

# CONTACT

APRIL 1954

## What's In Our Name ?

**L**IKE any other emerging political party, we have chosen a name for ourselves, and, since party-names are commonly a fair guide to the motives and ideals which brought the parties into being, we find ourselves now publicly committed to the cause of "liberalism." In the same way, "Labour" must be held to stand committed to the advancement and protection of the rights of *workers*; the "Nasionale" Party, to the fostering of South African *nationhood*; the "United" Party, to the principle of *unity*; and so on.

Remembering that our own group will one day have to face a similar test, we may find interest in comparing the current policies of some of the established parties with the ideals which inspired them at the outset. We shall note at once, in one sphere after another, the unhappy tendency of party-thinking to whittle down the originating concept, to narrow its political implications, to restrict its terms of reference and to convert ideals into inelastic formulae which, as time goes on, require increasing numbers of subsidiary formulae to buttress them and to disguise the increasing weakness and unrealism of the central "planks."

To take only a few examples, in which considerations of *colour* have been the narrowing and restricting factor—the sort of thing which happens when "Labour" virtually confines its attention to the protecting of *white* workers; when "Nationalism" limits "nationhood" to *white* men, preferably of the Afrikaner way of life; when the "United" Party decides that unity is synonymous with concord between the two *white* races of this land—out of such whittled-down, distorted versions of original concepts are born the unrealities of apartheid, white domination, the colour bar in industry, and so-called trusteeship which believes its wards will never come of age.

If the Liberal party is to escape this kind of pitfall—if it hopes to end up with a policy which faithfully interprets the ideals from which it sprang—we must be clear, right from the start, as to the nature of the liberal philosophy and the grounds on which it rests.

Liberalism, as an outlook, is based essentially on the idea of *freedom*. It calls for the practice of freedom, the recognition of freedom, the acknowledgement of other people's freedom, the fearless acceptance of freedom's responsibilities and rights and disciplines. In the language from which it derives, the word "liberal" meant "*that which befits a freeman*"—the opposite of all that marks the slave-mentality. The freeman (in contrast to the slave) was supposed to understand the full implications of freedom. He must receive a "liberal" education to implant and develop in him an appreciation of freedom—both his own and other people's. He must be "liberal" in his ways—generous, ungrudging, open-hearted, "free" (as we say) alike with his money and his service. He must abjure the slave-qualities of pettiness and cheap resentment, timidity and fear of freedom. And the fine flower of all his training would be his unfrightened movement in an element he felt to be his own and in which he equally recognised the freedom of other men to move around.

So much for the liberal of the old tradition—"freeman," by breeding, of the world in which he lived. The political liberal is the product of a much later age, but his political ideals are dictated to him by precisely the same conception of freedom as that which inspired his earlier social counterpart. He is, in fact, "freeman"—and not slave—in the sphere of

his political thinking. He is pledged by his own sense of freedom to respect and defend the freedoms of others. He will practise his freedom of thought, speech, action, and, at the same time, discipline himself in order that his freedom shall not cut across the rights and claims of other people. He will reject, alike, totalitarianism, the deification of the party-group, the tyranny of the abstract state. He will recognise himself with perfect assurance, a citizen among citizens, and equally, he will regard as a challenge to his creed the arbitrary denial of citizenship to any of his fellows.

These, briefly, are the traditions we are pledged to uphold, and the principles we bind ourselves to implement, when we name ourselves Liberals. They are no artificial imitation of an old-time outlook : we hold to them not because they were the pride of freemen of an older day but because they are *ours* : they represent the way we think, the way we feel, about the sanctity of human freedom.

It is for us to maintain them during the coming years of party political routine, as surely as we hold them now before we have been "tried."

---

## THE BUDGET AND THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

by THELMA PHILIP

Mr Havenga's plan for the financing of what he and his colleagues call Bantu Education should be studied together with the Bantu Education Act, for they are not separable ; they are integral parts of a "Development Plan" conceived by the Eiselen Commission on Native Education. Before discussing this plan as a whole, however, I should like to examine Mr. Havenga's section of it.

The Minister proposes that in future the amount voted for Bantu Education from General revenue be pegged at six and a half million pounds, and that £2 million be added from Native revenue (leaving £500,000 for the Native Trust Fund). Any extra money required will have to be found 'by the Bantu taxpayers themselves.' I shall consider these items in turn.

Mr. Havenga states that his reason for wanting to limit the amount voted from general revenue is that "expenditure on Bantu Education has increased three-fold in the last ten years." It has ; but the public ought to know, too, that though State expenditure on most services has been rising at an increasing rate, the annual increase on this particular service has been dropping ever since Mr. Havenga's Government came into power. In 1947, the increase over the amount voted for the previous year was £1,054,938 ; in 1953 notwithstanding the decline in the value of the pound, it was a mere £325,000.

Readers who may share Mr. Havenga's feeling that £6½ million is a lot of money to spend on the education of African children may be interested in the following comparative figures. In 1951/52, there were just under 500,000 European children at school, (roughly 98 per cent. of the school-age group). State expenditure on their education was nearly £22 million, or approximately £44 per pupil. In the same year, there were 803,537 African children at school (a third of those who should have been there). State expenditure on the education of these children was a bare £5½ million, or £7 per pupil. The fact is, of course, that for European children (and for Coloured children in the Cape Province), education is compulsory. This means that the State has to provide schools, and to train and pay teachers to staff them. No questions are ever asked as to what the children's parents contribute to the national income.

This brings me to my second point. Mr. Havenga calculates that this year Africans will contribute only £2½ million in taxes. This is perhaps an under-estimate and correct or not, it leaves out of account altogether the African's indirect contributions to the national revenue. For one thing, it ignores the indirect levy paid by all consumers of dutiable imported