

PC/119/4/28/1
13/08/1960



THE LONG VIEW

-----END OF AN AGE

X
X
For a month I have been, to use a well-known phrase, "away from civilization". Now that I have returned, and can again gear the news and read the newspapers, I realize that an age has come to an end. It is the change in the newspapers that strikes me most of all. Years ago -if I may say so with modesty- it was only persons like myself who spoke of early independence, for many countries, the instability of the Federation, the continental hatred of Aprtheid, the threat of closed markets and harbours and airports. In those days people used to tell me that economic self-interest ruled the life of nations. That statement is now seen to be a dangerous half-truth.

X
It is only a few short months ago that people told me that United Nations intervention was a delusion. Our papers pooh-poohed the boycott, and stated that its only effect in England was to advertise South African sherry and fruit. A few months many of our politicians were talking of South African leadership of the Conti - nent. Sir de Villiers Graaff was one of them. None of these persons would face the hard fact that Apartheid and continental leadership were totally irreconcilable.

Today the newspapers are beginning to face up to the hard facts. I say they are beginning to face up to it, but the "Daily News" can still record, in bold headlines, that Mr. Lulofs has "flayed" Ghana over the boycott. Mr. Louw condemns ^{Chavara's} ~~this~~ action as a sign of political immaturity. Sir de Villiers and Dr. Ste y - tler condemn it as contrary to the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs. The "Natal Mercury" reports a speaker who says that "law-abiding" natives have won the respect of South Africa. Which South Africa is this? And what does this particular South Africa intend to do to retain this law-abidingness, because it is certain
-that-

that its continuance must not be taken for granted.

We are also being told by people in high positions that boycott is a two-edged sword. But this boycott is not. We may scratch our opponents, but they will inflict on us the most deadly wounds. The world may boycott us, but we cannot boycott the world.

.....

I would not care to speak prematurely on the success or failure that may be expected to attend United Nations intervention in the Congo. The intervention itself signals the end of an age, and may mean a greater measure of peace and security for a world that has suffered so much for the lack of both. It may mean that political problems so far insoluble will yield to the kind of authority that seeks neither power nor revenge. I predict that if white South Africa ^{continues} combines to elect an Apartheid government, and if it shows no signs of adaptation except in the Bantustan direction, and if it provokes increasing hostility and aggressiveness from the other nations, then United Nations may be forced to intervene here also. In any interim administration we may be sure that Liberals like Peter Brown and Jordan Ngubane will be given positions of responsibility, and that the nonracial ideal may be expected to grow stronger under the just authority of this kind of government. It is insecurity that now prevents the growth of these ideals which alone will give security in the future.

.....

The Johannesburg "Star" says editorially that the Nationalist Party thinks the African can do no right, and the Liberal Party thinks the African can do no wrong. I can hardly think of a

more stupid generalization. We have reached the end of the age of white supremacy, and it is imperative to prepare now for the kind of society in which all people can share equitably in the fruits of industry and the responsibilities of citizenship. It would be quite irrelevant to speculate on the relative goodness or badness of the different races of man in South Africa; what is important is that they should all be given a social significance and their lives a social x purpose, so that the talents of all may be used in the building of a new and more just society.

This editorial remark of the "Star" is downright defamatory. It implies that the Liberal Party thinks that it is not morally reprehensible for Africans to commit atrocities against their fellowx humans. How on earth could that view be held by a party which has tried to bring people of all races together, to learn to live and plan in harmony? If the "Star" wishes to vent its spleen against the Party, it should at least not sink to calumny