

increasingly difficult to persuade investors to put capital into countries where the racial policies are thought to be leading to disaster.

The Commonwealth is being challenged on its racial policies. The vast majority of Her Majesty's subjects are other than White, and a new dynamic is needed to inspire us all and draw us together, to make us feel that we all belong and that the ladder of opportunity is increasingly within the reach of us all. Unless this challenge is met, how can our Commonwealth succeed? I believe that the Capricorn Africa Society is helping to show the way.

---

## (II)

# THE ENTRENCHMENT OF PRIVILEGE

JULIUS K. NYERERE

*President of the Tanganyika African National Union*

THE purpose of the Capricorn Movement, as stated in the Capricorn Handbook for Speakers, is to work "for the creation of a common citizenship in which members of all races would take a full part, in which only civilized and cultural values would be protected, and in which racial discrimination would be outlawed." The Capricorn Handbook states further that "In British Capricorn Africa . . . it is the Christian ethic which is mainly under test." Certainly, eminent churchmen in other parts of the world have seen fit to lend their support to the Capricorn Society as being somehow Christian in its policies.

It is not easy in a short article to do full justice to all the propositions of the Capricorn Society, but it will not be difficult to measure whether they are indeed Christian. And surely the examination will be worth-while, because if the churchmen who give their support so willingly should be mistaken, they may be doing a great disservice to their Church and to the great and rapidly growing Christian community of Africa, members of which are everywhere rising to leadership. One may justifiably question the wisdom of any Society's trying to use the prestige of the Christian Church to build up a political movement in a part of Africa which is not only multi-racial,

but also multi-religious. In Tanganyika, for example, the Capricorn Society is registered as the Tanganyika National Society, and its political wing (though this is not officially admitted) is the United Tanganyika Party.

What seems to have taken in a large number of liberal-minded people abroad is the Society's stated policy of outlawing racial discrimination and basing its stand on the dictum of that great imperialist, Cecil John Rhodes, of "equal rights for all civilized men." Obviously such a policy, if carried out, would be a great advance over present policies in South and Central Africa. Yet, while the Preamble to the Capricorn Contract rejects "the barren doctrine of racial nationalism," the Capricorn proposals are all disproportionately in favour of our smallest minority race. Throughout the Contract are scattered carefully propositions and assumptions for discrimination against a majority people by a dominant minority race.

There is, to begin with, a complete refusal to face the basic fact that human values can only be measured in regard to individual human beings, not by the abstract yardstick of comparable cultural prizes. There is the persistent assumption—a fuse which has lit many revolutions through history—that privilege ought to be given further privileges, and that the underprivileged, thus doubly handicapped, must first attain a similarly privileged position before being accorded equal treatment by the law.

In this regard it is incredible that because the Capricorn Society is prepared to grant privileges to a few Africans, so many are reconciled to its doctrines who would otherwise not be. But privilege is surely privilege, whatever the colour of the privileged. The American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the Chinese Revolution, all were revolutions against privilege. They had nothing to do with race. That the European in Africa should try to entrench his privilege by winning over the potential leaders of the masses does not make privilege any less dangerous, but more so, because it is less frank and intends to keep the underprivileged without leadership, and helpless.

A movement based upon fear cannot succeed, and the Capricorn movement is based on fear—the fear of the masses—though the fear is presented as a desire to protect "civilized standards." Abraham Lincoln once said: "God must love the common people most, because he made so many of them." Christian supporters

of Capricorn might give some attention to that remark.

Two centuries of democratic progress should have taught us one lesson—that the duty of government is not to rule as it pleases, but to consult the people, all the people, as to how it should rule. Government belongs to all the people as a natural and inalienable possession, it is not the private property of a minority, however élite or wealthy or educated, and whether uni- or multi-racial. Government is properly instituted among men not to secure the material or cultural advantages of a few, but to promote the rights and welfare of the many. Therefore the many must inevitably be genuinely consulted, and the just powers of government derived from them. Government by representatives in whose selection most of the governed have no part is not rule but repression, and it is by this standard that Capricorn should be judged.

The Capricorn Contract, by employing some form of “civilized standards”, argues to the conclusion that the vote is not a right but a privilege. It then states: “If the vote is not a right open to everyone, but a responsibility of those who have shown themselves fit for it, there must be degrees of fitness among those who have earned the privilege.” From these uncertain premises the Contract strides forth confidently to append a multitude of qualifications which it calls “broadening the franchise” but which creates only a most narrowly restricted class of real voters.

To get just one vote under the Capricorn Contract each person would have to qualify in two categories out of 11 or 14, with one additional vote to a maximum of six for each further qualification. The net result is that most adult Europeans would qualify in many ways; few Africans in contemporary East, Central and Southern Africa would manage the necessary two. Let us see why.

Few Africans, if any, hold or can hope to hold the “rank” and “office” qualifications listed. The “income” and “production” qualifications fit only very few Africans, because they pertain to businesses with a big cash volume or to estates so large that they can only be farmed with expensive machinery. The restrictions based on cash income or wealth in immovable property are set so high that in our African societies, based on production for use rather than for profit, only a few hundred people could hope to fulfil two of them at any time.

Similarly, the education qualifications are set so high that

they would include nearly all Europeans and exclude nearly all Africans.

In Tanganyika, the United Tanganyika Party, Capricorn's political spearhead, succeeded in influencing the Government to introduce this fancy franchise. Without introducing the "degree of fitness" principle and giving to the more fit more than one vote, they have nevertheless succeeded in pushing through legislation which will give the vote to all adult Europeans, to most adult Asian males and to a minute fraction of the African population. Since, however, the non-African population is so small, we are told that in all the constituencies except Dar es Salaam the African voters will be a majority over all the non-African voters. This announcement is made with great satisfaction and is expected to evoke sustained applause from us.

But we are not deceived. The framers of the franchise knew what they were doing. Each voter shall be given three votes, one for an Asian, one for an African and one for a European candidate. Each voter is required under the electoral law to use all his or her three votes and distribute them in that racial proportion of 1 : 1 : 1. Thus, whatever happens, each constituency is required by the law to return to our Legislature one Asian, one European and one African representative. I am told that in some countries a voter is presented with a single list of candidates from which to make his choice. In Tanganyika he will in effect be presented with three lists, one for each race, and he must choose one from each or not choose at all! This is compulsory voting with a vengeance.

Those who call themselves "protectors of civilized standards" can ignore this at their own cost, that under the Declaration of Human Rights Africans are "people" too, all of them, not just the most advanced ones. It is the implicit doctrine of African society that those in places of leadership owe their position not just to their superior wisdom and service, but also to the wisdom and free consent of the common people who elevate them to leadership. Even the simplest understand that there can be no responsibility of leadership that is not founded upon a responsible people. Chiefs and Councils of Elders do not act without confidence that the people are solidly behind them. They may not print ballots and set up other formal machinery every now and then, but they do consult their constituency constantly. Imperialists add insult to injury, therefore, when they expect us, the educated Africans, to join

their exalted races and help to maintain them in their privileged positions and applaud when they call our people "shenzis" backward trash). A plan that would divide us from our fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters who are poorer or less educated than we are, can hardly enjoy our patriotic fervour. True leadership, we believe, dare not allow itself to be divorced from the common people.

The Capricorn Contract makes, and the Tanganyika Government has accepted, the rather undignified assertion that: "In the special circumstances of East and Central Africa, universal suffrage would give rise to the danger of irresponsible politicians being elected to the Legislature on grounds irrelevant to the common good." Irresponsible politicians are evidently presumed to be those whom a majority of people might trust to work for their welfare. It is, however, the 1 per cent. who think they know what is best for the 99 per cent. they do not trust, as under the Capricorn Contract, who are surely the irresponsible politicians. They can only be responsible to themselves and by their own definition of responsibility.

Any discussion of policy in East and Central Africa must be incomplete without reference to land. Provision II of the Capricorn Contract provides that "all existing individual rights in land shall be recognized and confirmed by law." The important word here, of course, is "individual." The rights of all European individuals would thereby be protected. No African individual's rights to land would be definitely safeguarded. Let us see why.

All land, under the Contract, is to be gradually made available for purchase by all persons, regardless of race. But, one asks immediately, who would be able to "purchase" any sizeable amount of land, except, of course, the immigrants with their money and backing from overseas? Few, if any, African individuals would have the money to "purchase" land from a European farmer. Our customs of land use and transfer are based not on buying and selling and speculation, the manipulation of land values by those with the most money, but upon the actual primary needs and usage of each head of a family together with his wife, children and other dependents from within his clan.

This "Land Reform Provision" of the Capricorn Society confesses that "legislation to implement this principle may in certain instances involve the abrogation of treaties and of

solemn pledges to various communities.” We in Tanganyika know that the Contract refers more particularly to our Central African neighbours, but with this cynical proposal to remove the last remaining imperial safeguards—that the diminishing African lands might the more speedily fall into the grasp of the hungry European settler—it can hardly win our enthusiastic support. From the old German days down to the disastrous alienation of the Wameru lands in 1951, the people of Tanganyika have experienced what it is like to have other people deciding what to do with their land. The vague Capricorn promise that the State “shall be under obligation to provide . . . new forms of security” can only intensify our scepticism.

But this is not all that the Capricorn genius has devised. The Contract would actually prevent the possibility of Africans buying land held by other racial groups. It provides that the State “may take steps to ensure that transfers of particular lands are made only to experienced farmers,” and we have a very good idea of where the “particular lands” would turn out to lie and just who the “experienced farmers” would turn out to be.

An interesting admission in the Capricorn Handbook declares that “any attempts to exploit the Society for personal or partisan purposes would soon be evident.” All in all, it is an unfortunate admission for the Contract to have made. For we are reminded of a perception of Reinhold Niebuhr: “The intelligence of privileged groups is usually applied to inventing specious proofs for the theory that universal values spring from, and that general interests are served by, the special privileges which they hold.”