

their future with a calm confidence, that utterly ignored that they were living in a continent in which rapid, even violent change, can overnight alter the whole pattern of their lives. Not one "pink" qualified his answers by referring to social and political uncertainty in South Africa, unlike a high proportion of "browns" who explicitly referred to it. The "browns" expressed sharply and without restraint their feelings of disability, insecurity and sometimes despair in their present plight, and expressed hopes for political and economic freedom in ten years' time. "The future seems so dark"—is a theme that runs throughout the answers of many "browns", but they also have a robust realistic faith in the future triumph of justice.

The most damaging, cynical and malevolent folly of the governments of South Africa during the past fourteen years, is the systematic and shameless way in which freedom has been destroyed in education, by such totalitarian techniques as the naked indoctrination of "Christian National Education" and "Bantu Education."

A direct result of this educational distortion is that the "browns" have been thrust into a state of resentment and discouragement, and the "pinks" have been encouraged to live their lives in an atmosphere which deliberately plays-down any attempt to solve the problems of the future. Both "pinks" and "browns" are educated to fill roles in distinct societies within a future that they are taught they cannot have. This enquiry, and others similar to it, suggest that unless this *apartheid* society be overthrown there will *never* be one state of South Africa, united, prosperous, influential and honest but the fragmentation, the suspicions, the coarse lack of sympathy and understanding will make South Africa increasingly mean, callous and petty. ●

---

## 27 MARCH

### CHIEF SABATA

Randolph Vigne

### THAT TIME I JOLLED IN FORDSBURG

Vic Swanepoel

### FREEDOM FOR NAMIB

Mburumba Kerina

### ZULU TRANSFORMATION

a review by  
Anthony Barker

---

## The Two Moralities

*This second portion of a monograph inquires into the circumstances which produced the attitude of rejection in South Africa*

---

### JORDAN K. NGUBANE

THE EUROPE FROM WHICH Jan van Riebeeck's passionately Protestant settlers came associated government with absolutism. This was the political fashion almost all over the continent. The smell of the blood shed by the Inquisition was still in the air. In the long and bitter struggle with Papism the Protestants had relied heavily on the Old Testament to justify their stand. God, the Word and the Chosen People were the central trinity which gave content to this part of the bible. The God of the Old Testament was harsh and jealous in his judgments and absolute in his rule. To fear him was the highest virtue. The Word was the unchanging law by which he guided human destinies. The Chosen People were its custodians. This marked them out as a group singled for permanently privileged treatment. Blood purity, race consciousness and adherence to the Word were the inseparable conditions for successful custodianship.

In the Cape environment, where colour was the most obvious dividing line between one racio-cultural group and the other, the Old Testament's glorification of race could have only one effect: to project the settlers to the fore as the elect of the Lord; the keepers of the faith who were surrounded and often threatened by hordes of Black barbarians.

These factors combined with the settlers' relative isolation from the main streams of European thought and their numerical weakness to place a premium on group solidarity as a condition of survival. A mode of conduct emerged from all this which we shall call the morality of survival. The group exclusiveness which developed rejected the African's right to equal citizenship in a mixed community. Today it finds political expression in *apartheid*.

---

JORDAN K. NGUBANE, *journalist, former editor of the Ilanga laseNatal and Indian Opinion, vice-president of the Liberal Party of South Africa, attended the All African Peoples' Congress at Accra in 1958, and was chairman of the continuation committee of the African Leaders Conference held at Orlando in 1961. This article is Part II of a series.*

While religion, culture and the imperatives of survival conduced toward race segregation, economic necessity was moving events in the opposite direction.

IN HIS HISTORY of South Africa, Professor Eric Walker records that Van Riebeeck set up a fence around the Cape settlement to separate the White area from the Hottentot African's, and that the latter countered by withholding their cattle and sheep. The resulting shortage of meat forced Van Riebeeck to send emissaries with frantic appeals to the Africans to re-enter the White area to do business.

Apart from meat, the settlement also needed labour. This meant that the Hottentot African had to be persuaded to accept employment by the Whites. This, in turn, involved integration one way or the other in the White man's life. The man of colour was integrated more permanently when the settlers imported slaves.

The conflict between segregation and integration affected the attitude of the Whites almost as much as that of the Africans. The morality of survival had been evolved to protect the former against cultural ruin and physical destruction. While the more virile settler males often readily crossed the colour line in search of favours from African women, the overall pattern of behaviour was generally in the direction of emphasising racial differences and, more often than not, of treating the man of colour with contempt.

Repudiated thus almost from the very beginning of contact with the White man, the African found little to attract him permanently to the Old Testament-based morality of survival. He yearned for an ethic which recognised his dignity as a human being. In spite of its age the Dutch Reformed Church has not made spectacular progress among the Africans because it was committed to the morality of survival.

Thus, when the Moravian and later, other missionaries started preaching among the Hottentots, the Africans preferred the morality of the New Testament which recognised no Jews or Gentiles, no Chosen People. It promised fulfilment and equal treatment to all who accepted Christ regardless of race or colour or sex.

FROM ALL THIS IT WILL be seen that while the clash between Black and White was in some ways racial, it was to a very large extent also economic, cultural and moral. The collision between the morality of survival and the morality of fulfilment was to develop attitudes on both sides of the colour line which complicate the race problem to this day.

Increasing numbers of Africans were exposed to the morality of fulfilment as the settlers and the missionaries penetrated into the interior. The progressive acceptance by the Blacks of this ethic pushed the settlers to the sidelines of progressive humanity. In the end they were to find themselves in the position where, like Margarita in Goethe's *Faust*, they were forever to be asking themselves whether or not humanity loved them; whether or not they belonged to it in mind and in spirit.

The French revolution brought additional complications. It lit the torch of liberty, brotherhood and

equality in France. Napoleon's armies carried it almost to every part of Europe, awakening millions of people to a new evaluation of the human personality. The settlers were geographically too far from Europe to adapt to the changes in thought brought about by the awakening. Predestination was too real in their lives to enable them to appreciate the real significance of the revolution. Their morality did not recognise objective truth, but approached men and events from the angle of survival. That truth which guaranteed security was acceptable. That which did not had to be rejected. There could be no adaptation to it. It was, ultimately, false. Where this was the case people in time came to believe that truth could have one form of validity among the Chosen People and another, among those whom God had created for ultimate destruction. The Transvaal Grondwet was later to prescribe that both in the Church and the State there was to be one law for the Whites and another for the Africans.

IN THIS STATE OF MIND some of the settlers could embrace the ideals of the French revolution—partly because they were White ideals, produced in a White environment, for White people. They used them to give direction to an urge which conflicted with the spirit from which they sprang.

In 1795 some of the settlers in the Swellendam area revolted against the authority of the Dutch government. They proclaimed themselves an independent, sovereign people—the *nationals*. They set up a short-lived republic of their own and even hoisted the tricolour. Less spectacular demonstrations took place in a few other places.

These developments were of the greatest significance for South Africa's race problem. In demonstrating against Holland the settlers were not identifying themselves with the humanistic spirit which prevailed in Europe at the time. Rather did they have to pull out of the new intellectual atmosphere charged with humanistic dynamite and create for themselves a world after their own design, where they could adhere to the morality of survival unmolested. They used the contemporary ferment in the minds of men to give momentum to their movement toward a separate and distinctive destiny as a people apart from the Dutch and Europe.

The rejection of Holland was a significant repudiation of the humanistic tradition which reinforced the morality of fulfilment. It was a repudiation of post-revolution Europe's evaluation of the human personality, of the liberal tradition.

In important essentials the settlers' action meant that they had of their own choice, virtually abdicated as trustees of the finest traditions in European culture. A vacuum was created which waited to be filled by a quality of leadership nearer the humanistic spirit than that given by the settlers.

The White community could not give this leadership. It had just stepped aside from the main stream of European thought. The African was not ready to give it, being then still too much of a tribesman to lead a progressive community. ●

(To be continued)