

South Africans who feel that their salvation lies in "separate, but equal" facilities should remember these things. In particular they should remember the Western Areas, which, twenty or thirty years ago, were "separate areas." As time went by these areas became as near equal to a European suburb, in terms of standard of facilities and freedom to own land, as any predominantly African suburb in the country. But, in the end, these places were encroached upon by Europeans, they came to be called "Blackspots" and they were removed.

For those who still doubt, an interesting item of news came out of the American South not long ago. Governor James Byrnes, of South Carolina, announced that, under the State's 3½ year old school improvement plan, allocations for school buildings averaged 314 dollars for each Negro pupil compared with 147 dollars for each White pupil. As South Carolina believes in "separate, but equal" facilities it can be safely assumed that it is not the intention to provide schools for Negroes more than twice as expensive as those for Whites. The only conclusion to which one can come is that, almost 60 years after the doctrine of "separate, but equal" obtained legal sanction in the United States, South Carolina still lags so far behind the ideal that it must spend this disproportionate amount on its Negro pupils in an attempt to make up the leeway. It is, perhaps, significant that this is being done at a time when the general trend in the U.S.A. is towards de-segregation of schools and when some Southern states are doing their best to convince their critics that their schools are equal, though segregated.

Let those who are threatened with the seductions of this insidious slogan face the fact that where there is separation there has never yet been equality. In its now celebrated judgement of May, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court stated "that in the field of public education the doctrine of separate but equal has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." So also are separate arrangements in other spheres. In South Africa the emphasis has been on "separation" for far too long. It is high time we started putting it on "equality."

---

## THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

**I**N Parliament recently the United Party launched a concerted and well-planned attack on apartheid from an economic point of view. They showed with great clarity that any attempt to prevent the continued integration of Europeans and Non-Europeans in a single economic system would be fatal to South Africa economically, and that any large scale implementations of economic apartheid would mean the ruin of all sections alike.

The Nationalists had no answer to this attack. Yet they succeeded in silencing the United Party by means of a counter attack. They proceeded to prove, without much difficulty, that the inevitable outcome of the United Party's policy of economic integration would be the rise of the Non-European people of South Africa into a position of equality with the Europeans. The only way, they said, of avoiding this was the fully-fledged economic apartheid preached and to some extent practised by Dr. Verwoerd. And the United Party could no more answer this one than the Nationalists could answer their attack; so they diverted the debate into other lines.

This debate illustrated perfectly the painful dilemma in which both the major parties in Parliament find themselves to-day. Each has a line of attack on the other which the other cannot answer, but can only hope to evade by increasing the vehemence of its own attack. The United Party says that economic integration is the only way of building prosperity, and that economic apartheid will mean ruin. The Nationalist Party retaliates by saying that economic integration will inevitably lead to complete equality, and that economic apartheid is the only alternative. They cannot answer one another for the simple reason that there is no answer. Both are absolutely right.

We are fully acquainted with the way that this dilemma has paralysed the United Party as an opposition. But it is less generally realised that it is also paralysing the Nationalists as a government, for they are no more prepared to face the consequences of apartheid than the United Party is prepared to face the consequences of integration, and the government's implementation of apartheid is as half-hearted as the United Party's opposition to it. That is why, after seven years of Nationalist rule, there are no Group Areas, no Population Register, no industries in the reserves, and far more Africans than ever before are employed in skilled and semi-skilled jobs in what Dr. Verwoerd pleases to call "white areas."

The choice before white South Africans is simple. They can either have prosperity or temporary white supremacy. They cannot, in the long run, have both, though they can very easily have neither. The two big political parties are promising both prosperity and supremacy, but between them they are making the impossibility of this promise clearer and clearer. The time is coming when the country will have to face the choice squarely, and we cannot doubt that many will choose the sane alternative of prosperity and equality. That is why the Liberal Party has a future among European South Africans as well as among Non-European South Africans.

---

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Sir,

The December issue of CONTACT contained a most erudite exposition of what 'Liberal' should mean as applied to a political party in South Africa. To a simple fellow like me however, the word conveys something like this . . .

I like the word 'liberal', whether it qualifies a politician or a helping of pudding. There is something generous about it, something elastic and intangibly accommodating. I don't, as a member of the Liberal Party of South Africa, feel that I've joined a body of power-seeking freaks with a constitution of brittle clauses and a creed of exclusive definitude. Rather do I think of us South African Liberals, with no respect to our alleged antecedents in Britain or elsewhere, as a growing group of people who are trying to assemble kindly and tolerant thought from all sources and peoples in this country. I would jib, for example, at the commonly held belief that our inspiration is the extension of the franchise to all adult South Africans — if only because such an 'inspiration' is too constricting, too finite, to allow of or invite discussion.

We S.A. Liberals are, as I see it, inspired to the extent that we recognise the common humanity of all peoples : we are without the peculiar, biologically unsound but conveniently cultured notion that white people are congenitally privileged and superior to people of other pigmentation : conversely, we don't regard white people as knaves, not even—and this is important as part of what 'liberal' means to me — that section of white people which is yet having difficulty in exorcising its insular prejudices.

Those of us South Africans — and we may be drawn mainly from the simple and personally unambitious peoples of all races — who can pool our ideas and discuss them together, should and will find that our common goal is the extension of freedom, happiness, mental and bodily welfare and security to all South African men, women and children. We shall search together for the routes to that goal, and the goal itself will ensure that we are liberal.

C. A. ROY.

P.O. Box 109,  
Maritzburg.

---

*Further letters, defining "Liberal" as it may apply to our Party, are invited.*

—Editor