been hanged for murdering a black except in one case arising out of the Johannesburg riots in 1922, which was tried by a Commission of Judges. The killing of a black by a white is in practice not treated as murder, or indeed as a very heinous offence. This is a state of matters that cannot be defended. All one can say is that things are not nearly so bad as might be expected under the circumstances. In general white people in South Africa are kindly towards the natives. Cases of cruelty are rare. It is obvious that the natives do not go about in fear of their lives or of brutal treatment.

2. To pass to economic matters, the natives are taxed heavily both directly and indirectly, but it would be difficult to point out what benefits very many of them receive from the State in return for the revenue they contribute. Surely the revenue thus

received should be expended on native welfare. Legislation has recently been passed to ameliorate this state of matters, but it is not sufficient.

Complaints are widely made that native workers receive inadequate wages, and these complaints in many cases are well founded. On the other hand absurd demands have been put forward by native agitators. Native labour is generally unskilled and is often of very poor quality. It would often be more economic in white areas if native labour were replaced by machinery under skilled workmen.

3. What is popularly called the "Colour Bar" has been legalised. By this legislation, unique, I believe, in the civilised world in its repressive nature, the Bantu may be debarred from performing skilled artisan work, even in the territories reserved for him, no matter what qualifications he may possess. "

4. To the majority of the Bantu the most important question is the security of the tenure of their land. Recently there has been a wide-spread feeling of nervous apprehension in regard to it, especially in Zululand. One cause for this nervousness is to be found in the irresponsible and mischievous utterances of members of Parliament bidding for popular support. One declares that a man has "no natural rights." Another that "Justice to the native is injustice to the white." A third invents a slogan, "If it is unfair, I don't care."

5. At the present time perhaps the worst injury done to native people through their contact with Europeans is their demoralisation resulting from "slum" life in our larger cities. Of recent years increasingly large numbers of natives from the reserves have got the habit of coming for longer or shorter periods to the larger European centres in search of work. Some remain permanently. I remember Mr. Cecil Rhodes some thirty years ago speaking to a deputation of teachers who wished to visit the compounds in Kimberley. He said:—"The natives who come to work at De Beers leave us healthier in body and richer in pocket than when they came." That could not be said truthfully now of large numbers of the natives who come to our European centres. What are the considerations that determine their choice of locality? Largely the facilities for drinking and for fornication. The truth is—the freedom of city life with its opportunities for licentiousness is ruinous to the health and morality of the primitive native.

After this catalogue of evils in fairness there should be mentioned one great boon conferred by the Union Government upon the native peoples. A college has been established successfully for the Higher Education of native students. This marks a great advance.

At present in the House of Assembly, in the rivalry and antagonism of many conflicting interests, who is there to plead the cause and uphold the interests of the natives? There is no one. Surely it would be an immense improvement on the present position if the proposals of the Prime Minister were carried into effect and there were a certain number of members charged with the sole duty of representing native interests and dissociated from European political parties.

But even if the Prime Minister's proposals for giving the Bantu peoples special representation in the House of Assembly are carried, this step, though a very desirable step, will not settle even temporarily the native question. The main cause—the root cause—of our present native trouble will now be discussed. Attention has never adequately been directed to it; and it is time the facts of the situation were faced.

The apprehensions, aroused by what I have termed the "peaceful invasion" by Bantu of the European areas in the Union, were augmented by the publication of the Report of the Director of Census in 1924. In this document, it was shown that in the last thirty years, while the non-Europeans had increased by 2,630,000 the Europeans excluding immigrants had increased by only 500,000; and expression was given to the view that if the white race was to hold its own, it would be necessary to secure an immense development of white civilisation during the next fifty or twenty-five years.

Some of our South African authorities on native affairs have published articles minimising the gravity of the statistical revelations in the Census Report, but their arguments fail to carry conviction. Any person with a head for facts and figures who reads the Census report, must feel that the future for South Africa is, as General Smuts said, "dark and uncertain."

It is vain, however, for the Director of the Census to speak of an immense development of white civilisation to counter-balance the rapid increase of the Bantu. No immense scheme of immigration is within the bounds of practical economics. The fact must be faced that a grave menace to civilisation in the Union of South Africa lies in the excessive increase of the Bantu population.

A brief investigation of the growth of the population in Basutoland will illuminate the question.

Basutoland, the Switzerland of South Africa as it is often called, is a fertile and healthy country, a little smaller than Belgium. Like the Swiss, the Basutos under the leadership of a very able chief, Moshesh, bravely and successfully defended their country. They were never conquered, and at their own request came under the British rule, and are now governed as a crown colony. The land is strictly reserved for the natives.

No European is permitted to own a foot of it. The people are governed in accordance with their own native laws and customs. In *The Golden Stool*, the Rev. E. Smith writes: "Under this system, an African tribe is given the opportunity of developing sanely and securely along the lines of its own *ethos* while gradually absorbing the best elements of our European civilisation. On the whole the result is encouraging. One criterion of African happiness is increase in population. In 1875, Basutoland contained 127,707 people, in 1924 540,000. That is to say in fifty years the population has increased more than fourfold."

It is clear that Mr. Smith does not realise the true significance of these figures which he recounts with such evident satisfaction.

Taking the rate of increase among the Basutos as *fourfold*, considerably less than it really is, it works out at the rate of *sixteenfold* for a century—an enormous rate of increase. England trebled her population in the last century, but, as economists point out, it was a very exceptional century. The application of science to agriculture and industry and transportation, and the opening of the fertile western lands of the United States permitted an exceptionally great increase in the population of Western Europe. But compare a sixteenfold increase with a threefold increase! What is the real significance of these figures? They mean that, the Imperial Government having taken away the check of intertribal warfare, the natives, who propagate recklessly without any feeling of moral responsibility, are multiplying with a rapidity out of all proportion to their means of subsistence. There is great poverty in Basutoland, and in 1924 over 88,000 Basutos came into the Union looking for work.

No land could go on sustaining the present enormous rate of increase of the Bantu population.

It will be of interest to give the solution of the Basuto problem I heard propounded by a prominent native, the President of the African Congress. It was to permit unlimited "squatting" in the Union, *i.e.*, to allow native families to settle as tenants on farms owned by Europeans on the condition of giving half the produce as rent. This method might well be called "peaceful penetration." The European farmer would become a landlord and a landlord, moreover, who fulfils no useful function. Under such circumstances he would soon become extinct. This would certainly be the most expeditious way of making South Africa black. But, even if the white men were to hand over to the Bantu the whole of South Africa, the country would soon be filled to overflowing at the present rate of increase. What would happen then? Internecine tribal war, famine and pestilence would quickly reduce the population, and barbarism would again reign over South Africa.

Melancholy accounts of the poverty and distress prevailing in the native territories and districts have been published recently in the press. The subject has been discussed at important conferences. The government has been asked to appoint a commission to investigate causes and prescribe remedies.

The main cause of destitution among the Bantu is their excessive increase. This leads to overpopulation, and from overpopulation the inevitable consequences are indigence and disease. This excessive growth in population is bound to be checked in some way or the other. The best check would be for the natives to become imbued with a higher conception of marriage and a deeper feeling of moral responsibility in undertaking family obligations.

Mr. Max Yergan has said: "I believe that God must love the black man; He makes so many of them." In the native reserves I heard of an old chief who boasted he had over forty children. Does Mr. Yergan seriously maintain that such prolificity is a mark of divine favour? Surely some sublimation of animal instincts is a necessary step in the upward development of the native.

If an appeal be made to Christian charity, the Biblical precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," cannot by any sound exegesis be extended into imposing upon the state a moral obligation to provide the Bantu with land sufficient to enable them to go on multiplying as they are doing.

In my opinion, therefore, General Smuts was fully justified in passing legislation to prevent natives from acquiring land in European areas. If it is right that Europeans should be legally restricted from acquiring land in Native territories, it is equally right that natives should be subject to a similar restriction. The natives cannot have it both ways. All that can be equitably claimed is that under the circumstances the native reserves receive a fair augmentation.

What do all the preceding arguments and considerations point to? Surely to one conclusion—the territorial segregation of the Bantu peoples? It is often said that segregation is impossible. It certainly would be extremely difficult to effect in a short space of time. Still it is worth while drawing attention to the fact that a few years ago over two million Mohammedans were moved within a few weeks from the Balkan Peninsula to Asia Minor, and over two million Christians were transferred to the Balkan Peninsula in their place. Certainly this involved much suffering. But there is no necessity for precipitate haste in South Africa. Let the transference take place on lines such as are proposed in the Prime Minister's scheme of legislation. Let the land for European and Native occupation respectively be judiciously demarcated, and let it be enacted that land be sold

only to natives in the native areas, and only to Europeans in the European areas, and in a generation the matter will be practically settled. The business will be made easier by the fact that to a very large extent segregation exists already in practice.

It is not suggested that the Bantu should be simply allowed "to stew in their own juice" in their territories. They should be encouraged and helped to advance in civilisation. But it must be recognised that external assistance cannot do everything. The native must learn by experience that Divine Providence will not secure him against his own improvidence; that he must work if he wants to eat, and that he must postpone begetting children till he is able to support them.

English critics of South African native policy have never sufficiently realised how different native morality is from English. The native moral system, which grew up under the influence of constant tribal warfare, presents some admirable features, but it looks almost exclusively to the increase of the fighting strength of the tribe.

It is not suggested that under the segregation system natives should be prohibited from entering the European areas to do work on conditions mutually beneficial to both races. But they should be permitted to enter only as temporary workers, not as permanent settlers; and the government should exercise a certain degree of paternal supervision over them. In certain ways they are like children, and they cannot be allowed to do just as they please. Like children also they need a certain amount of protection. This is the attitude adopted by the League of Nations.

The final question is now to be considered. How can we best secure that the natives in their reserved territories shall be ruled rightly and justly? A great many white people in the Union, probably the majority, wish to do the right thing by the native; but it must be recognised that a great many wish to keep the native in a servile or semi-servile condition in order that they may have cheap labour. And a strong persistent minority, actuated by self-interest, manages often to get things its own way. To prevent this contingency, the proposal is made that the rule over all the native territories in South Africa with the exception of South West Africa should be exercised jointly by the Governments of Great Britain and South Africa. As things are, Great Britain exercises Imperial Rule over Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, territories which are encircled or almost encircled by Union territory, while the Union exercises Imperial Rule over Zululand and the Transkeian territories and other smaller native districts. Instead of each of these two Governments ruling separately and independently its own native territories, it is proposed that they should exercise a joint rule. This is not an

uncommon international arrangement for the protection of a backward people. It gives, as it were, two trustees instead of one. It should be also an easy arrangement to effect in the present relationship between Great Britain and the Union.

With regard to South-West Africa, as the charge of this territory has been specially "mandated" by the League of Nations to the Union, it should be a point of honour for the Union to retain that charge.

What would be the advantages of the proposed change? In the first place surely it is wise to have one strong consistent native policy. Indeed it is hardly practical to have two widely differing native policies within the boundaries of South Africa.

In the next place it is not sufficient to treat the natives with justice. The natives should believe in the justice of their rulers if things are to go successfully. We have seen that the recognition of the "Higher Status" took away from the Natives the right of appeal to the British Parliament. This diminution of their rights has been deeply felt. The natives had confidence in British justice. And indeed no country has a better claim to the confidence of the natives of Africa. For over a century in the world's history, Great Britain's naval strength gave her supremacy. It is to her enduring honour that she used that supremacy to put an end to slavery and the slave trade. The suggested change would bring the native territories again into direct connection with Great Britain.

To look at the same matter from a different point of view—the Union of South Africa should do everything in its power to avoid a native war. It is not that there need be fear about the result. What chance would the natives have against the deadly instruments of modern warfare. It is because of the brutality and cruelty common in native wars that do injury to the victor as well as the victim. But it must be admitted that it is sometimes very difficult to avoid a native war. The Bantu are a brave and warlike people. As the late Mr. Merriman said of the position: "We are holding a wolf by the ears." Now it is quite evident to anyone conversant with South African affairs that there is at present far more danger of a rising in Zululand or in the Transkei than there is in Basutoland or in Bechuanaland. Joint control would be therefore a great safeguard against war.

There would be also another advantage in joint control. South Africans understand the native better than the British, and, where they have pursued the good of the native with a single eye they have been successful. There is little doubt that the economic and social situation in the Transkei is better than in Basutoland. In the Transkeian territories the communal system of land was changed by the Glen Grey Act into a system of

peasant holdings with beneficial results; the cultivation of the land has been improved and amongst the people the feeling of individual responsibility has been increased.

But what, it will be asked, is to become of Cecil Rhodes' vision of a great state reaching up to the Zambesi? or of Sir Abe Bailey's revised and enlarged edition of it—The United States of Africa, rivalling in wealth and power the United States of America!!

Mr. Rhodes was a great man and "thought," as it was said, "in continents." This phrase originated with the American statesman, Alexander Hamilton, who told George Washington he must "think continentally." Unfortunately there is a vast difference between the circumstances of the two countries. Thinking continentally meant for the United States thinking along lines of latitude, for the Union it means thinking along lines of longitude. The hinterland for the former was in the temperate zone, for the latter it lies in the tropics. The power and wealth of the United States is based on the intelligence and character of its one hundred and ten millions of white citizens working almost too energetically in an invigorating climate. The United States of Africa with a governing caste of two or three million Europeans exploiting the labour of a hundred million negroes in a trying tropical climate is an entirely different proposition. The life of such an empire would be brief and unhappy. Experience shows that the white races, especially the Nordic race, when permanently settled in the tropics, degenerate rapidly both morally and physically.

If the Union of South Africa were to consent to form the nucleus of such a confederation, its doom as a white man's country is sealed. Friendly co-operation with the states of tropical Africa; especially with those within the British Empire, should be the aim of South Africa's policy as far as possible; but union with them should not be accepted at any price.

In conclusion two remarks remain to be made.

The larger and older section of our white population, which is of Dutch and Huguenot origin, and which is the more deeply rooted in the soil, have thought and think that the society which they have built up has something of permanent value in it worthy of survival. Their history to some extent justifies this belief. But they must also recognise this less palatable truth that if they build upon a foundation of oppression and servitude, no matter how cleverly camouflaged, their social structure will not endure.

On the other hand leading representatives of the smaller section of British origin, which is not so deeply rooted in the soil, while they are fully justified in opposing any policy of

of oppressing the natives, often speak as if the prospect of a black South Africa ought to be accepted with equanimity as a thing right and natural. They do not see that such a prospect means a very different thing to them from what it does to their Afrikaner fellow citizens. A large part of the world is British. There are many places where they might make a home. The Afrikaner has only the one place in which he feels at home — South Africa.

It is of the highest importance that both of these sections of the white population should come to a sounder mutual understanding with regard to the native problem.

IMPORTANT WORKS.

DEALING WITH THE NATIVE QUESTION

	PRICE, POST PAID.
THE LIFE OF A SOUTH AFRICAN TRIBE. By H. A. JUNOD. New Edition. 2 vols.	62/6
THE NATIVE POLICY OF THE VOORTREKKERS. By J. AGAR HAMILTON. Map, Bibliography, and Index. Cloth.	9/9
THE CAPE COLOUR QUESTION. By W. MACMILLAN.	25/9
THE EDUCATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE. By C. T. LORAM.	9/3
BLACK AND WHITE IN SOUTH-EAST AFRICA. By M. S. EVANS.	13/3
BLACK AND WHITE IN THE SOUTHERN STATES. By M. S. EVANS.	13/3
HISTORY OF THE NATIVE POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA. 1830 to the Present Day. By BROOKES.	16/-
THE NATIVE RACES OF THE EMPIRE. By Sir G. LAGDEN.	19/6
HOW NATIVES THINK. By Prof. BRUHL.	15/9
RACE PROBLEMS OF NEW AFRICA. By Rev. W. C. WILLOUGHBY.	18/8
THE CLASH OF COLOUR. "Study in the Problem of Race." By MATTHEWS.	2/8
CHRISTIANITY AND THE RACE PROBLEM. By OLDHAM.	4/9
THE BLACK PROBLEM. By JABUVA.	4/3
THE VOICE OF THE NEGRO, 1919. By R. T. KARLIN.	15/-

— THE ABOVE STOCKED BY —

MASKEW MILLER, LIMITED
THE BOOKSHOP, CAPE TOWN

ARE YOU A COLLECTOR OF

AFRICANA?

If so, you are fortunate, for as time speeds on the rarer items are more difficult to secure, and prices have enhanced during the last few years—which has made this interesting Hobby a lucrative investment.

We have, after thirty years' careful study, a Very Fine Collection of some of the Choicest Rarities in "Africana," which includes OIL PAINTINGS, WATER-COLOUR PAINTINGS, AQUA-TINTS, and ENGRAVINGS.

The following is a Small Selection of the BOOKS available:

WILLIAM BURCHELL'S TRAVELS.
JOHN BARROW'S TRAVELS.
HENRY LICHTENSTEIN'S TRAVELS.
GEORGE THOMPSON'S TRAVELS.
JAMES CHAPMAN'S TRAVELS.
CAPTAIN HARRIS' PORTRAITS OF GAME.
DAPPER'S TRAVELS.
ANDREW SPARRMAN'S VOYAGE.
MOODIE'S RECORD.
PERCIVAL'S CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.
TROTTER'S OLD COLONIAL HOUSES.
PETER KOLBE. All Editions—German, Dutch, English.
LE VAILLANT'S TRAVELS.
WILLIAM DANIELL'S SKETCHES.
CAMPBELL'S TRAVELS.
F. C. SELOUS' TRAVELS.
GORDON CUMMING'S LION HUNTER.
VAN REENEN'S JOURNEY.
LATROBE'S JOURNAL.
BUTLER'S SOUTH AFRICAN SKETCHES.
TRIMEN'S BUTTERFLIES.
LAYARD AND SHARPE'S BIRDS. With Coloured Plates.
SHELLEY'S BIRDS OF AFRICA. With Coloured Plates.
LE VAILLANT'S BIRDS. With Coloured Plates.
SMITH'S ZOOLOGY.
BAINES' ALBUM OF VICTORIA FALLS.
ANGUS' BOOK ON KAFIRS.
MENDELSSOHN'S BIBLIOGRAPHY.
SWEET'S GERANIACEAE.
CAPE FLOWERS. Painted by a Lady. A rare exquisite work.

If you are interested, we invite your inspection.

MASKEW MILLER, LIMITED
THE BOOKSHOP, CAPE TOWN