

Xuma, Matthews and finally Lutuli, who became the national president of the A.N.C. in 1952. They all had to pay for that historical withdrawal of the Voortrekkers "to preserve our doctrines in purity".

I doubt whether one of these actors felt that life had been wasted. That was the way life had to be lived, in the times and circumstances in which they had to live. Not one of them was given to self-pity. I myself like to reflect that two of them received some external reward for their brave and noble lives. One was Z.K. Matthews, whom Seretse Khama appointed Botswana's ambassador to Washington, some recompense for that great man who resigned from Fort

Hare when he would shortly have received a considerable pension. Others who resigned with him were Selby Ngcobo, and Cyril Nymbezi. I like to remember that Ngcobo went bare-footed to Adams College, that Nymbezi had to matriculate after he left school, and that Z.K.'s father was a mine-worker. The other who received external reward was Albert Lutuli who in 1961 was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, he who had knocked patiently for thirty years at a door that would not open. Neither of these two great men received any reward from their own country except to be tried for treason.

It is a melancholy tale, but a tale of heroes. □

Footnotes:

I have referred to Anna Steenkamp as an Afrikaner Nationalist. That she undoubtedly was, though the appellation did not then exist. I do this for a further reason, namely that it is wounding to some Afrikaners if one were to call it "Afrikaner psychology".

There were only 11,00 black voters on the common roll.

Lutuli, though 38 years old, had not yet been drawn into politics.

Final Note:

In this essay I should have mentioned Smut's Asiatic Land Tenure Act of 1946, which was the forerunner of the Group Areas Act of 1950.

PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT

by Edgar Brookes

Many of the readers of "Reality" (myself included) stand by the policy of the old Liberal Party which, it will be remembered, was universal suffrage and majority rule.

This is a highly unpopular policy with our rulers and with white South Africans generally, and one might be tempted to keep it in the background and to press for urgently needed reforms within the present system.

Apart from the fact that it is morally dishonest to be silent about our ultimate aims, there are strong arguments for declaring them — first, that black leadership may know that there is a real and vigorous element of white opinion which shares their hopes and ideals; — second, that the white electorate may become more and more aware of the fact that universal suffrage is a practical policy, brought forward by some who are prepared to work under it.

Overnight it became practical politics in Rhodesia, and that very fact brings it nearer to our own borders.

But at the same time it is true that the revolutionary policy of "All or nothing" should *not* be ours. There is a strong tendency to decry real and urgent reforms because they may blunt the spearhead of our main attack.

Let us give a few examples.

Take the question of influx control. It has been made harder and harder for a young man to obtain work in an urban area. This part of the African's life is under complete bureau-

cratic control, with the natural results of being sent from pillar to post, and multiplying opportunities for bribery (*and bribery does take place*). When the work-seeker is given permission to work in an urban area he is directed to work in a certain category of jobs. The young man may long to work in a factory: he will find himself directed into domestic service.

Another point is the treatment of Africans by subordinate officials. A magistrate is rarely discourteous to an African; a junior clerk rarely courteous. As most matters affecting Africans have now been made administrative, reform in this field is urgent.

Should we not, however strong our belief in ultimate complete liberty and equality, actively support reform in these and many other similar fields? To pour cold water on the efforts of those who seek to attain them, or even just to be quiet, is to betray our cause — unless, indeed, we take the Communist view that all real reforms are anti-revolutionary. In this view people would only fight for their rights when life becomes quite intolerable. We want the people to get what can be got to make life richer, fuller and happier.

I will go further. Besides our ultimate aim we ourselves should also have a programme of immediate reforms, for which we are prepared to work. Anything which makes life easier and securer for the people we love should have our active support, not a silent and somewhat scornful acquiescence. □