

who are exploiting the labour of the native African population, it runs counter to the interests of the national development of the European section of the population. To prove this is not at all difficult.

The founder of the English classical school of political economy, W. Petty, said: "Land is the mother of wealth and labour is his father". Labour is the father of wealth. Wealth is created by labour, but labour may have various degrees of productivity. The higher productivity of labour the wealthier is the country. The policy of apartheid has created an extremely low labour productivity of the Africans who constitute three quarters of the whole population of the South African Republic. Let us see for instance the yields of corn and wheat that form together about 60 per cent of the total of the South African field husbandry: the yields of corn in the SAR are twice as low as those in the USA, and the wheat yields are nearly five times lower than those in England. "In Great Britain it has been shown that one agricultural worker is capable of producing food for at least ten people. In Australia the labour of one male worker can supply an optimum diet for twenty-five people. In New Zealand one man in farming can produce an optimum diet for forty people. In South Africa it is doubtful whether one man engaged in agriculture can produce enough food for two people."³

To abolish the policy of apartheid and accord to the Africans the rights and privileges equal to those of the Whites means a manifold increase in the labour productivity of the whole population as well as in the national income of the SAR. The self-employed section of the White population will lose nothing economically by abolishing apartheid. Quite the contrary it will gain a lot. The South African Republic is a country of huge potentialities, and if a reasonable policy is followed, everyone in the Republic can be well-off. Bunting is absolutely right in saying that "South Africa can become a country of abundant wealth."⁴

The policy of curtailing the democratic rights of the Africans has inevitably led to restrictions of the democratic rights of the Whites. The abandonment of this policy will bring about a renaissance of democracy. Finally, the policy of racial oppression is detrimental to the national dignity of the White population of the SAR. The progressive public of the world condemns the policy of apartheid pursued by the SAR Government and this condemnation smears the honour and dignity of the European part of the Republican population. The progressive part of the European population has long realised the incompatibility of apartheid both with human dignity and the interests of their country. In the last years the SAR Government has been endeavouring to carry out the "Bantustan" programme. This is not a new idea. As far back as the 20's, the missionary Walter Cotton wrote: He said that the time had come for the last call for the territorial segregation which alone could prevent the forces working for the merging of the races. This issue had such a vital and fundamental importance for the Europeans in South Africa that no moral consideration would stand in its way. The Europeans saw it as a question of self-preservation.⁵

The whole history of the so-called "native policy" of the Government has been a realisation of this idea. All

moral considerations have been brushed aside at that. In the name of the "pure race" the human dignity of the Black man has been humiliated. But what has come of the idea? The Africans were driven to reserves but the way out of the reserves was not sealed, though restricted. It could not be sealed, anyway. Not because the Africans cannot live in the overcrowded reserves but because the Whites cannot do without their labour force. The reserves were set up as reservoirs of cheap labour. Millions of Africans now live in the towns at the white man's farms and mines. The policy of the SAR Government *vis-a-vis* the Africans is extremely controversial in itself. This controversy received a very spectacular definition in the words of the same Cotton, an irreconcilable supporter of separate existence of different racial groups: "We want the Natives' labour but we don't know what to do with them We don't want their family and social life impinging on ours We want their lands, but we don't want them".⁵

This old idea has been termed differently nowadays —"Bantustans". The idea is impracticable.⁶ Any attempt to translate it into life will only add to the complexity and acuteness of the racial problem.

Such is a general outlook of the Soviet scholars on the racial problem in the South African Republic, based on a thorough investigation into the issue. What is a solution? It has been already found; it is laid down in the "Freedom Charter", elaborated by the South African People's Congress in 1955. Pursuing the policy of apartheid the Government of the South African Republic has led the country to a blind alley and created a situation pregnant with very grim consequences. "The Freedom Charter" is the only reasonable escape from this blind alley. ●

1. E. Morel. *The Black Man's Burden*. London.
2. J. C. Smuts. *Africa and Some World Problems*, Oxford, 1930, p. 75.
3. E. Sachs. *The Choice Before South Africa*. London, 1952, p. 113.
4. Brian Bunting. *Apartheid—The Road to Poverty*, p. 8.
5. Walter Cotton, *Racial Segregation in South Africa*.
6. *Bantustan Bluff*. Publication of S.A. Congress of Democrats.

Is your
commitment showing?

TIMOTHY HOLMES

THE FIRST ISSUES of *The Lion and the Impala* bring to the South African literary scene the only (to our knowledge) magazine devoted to "committed" literary writing in the country. The magazine is published by Messrs. C. J. Driver and R. K. Parker at the S.R.C. Office, Students' Union, University of Cape Town.

In their introductory article the editors explain that they have decided to produce the magazine to fill a need at the university for a monthly literary magazine.

They aim, firstly, to publish the best work they can

lay hands on, whether from students or not, and secondly, they aim to "make this a 'committed' magazine". By this they mean that they will publish work only which does not put forward racialistic ideas. The editors explain that they do not intend to exclude writing which does not put forward political ideas of a non-racial character, but that such "pure" writing will have to take second place to the "political".

The editors' statement of their aims raises immediately the question of the value of "committed" writing in itself, and of the nature of the "commitment". It seems from their first editorial, that their "commitment" is to a concept held by the majority of mankind—that racialism is bad. If they are committed against racialism, what are they committed *for*?

Whether or not it is possible to tie creative writing to a political belief is another matter. We can only

hope that those writers who choose to produce material "which (has) political bias or political direction" do not come to believe that their political beliefs are in any way more important to themselves as writers, than the art of writing truthfully and unblinkered. And let us hope too that the editors do not allow themselves to make political criteria paramount in the selection of material for publication; if they do, their magazine will be able to make no better a job of its self-imposed task than those which reject material because it is "political".

Political commitment is the "lion" of the magazine, and "pure art" is the "impala". Perhaps these are mythical beasts as far as literature is concerned. But all those who are interested in the development of the arts in South Africa should get and read this magazine (5c monthly). ●

Whither,
O Africa?

M. F. DEI ANANG

*I sat beneath
The star-flecked dome of heav'n,
And watched the moon
Sail silently
And patiently
Along her course.*

*She did not fret
Nor seem to care
What Nature had
In store for her;
Just silently
She smiled
Amidst the clouds on high.*

*And then,
O Africa,
Land of the great Pharaohs
And the vast pyramids
With strange architectural laws,
My fatherland,
I thought me then
That, like the moon,
Thou too hast spread thy sail!
But whither bound,
O Africa,
Oh, whither bound?
Backward?*

*To days of drums
And festal dances in the shade
Of sun-kist palms;
Backward?
To untutored days
When maid was ever chaste
And lad abhorred unhallowed ways
For dread of ancient gods;
Backward?
To dark thatched huts
Where kindness reigned
And solace dwelt,
Backward, to SUPERSTITION?*

*Or forward?
Forward! To what?
The slums, where man is dumped
upon man:*

*Where penury
And misery
Have made their hapless homes,
And all is dark and drear?
Forward! To what?
The factory
To grind hard hours
In an inhuman mill,
In one long ceaseless spell?*

*Forward! To what?
To the reeking round
Of medieval crimes,
Where greedy hawks
Of Aryan stock
Prey with bombs and guns
On men of lesser breed?
Forward, to CIVILISATION?*

*Forward, to dusty tools
And sordid gains,
Proved harbingers
Of mortal strife?*

*Or forward,
To the crafty laws
Of Adam Smith
That turn the markets upside down
And steel men's hearts
To hoard or burn
The food supplies of half the world
E'en when the other half must starve?*

*Or backward?
Backward to the primal source
Of ethic qualities:
Man's love of fellow man
And fear of God
Emanating from a chainless soul
Full and frank and free?*

*The moon sails patiently
And silently
Across a star-flecked sky,
Adown predicted paths:
Sail cautiously, O Father land,
Along thy course well-tried;
But whither bound, O Africa?
Oh, whither bound?*

M. F. DEI ANANG is a senior official in Ghana's Minister of Foreign Affairs. He has published three books of verse.