

for them lies in their standing together in the defence of a Union which shall symbolise their being heirs with an equal title to a tradition of freedom for which all have fought valiantly ever since Black and White met in this part of the world.

The second most important requirement is that we, Black and White, all need a powerful ideal which will bind together our peoples as against the influences which divide them. That ideal is the goal of a Greater South Africa where colour shall be no criterion by which to assess human worth; where Black and White shall be conscious, not of their skin colour but of the things they shall have in common; where no racial group shall feel threatened by any other and where each shall see in the security and prosperity of the others the only permanent guarantee of its own survival. This is the goal towards which the majority in the African community have been moving since Union.

## PASSIVE RESISTANCE

PATRICK DUNCAN

It is becoming clear that our country has only one future—a non-racial future. Once the social and economic forces begin to act strongly in any situation, then he who defies them does so at his peril. I was moved to read the summing up of Hitler by that simple man, his interpreter, Paul Schmidt. After watching human affairs at the top level for twenty-five years Schmidt's judgment is that there are at work in the world irresistible moral and economic forces, and that although dictators can construct false moralities and phoney economics which have dazzling short-term success, yet in the end such people are crushed and their systems with them. Now these social and economic forces are at work with great strength in South Africa, working for change in the direction of greater equality and of democracy. However great the will-power may be that attempts to dam them it will not succeed, and resistance will hurt mainly those who resist. The doctrine of White supremacy, as thinking men even on the Nationalist side know, is doomed. There are no social and economic forces strengthening it. We hear wild talk of the time coming for another "Blood River". There will be no second Blood River, and for this reason. In 1838 the Boers carried with them the

strength born of a superior economic and technological system. The spear could not resist the gun, nor the hoe the plough. To-day those who talk of Blood Rivers are obstructing, not helping, the flood of technological progress. White supremacy is ending abroad and in South Africa, and there is nothing that anyone can do to change this.

Given that amount of inevitability in our future, there remain great uncertainties. The two most important are (1) how do we reach our non-racial future: violently or non-violently? and (2) in the non-racial future will South Africa have any room for a White minority? The two are of course intimately connected. If quiet non-violence is used, and if White supremacy capitulates easily, then the answer to the second uncertainty is almost certainly "yes". I do not believe that there is at present any widespread desire that the White minority should leave. But if the Nationalists imitate Hitler, and plan a *götterdämmerung*; if they go down like Samson, then it is doubtful whether there will be any place in the future South Africa for the Whites.

Now, as to means, it will be objected that I have wrongly limited the choice to two possibilities—violence or non-violence. What about Parliament? Why should evolution to a non-racial future not come through Parliament as progress came in England and elsewhere? The answer lies in a century of stupidity. The Cape constitution of 1853 had everything necessary to guarantee the country a safe passage into the future. But each time the rights of the non-Whites have been changed since then, they have been cut down, never increased. This was true of the old Cape "Liberal" days, just as much as it is true of the illiberal days of Union. This process of taking away rights has never shown any tendency to reverse itself. On the contrary it has shown a tendency to speed itself up.

Now this destruction of non-White rights has weakened the position of the non-Whites in South Africa. This was intended. But it has also had the effect of weakening the position of Parliament, and therefore of the White minority. This was not intended, but time may show that racialism has harmed the Whites more than the non-Whites. The principal strength of any government derives from the belief which the ordinary man has in its legitimacy. People will do what legitimacy orders them to do without compulsion. They do it because we are all born with the feeling of loyalty to legitimacy within us. It is a quality which not every government possesses. It takes a long time to grow up, and, as

Mr. Strijdom has shown, can be destroyed quickly. Legitimacy is the most precious jewel in a sovereign's crown. Now, by removing non-Whites from the common roll the Whites have made Parliament unrepresentative of the non-Whites, that is to say of four-fifths of the South African people. A parliament which is not representative of a population is not a legitimate parliament, and has lost the best and easiest way of obtaining obedience to its laws.

Be that as it may, it is quite clear that it would be unrealistic to look to Parliament to increase the rights of the non-Whites sufficiently to allow us a smooth passage into our non-racial future.

There is another point that is sometimes raised, especially by members of the Liberal Party. Some Liberals believe that in a qualified franchise lies the key to a smooth crossing.

I regard this as quite unrealistic. The Nationalists or people like them are going to be in power so long as White supremacy lasts—the more dangerous a country this becomes, the more the Whites will tend to cluster round what they believe to be a strong government. No Nationalist is going to give a qualified vote to the non-Whites. And, what is much more important, the non-Whites will not accept it. Why should they? Any such qualifications have but one purpose in our country—to preserve effectual White control under a cloak of non-racialism. The non-Whites accepted a qualified vote in the Cape in 1853. For forty years every adult male in the Cape, African, White, and Coloured, had the vote, if he got a wage of £50 or more per year. He might be illiterate—it did not matter. What was important was that despite this generous qualification the Whites kept the power. And as soon as the non-Whites increased their voting numbers a little, the Whites cheated, and changed the rules to maintain their exclusive power. If this was possible in the Cape, the liberal Cape of the nineteenth century, how much more is it likely in the illiberal Union of the twentieth? And so the qualified franchise turns out to be just another pipe-dream, leaving us, as before, with our two alternatives. Between non-violence and violence, surely no sane person would prefer the latter.

It might be objected here that I am too optimistic—that there is in reality no such choice. The White minority has gone so far now, this argument would run, that it is not now possible for violence to be avoided. To this I would say two things: that I do not think there is any single human being in South Africa with a knowledge so profound of both White and non-White public opinion that he

could take it upon himself to make such a statement with any accuracy. Secondly, I believe it to be a great error to make a decision that violence is inevitable. Imagine the world-catastrophe that would follow such a decision at the present time by President Eisenhower or Mr. Khrushchev. Milner argued in 1897-9 that war had to come. It was an arguable view. I personally believe he was wrong. But the point is this: by making such a decision he in fact made war inevitable, and put himself and his country in the wrong. And of course there are degrees of violent political action, from the suffragette chained to the pole to the totalitarian annihilation-camp. We already have political violence in our country. We have violent collection of taxes in Reef beer-halls, and violent resistance to dagga-patrols, and tsotsi-violence. These are all partly political in that they would not be just as they are if we did not have a government based on colour-discrimination. Such violence is probably going to increase. But that does not mean that all our arts of statesmanship should not be directed at minimising violence in the difficult period of change that we are now entering.

If we accept that our path must be as non-violent as possible, then we are able to define fairly clearly the task of statesmanship in South Africa for the second half of this century: to accept the inevitability of the breakdown of the colour-bar; that the change-over will be exceedingly difficult and even dangerous; to work now and during the change-over to minimise violence and dislocation; to work during the change-over against racialism and sectionalism in all its forms; to work after the change-over for a South Africa which will have forgotten about race, and in which the descendants of all who are now South Africans will be able to live together normally in a democratic state. I use the word "normally" because it will not be the first or only time that there has been a state with minorities. South Africa is not the "unique" place that White South African self-pity would like to make out that it is.

Now in this task—the task of a non-violent change-over—the only star is the star of Gandhi. Many do not yet realise his greatness. John Gunther called him "one of the supreme political geniuses of all time", and Einstein said: "Generations to come, it may be, will scarce believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon the earth." In India Gandhi inherited one of the situations which men fondly call "insoluble" (meaning that someone wants the impossible, like the man with £100 a year wanting to run a Cadillac.) The British will to retain India was unbroken: the Indian will to rule India was unbreakable. Head-on collisions have usually

in human history meant war, but thanks to Gandhi's goodness and greatness there was a change-over, but no war, between the British and the Indians.

People object that Gandhi's methods were useful against the British who yield, but would not be any use against the Nazis or their admirers. I do not accept this. The British were utterly determined to hold India. Sir Winston Churchill said that he would not hand India over to the Indians—he did not propose to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. General Dyer in one day at Amritsar shot down some 500 Indians. The Government of India was quite prepared to use the fascist methods of internment and exile in order to damp down resistance to its will. And yet Gandhi's methods brought about a peaceful outcome—at least as between the British and the Indians. He called his methods *satyagraha*, or "firmness in truth". It implies that one has right on one's side, and that one is prepared to die, but not to kill, for one's beliefs. He invented it in South Africa during the years 1906-14. The story of those years is told in Gandhi's own book *Satyagraha in South Africa*. I cannot in a few lines paraphrase the book, but I would just like to say how moving I found his opinions—respect and liking for the Boers and for the British Empire—and how I admired his personal qualities—bravery worthy of the Victoria Cross, a piercing insight into truth and justice, and self-respect, personal and racial. I was particularly moved by his generous judgment on General Smuts's breach of faith. This book is the text-book of non-violence. Let us read it. It is a piece of South African history, even if it does not figure in the school matriculation syllabus. Let us see the true nature of this new political action, and see whether it is right for us.

Many people think that passive resistance has got to involve a breach of the law. This is not so. The Black Sash hauntings are a perfect example of *satyagraha*. Indeed the London *Economist* called its leading article on their movement "*Satyagraha in a Black Sash*". No one can have failed to have been moved by the dignity and the bravery which these women have shown, often in the face of the menaces and assaults of hooligans. Surely this sort of protest, based on the calm knowledge of moral rightness, has a great field of action in our future.

The greatest objection of course is that the Africans are not ready for passive resistance. This claim that the Africans are not ready for  $x$ , not ready for  $y$ , becomes somewhat tedious. Usually it conceals a desire on the part of the speaker not to see the Africans

doing *x*, or *y*. I can quite understand many White South Africans not wanting Africans to use one of the most powerful political weapons ever discovered. And does the Defiance Campaign not give the lie to the theory that they are not mature enough to practise passive resistance? Let us remember that no violence whatsoever was directly caused by that campaign, although the tension that was associated with the campaign might have helped, indirectly, to produce the police attitudes that have done much to bring death into politics. That this can be conscious policy cannot be doubted—witness the total failure of the police to use tear-gas to disperse crowds. Their weapons are guns, not tear-gas, the greatest harmless disperser of mobs.

Above all, let us realise that the choice is *not* between Parliament and passive resistance. It is between passive resistance and war. It is *not* between Tennyson's freedom, slowly broadening down "from precedent to precedent" and Gandhi's *satyagraha*. It is between Gandhi and Algeria or Belsen. It is between Gandhi and Haiti.

I mention Haiti for this reason: that eighteenth-century Haiti was in many ways similar to twentieth-century South Africa. There a small White minority grew rich on the backs of a large poor Black majority, and between them was a small group of men of mixed origin. In Haiti, too, there was a colour-bar, and segregation on the public coaches. When the French Revolution broke out, a revolution broke out in Haiti as well, and plunged the island into a long agony. Peace was restored by Toussaint L'Ouverture, the great Negro leader. He set up a state in which Black and White lived happily and productively side by side. Napoleon intervened, and tried to reintroduce White supremacy. The Whites helped Napoleon, who crushed Toussaint. But Toussaint was followed, not by slavery and White supremacy, but by a savage tyrant named Dessalines, who eliminated the entire White minority. Some left, and the rest were killed. Haiti has been ruled by men of colour ever since then. This is an example of what violence can do to a mixed society.

And now comes the reason why African nationalists, too, should study Gandhi. With the departure of the Whites went any hope of prosperity for Haiti. One hundred and fifty years have passed. Haiti has been free for a century and a half without the Whites. It would be difficult to pick a poorer part of the world than modern Haiti, though recently its government has done much for it. Up to the present poverty, disease, and witchcraft have ruled the

island. Who can doubt that if the White minority left the shores of South Africa we would suffer a similar economic eclipse? But if there is to be a violent race-war, and if the Africans won in the end, it is improbable that a White minority would remain. The Africans would be left with the damaged equipment of an industrial society, without the technical knowledge to work it. They would be poorer than they are to-day. Thus, even from a purely Africanist point of view, violence on this scale, even if successful, would be a catastrophe.

So let us all, White and Black, use our heads and hearts together for the future of our race, the human race, in our country. Let us use our heads to put behind us the childish nonsense of which the Tomlinson Report is so brilliant an example. Let us realise, as all the rest of the world realises, that White supremacy is doomed. Let us build realistically on the real, and aim at the possible. Let us open our hearts to the influences of true patriotism, and teach our children to love this land and the people among whom they have been born. But such ideals will remain idle talk unless we work to actualise them. And it is the purpose of this essay to show that there is only one way to do this—the way of Gandhi.

## THE UNITED STATES DISCOVERS AFRICA

DR. GEORGE W. SHEPHERD, JR.

THE single most important historical event of our century has been not world warfare, nor even the advent of Communism, but the emergence within the last decade of over 600 million people (one-third of the world's population) from the political domination of the West. Now we must place Africa, with another 200 million people, within the context of this historical thrust of dependent and exploited peoples towards freedom. Only a small percentage of Africa's people has gained that freedom, but the others will not be denied theirs for long and remain peaceful.

American policy is just beginning to recognize the fact of this "world revolution". It took the Japanese conquest in the Pacific and the victory of Communism in China to awaken any large section of American opinion to the true proportions of the situation