

Hoernlé Memorial Lecture
1945

Christian Principles and Race Problems

Jan H. Hofmeyr

S.A. INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS
P.O. Box 97 JOHANNESBURG.



REINHOLD FREDERICK ALFRED HOERNLÉ

HOERNLÉ MEMORIAL LECTURE

A lecture, entitled the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture (in memory of the late Professor R. F. Alfred Hoernlé), President of the Institute from 1934—1943), will be delivered once a year under the auspices of the South African Institute of Race Relations. An invitation to deliver the lecture will be extended each year to some person having special knowledge and experience of racial problems in Africa or elsewhere.

It is hoped that the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture will provide a platform for constructive and helpful contributions to thought and action. While the lecturers will be entirely free to express their own views, which may not be those of the Institute as expressed in its formal decisions, it is hoped that lecturers will be guided by the Institute's declaration of policy that "scientific study and research must be allied with the fullest recognition of the human reactions to changing racial situations; that respectful regard must be paid to the traditions and usages of the various national, racial and tribal groups which comprise the population; and that due account must be taken of opposing views earnestly held."

Reinhold Frederick Alfred Hoernlé

REINHOLD FREDERICK ALFRED HOERNLÉ, was born in Bonn, Germany, on 27th November, 1880.

His father was Principal of the Madrassah College, Calcutta. His paternal grandfather was a missionary of the London Missionary Society, and, as such, was one of the founders of the Sikundra Mission, near Agra. Alfred Hoernlé was brought up in Germany, where he attended Schul Pforta, a well-known public school in Saxony. He entered Balliol College, Oxford, in 1898, and from that time his career lay in English-speaking countries—Britain, United States of America, and the Union of South Africa. His ancestry, talents, training, and circumstances all combined to produce a man of deep culture, wide sympathies, and strong personality. He came to South Africa at the age of 28 to be professor of philosophy at the South African College (now University of Cape Town), and then began his deep interest in the problems which arise from the presence in one country of peoples of different races. He left in 1911 and returned in 1923 to become professor of philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand, bringing with him his South African wife to be Senior Lecturer in Social Anthropology and to earn distinction in that field of scholarship. Hoernlé had spent the intervening years as professor at Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and assistant-professor at Harvard University in the United States, where he had seen something of the vigorous, ambitious Negro and of the situations created by the presence of the Negro in American life.

Professor Hoernlé became associated with the South African Institute of Race Relations in 1932, and served as its President from 1934 until his death in July, 1943. During these years of his leadership the membership and activities of the Institute expanded, and its effectiveness increased, whilst his own

influence as a thinker and leader in the field of race relations became more and more powerful.

In Hoernlé were combined several outstanding qualities. Gifted with a brilliant analytical mind, he was able to trace more clearly than anyone the single threads in the tangled skein of our racial situations. At the same time, his aptitude for administrative work made him ever willing to tackle practical problems, whether in academic organisation, in racial situations, or in such specialised activities as the educational work for the Union forces which he initiated during the present war. He was an outstandingly good lecturer and public speaker.

As a philosophical thinker his reputation stood high in Europe and America, and there is no doubt that his deep concern for the future of the Union and the welfare of its under-privileged people led him to turn aside from an even more distinguished career as a philosopher.

In the field of race relations Hoernlé's hard thinking and practical activity over a dozen years, and the rare combination in him of the scientific spirit and humane sympathy, were yielding fruits which were ripening fast. His Phelps-Stokes lectures on "South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit", by their searching analysis of the problems of our multi-racial society had cleared his own mind in readiness for further constructive thinking. He would have helped thoughtful people, not only in the Union but also in other parts of Africa, to see more clearly the various possibilities of the racial situation and the lines along which the main objective of the Institute of Race Relations may be realised, *i.e.*, "to work for peace, goodwill, and practical co-operation between the various races. . . ."

The most fitting memorial to Professor Hoernlé seemed, to the Executive Committee of the Institute, to be the institution of a Hoernlé Memorial Lecture under the ægis of the Institute, to provide a platform, during the annual sessions of the Institute's Council, from which persons distinguished in some field of race relations could bring forward the fruits of their thinking and their practical experience, and thus contribute to

a greater understanding of our racial situations. This decision has been widely welcomed.

The Institute was fortunate in securing the Honourable Jan H. Hofmeyr, M.P., Deputy Prime Minister of the Union, Minister of Finance and Education, and Chancellor of the University of the Witwatersrand, to deliver the first address under the Hoernlé Memorial Lecture. Mr. Hofmeyr's introductory remarks show that there is a special appropriateness in the fact that he inaugurated the series. The Institute is privileged to add other reasons for its choice — that he is a Vice-President and an honorary Life Member of the Institute.

J. D. RHEINALLT JONES.

Christian Principles and Race Problems

WHEN I was invited to deliver this, the first Hoernlé Memorial Lecture, I felt myself under the constraint of *pietas* to accept the invitation. I was one of the first band of students whom Professor Hoernlé taught at the old South African College away back in 1908. Subsequently I played a part in bringing him to South Africa again, to the University of the Witwatersrand, where for a time I was his colleague. In later years I observed him, with the interest and approval of friendship, as he devoted his great gifts to the practical problems of race relations in this land. He was of course a great academician, with outstanding qualities in his chosen field of philosophical investigation, not least a mind as acutely analytical as that of anyone I have ever met; he was also a brilliant teacher, with a supreme faculty for exposition, coupled with the divine gift of enthusiasm which he knew how to pass on to those whom he taught; but above all he was dominated by the ideal of *humanitas* in his attitude and outlook towards his fellow-men.

It was a fortunate thing for us all when Alfred Hoernlé, under the impulse of that *humanitas*, threw himself with all his energy and ability into the analysis and exposition of South Africa's race problems. Some years ago, when I was myself still young in politics, and inclined to be on the defensive against the reproaches to which my own academic past seemed to expose me, I made the remark that our politics would be all the better for a little more of the unprejudiced thinking and the ruthless analysis which are of the essence of the academic spirit, and I went on to declare that there is no greater fallacy than that the academic man is necessarily unpractical. There was in those words an element of prophecy in relation to Alfred Hoernlé.

His Phelps-Stokes lectures on *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit* still stand as a splendid evidence of the illumination that the analytical mind can bring to a difficult political problem, or nest of problems, while the very last thing he did, his analysis of the Alexandria situation, showed how intensely practical and effective an outstanding academic man can be.

But above all, it is the essential humanity of his spirit which we treasure as a continuing inspiration for all who cherish the causes which he had at heart. This Institute has special reason for mourning his early death—it drew much from him—it can best repay its debt by a quickened instinct of service to those ideals which it was created to further and which he made his own.

I am happy, then, on grounds of *pietas* to be delivering this lecture. I am not so happy on other grounds. I am very conscious of the fact that I cannot give you the kind of address which you would wish to hear. I suffer from a twofold limitation, firstly that I am a politician, and as such must ever remember the fact that politics is necessarily to a large extent the science of the practicable, and further that in my ministerial capacity I deal only secondarily with problems of race relations. An authoritative pronouncement on such matters from the Government's point of view can only be made by the Prime Minister—you had the good fortune of listening to General Smuts two years ago—or by a Minister more directly concerned with them than I am. I must therefore of necessity keep away from specific questions of the day, and, at the risk of being dubbed unrealistic and academic, seek to deal rather with what I would like to be regarded as fundamentals.

I think it well that such an attempt should be made. There is a tendency for us in South Africa to be so much oppressed by the magnitude and gravity of our racial problems that we fail to see them against the background of broader human trends. If in the sixteenth century men fought about religion, and in the nineteenth century nationality was the driving force of European politics, our own generation is one in which it is the concept of race that is the main divisive and destructive

force that tortures humanity. Twenty years ago Dr. J. H. Oldham, the great missionary statesman, wrote: "In the past Europe has been chastised with the whips of nationalism, in the future the world is to be chastised with the scorpions of racialism." How painfully prophetic those words are now seen to have been. At the root of this war there is the racist doctrine of the *Herrenvolk*. But let us not make the mistake of regarding that doctrine as confined to Germany. The growth of Naziism was part of a world phenomenon. Similar tendencies were at work in other lands before the war, and the danger of the present situation is that in the very countries that are fighting Germany to-day, there has in many cases during the war been a strengthening of racist tendencies, with the result that, when the conflict is over, we may find that, while we have defeated Naziism in its homeland, our own national life is deeply infected with the germ-cells of Naziism. By that I mean such things as intolerance, racial prejudice, thinking with the blood. If we justify—as we do—our participation in the war on the ground that the conception of the *Herrenvolk* is a dire threat to Christianity and to human welfare, we must not fail to ask ourselves to what extent a similar conception prevails in our own midst. It is the more necessary to do so because there are very many people who just don't realise the extent to which their own individual outlook has been affected by that very spirit against which, as expressed by Nazi Germany, they are waging war.

I do not therefore propose this evening to deal with specific questions of political or economic reform—I want to get behind such matters to the factor which will ultimately determine whether and to what extent progress is possible, and that is the spirit and outlook of the people. And in particular I want to emphasise the importance of the Christian approach to our problems of race relations. I offer no apology, politician though I am, for doing so. In our life as a community we make profession of our Christianity. It is fitting to use it as a touchstone of our public as well as our private attitudes in regard to these most important questions. Eight years ago our Prime Minister, General Smuts, took exception to the way in which

the gentler virtues and the human standpoint inculcated by the Founder of the Christian religion have come in our time to be derided as signs of weakness and of national decay.

I cannot help feeling that the reformer in the field of race relations often fails through not paying sufficient attention to the hard facts of public opinion, and to the necessity of securing a modification of these facts as a condition of progress. Professor Hoernlé in his Phelps-Stokes lectures rightly emphasised the contrast, between the approach of the democrat and that of the revolutionary, making the very true observation that "the hardest part of the liberal's lot is not the opposition, or even the abuse, he meets with from the uncompromising adherents of domination, but the accusations of moral cowardice, of betrayal of principle, of compromise with evil, which are hurled at him by doctrinaire extremists". These extremists scorn palliatives as a means of bolstering up a system which they wish to destroy, and which in fact, along the lines of their methods, can only be destroyed by the revolutionary's appeal to force. The true democrat however is by the nature of his professions bound to accept the system endorsed by the majority, to work within its framework for small-scale improvement, and for the rest to apply himself to the task of persuading the majority that it is wrong, of altering its attitude and outlook. It is of these same doctrinaire extremists that Dr. Oldham wrote in his book "Christianity and the Race Problem", that "they shut their eyes to the stubbornness of human nature in the mass. They refuse to recognise the powerlessness of a formula to effect a change in vast multitudes, whose ways of thinking and feeling have been formed by influences operating through countless generations, creatures of habit, bound by custom, steeped in prejudices, influenced in their actions far less by rational considerations than by deep-seated inherited instincts, impulses, and desires. They fail to distinguish between the goal and the long, slow, and painful steps by which it must be reached, and grasp at great ends without consideration of the means which are indispensable for achieving them. They wish immediately to make their ideas prevail, forgetting that nothing that is imposed

on men can last, but only what they freely accept, and that it is only by the gradual, divine, and costly process of education that truth wins its way in the world and transforms human life into something higher and better." And so I come back to the question whether those who aim at progress in race relations have done enough to secure it, by presenting the Christian principles which should determine such progress to a people such as ours which in the light of its traditions might be expected to be responsive to such a presentation.

How then shall we describe the Christian principles which have a bearing on race problems? The central truth, which we cannot escape, try as we may, is that of the Fatherhood of God, carrying with it the implication of the brotherhood of man, irrespective of race or creed or colour, and the concept of a world-wide family, all the members of which stand in the same relationship to its Head. With that one links the statement of the Founder of our religion that "whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is My brother and sister and mother", which means that the family association is independent of the physical origin and the racial characteristics of those who make it up. Then there is the command to love our neighbours as ourselves, a command at the very centre of Christian teaching, and the accompanying illustration of the term neighbour as covering those whom normally we would scorn and despise. Here indeed in the Christian doctrine of Man we are at grips with the essentials of our religion—it is that truth that we must bring home to those who in effect repudiate it in their attitude to our problems of race relations. As Principal Micklem, of Mansfield College, Oxford, has written, "Christianity and Racialism (he used the term of course in its correct sense, not as it is so often wrongly used in South Africa)—Christianity and Racialism stand opposed as two religions". It is not without reason that in his recent Presidential Address to the Classical Association Sir Walter Moberley picked out as one of the points in which Plato fell short of Christianity this Christian doctrine of Man, which assigns to every individual person a far higher value than Plato did, and in the light of which it is indefensible to regard

another person as merely a unit in a mass or a means to an end.

It was this doctrine that General Smuts emphatically endorsed in the address which he delivered at his installation as Chancellor of the University of Capetown early in 1937. In that address he preached the gospel of toleration among humans, the fundamental recognition of the common humanity of all men as the very foundation of our civilisation; he ranged himself on the side of the Christian doctrine of human brotherhood against the intolerance of our time which he stigmatised as a returning to barbarism and he described the University as a place where there should be nourished a spirit of racial indifference.

What in the light of Christian teaching does that spirit of racial indifference mean for us in South Africa? It does not imply, nor do I believe that General Smuts meant it to imply, the acceptance as a guiding principle of what the founders of the United States of America declared to be a self-evident truth, that all men are created equal. In Dr. Oldham's book, from which I have already quoted, he has a chapter entitled "The Fact of Inequality", preceding his chapter on "The Truth of Equality". It is, as he points out, simply not true that all men are in fact created equal in natural endowment. The world is full of differences—from some points of view it is the richer for it, and it is misleading and dangerous to minimise the inequalities which do exist. But these differences between individual men and groups of men, great and real as they are, are none the less differences within a unity. Underlying them all there is a common humanity, there is a fundamental equality of men as men. "Men", Dr. Oldham sums it up, "are not equal in their capacity to serve the community, nor are they equal in their needs. But they *are* equal in the possession of a personality that is worthy of reverence. They *are* equal in the right to the development of that personality, so far as may be compatible with the common good. And in the determination of what constitutes the common good, they have an equal claim that their case should be heard and weighed and that the judgment should be disinterested and just." That then it seems to me is what racial indifference means. It does not imply

that all men are created equal, but it is of its essence, that all men should be free through development to attain the best that is in them. It insists on the belief, which John Buchan described as fundamental to Christianity, in the worth (not the equality) of every human soul—"that something may be made of anybody, that there is nothing common or unclean." It associates itself with the definition of democracy as "that form of Government and of society which is inspired above every other with the feeling and the consciousness of the dignity of man". And it implies also that in the last resort, in those individual cases, where the differences of social tradition and cultural background have been eliminated, race by itself is not a sufficient ground for differentiation. So then there can be no reconciliation between the acceptance of Christian doctrine and the countenancing of a policy, open or concealed, of repression of, or the withholding of reasonable facilities for development from an under-privileged race. The South African who professes Christian doctrine must, with General Smuts, regard it as an outrage to say that South Africa has a population of two and not of ten millions, must repudiate the attitude of mind which, openly or by implication, claims that there is a divine right attaching to a white skin.

There is a second point of Christian principle, arising out of what I have been saying, which is hardly less important. I have spoken of the differences which exist between men of different races. What is important from the point of view of Christian principle is the way in which we react towards them. The temptation that comes to the ruling group in a multi-racial society is to ensure their perpetuation as part of what Professor Hoernlé would have called the technique of domination; in the Christian view they constitute a challenge to service, with a view to the stimulation of development and the neutralisation of handicaps. That therefore suggests a further criterion to be applied to our policies in respect of race relations. Is the motive of those policies self-regarding or is it other-regarding? It seems to be necessary to make that point with reference more especially to the description of our South

African Native Policy as one of Trusteeship. There is much of value in that conception, and it has made a good deal of progress possible, though we would be foolish to attempt to pretend to ourselves or to the world that in fact our policy is not one of domination, which our efforts in the spirit of trusteeship can at best but qualify. But the real crux is this, in whose interest is the Trust being conducted? Are we concerned merely with the welfare of our wards, furthering their interests and theirs only, stimulating their development, against the day when they will no longer need our tutelage—do we really contemplate that possibility—or do we regard the relationship as something that will continue indefinitely, and as such a disguised instrument of white superiority, with the added advantage that it makes our native policy look rather more respectable in the eyes of the outside world? To put the point somewhat differently—are our wards, like some protected infant industries, subject to the disability of never growing up? As General Smuts pointed out in his address of two years ago, there is great potential value in the concept of trusteeship, but the realisation of those potentialities will depend on what is the real underlying motive of that policy, and it is here that the Christian criterion which I mentioned a few minutes ago comes to be of such great importance.

I would like to offer one more remark in this connection. Professor Hoernlé rightly made the point that “the price which the White caste pays for its domination is fear—fear for the continuance of its own domination, fear for its future”. But the casting out of fear is of the essence of Christianity. Stand firm by principle, and go forward in faith—that is its spirit. Faith against fear, that indeed is the real issue in most problems of race relations. Often there is ground for fear. In our South African native problem there is the hard central fact of the numerical preponderance of the Bantu. There is a fundamental desire in the minds of the South African people to act justly towards the natives in their midst, but that desire fights a difficult battle for expression against the power of fear. Sarah Gertrude Millin has told us how once she put this point in

conversation with an American negro. "You know," she said, "the relative numbers of black and white in South Africa. Well, consider the black people as a big man struggling in a swamp, and the white people as a little man standing on the edge of the swamp. The little man wants to help the big man. But how far dare he? Isn't it more possible that the big man will pull in the little man, than that the little man will pull out the big man? That is the question we are always asking ourselves in South Africa." For fear then as a motive, admitted or concealed, of our native policy there is psychological ground enough. But that does not make it a sound basis in the long run. The realist, as he is pleased to call himself, sees that one fact of Bantu numerical preponderance, and so, logically, as he thinks, he sets himself to check Bantu development—if not actively to repress it, at least cunningly to hold it back. But he does not see all the facts—is it not a characteristic of the realist that he very rarely sees all the facts?—he does not see the further facts, that fear inevitably engenders hatred, that you cannot solve the Native problem by a policy which creates a sullen, discontented hostile Native population, that you can't go on indefinitely sitting on the safety valve. The right course to take is, while facing the facts, all the facts, to refuse to abandon the firm ground of principle, to maintain the essential value of human personality as something independent of race or colour, to provide facilities for Native development, and, since no one can say with certainty to what in the long run the policy of development will lead, to go forward in faith. That is the issue—faith against fear. A policy based on fear must lead to disaster. The outcome of a policy based on faith may be unpredictable in detail, but there is more than a reasonable chance of it leading to success. And the Christian approach is the approach not of fear, but of faith.

Perhaps it is not inapposite to recall the experience of Lord Shaftesbury as factory reformer a century ago. When he urged the mitigation of abuses, the realists replied that, though of course the lot of factory workers was hard, it could not be improved, without making it impossible to meet foreign com-

petition, without capital being driven away, unemployment resulting and the last state of the worker being worse than the first. To these seemingly irresistible arguments Lord Shaftesbury opposed the certainties of his Christian conscience. He gained the day; the forebodings of his critics were not realised; and in the end it was shown that he, not they, had been the true realist, who had correctly assessed the ultimate facts and values.

Against the background of what I have so far said, I propose now to make some remarks on three of South Africa's problems of race relations.

First I want to deal with the relations between Jew and non-Jew. We do not perhaps normally think of this as one of our racial problems; certainly it is more complex than our other racial problems; but it is none the less much more a problem of race relations than is the so-called racial question as between Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking South Africans, and in essence anti-Semitism *is* a racial phenomenon.

Anti-Semitism was not a natural growth in South Africa—in view of our traditions, our traditions of a religious outlook and reverence for the Bible, of hospitality, and of the love of freedom, it might have been expected that it would never get a foothold here. In the light of those traditions the Jew was for long regarded throughout South Africa as the stranger at the gate for whom both the injunctions of Scripture and the instincts of hospitality bespoke a courteous reception. But during the last twenty years our traditional attitude towards the Jew has been widely breached. I have already referred to the growth of racism between the two wars and of Naziism as the chief exponent of that doctrine. It is with the Nazis that anti-Semitism took on a particularly aggressive form, and the anti-Semitism of Naziism *was* an article meant for export. The seeds of this evil thing were blown over the oceans even to South Africa. The stock libels of Nazi propaganda came to be sedulously disseminated among us, sometimes skilfully adapted to our local circumstances, and anti-Semitism grew apace. This was the position before the present war began. But

though the war is a war against Naziism, the process has continued. What I called the germ-cells of Naziism have grown in number and virulence during the war—wide sections of the community have become infected—the present position in this regard constitutes a grave danger to our national future.

I shall return to that point, but first let me say this. The Anti-Semitism of our day, which has rightly been called the new barbarism, is essentially un-Christian—it is in conflict with all that is of permanent value in our culture and civilisation. Between it and these truths of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, which are essential in Christianity, as they are also in the Jewish religion, there is a sharp conflict. To me it is a never-failing source of wonder, how people in this country and in other countries, who profess Christianity, and do not repudiate those truths, can also preach and practise anti-Semitism. To the extent to which a nation accepts anti-Semitism it is un-Christian and uncivilised.

What then are the ultimate causative factors of this aberration—for I cannot regard it otherwise? I would suggest two such factors. The first is the distinctiveness of the Jew, or, as someone once described it, the “other-ness” of the Jew. The Jew is different from the rest of us—we are conscious of that fact—and for all too many people the consciousness of difference acts as a seed-bed of intolerance. “The dislike of the unlike”, it has been said, “is a very common human failing”. The Jew is different because of his religious background, and of his continuing consciousness of the fact that he belongs to a people called to come apart and to be separate. But he is different also because the Gentile peoples have in the past forced him to be different, to live in ghettos, to have a separate economic and national life. When we who are not Jews complain of the distinctiveness of the Jew, it is well that we should remember that it is largely the consequence of the way in which they were treated by our own forbears. History has a queer way of taking its revenges. If you make a ghetto, it nearly always comes back on you or on your descendants. Not only those who live in ghettos

suffer ; those who compel them to do so also suffer, and the sins of the parents are often visited on their children.

But a second cause of the development of anti-Semitism has been the success of the Jew. In pretty nearly every country where he has had a fair chance, the Jew has been disproportionately successful. To a large extent this has been a natural reaction to the repression of the ghetto. But it is due also to his own qualities. There is a great diversity in the characteristics of Jews, just as there is in the characteristics of the rest of us. It is interesting to note how often it happens that the Jews as such are attacked because of opposite qualities displayed by individual Jews. But they have the generic characteristics of energy and the will to make that energy felt. That naturally brings its rewards. But whatever the reasons of the Jew's success may be, the point that I would make here is that prosperity stimulates envy, and that envy blinds those who feel it to the fact that the prosperity of one element does not impoverish the community as a whole, but enriches it. It is perhaps not without significance that in South Africa anti-Semitism seems to come most naturally to those who believe that to save the white man in South Africa you must keep the Native and the Coloured man and the Asiatic down, who do not recognise the fallacy in the attitude of mind which seeks to secure the welfare of one's own section of the community by preventing other sections from faring well.

It is on this foundation that anti-Semitism in our day, used chiefly as the spearhead of Naziism, has been built up—and it is at this point that I come back to its danger to us from the wider point of view. First I would make the point that Hitler's attack on anti-Semitism was in effect also an attack on Christianity. His objective was the establishment of a totalitarian state, a state which would usurp the place of God and stimulate hatred instead of love towards one's neighbour. To such a totalitarian state no true Jew could give his undivided allegiance—bitter hostility between Naziism and Jewry was therefore inevitable. But those very doctrines which made it impossible for the true Jew to accept Naziism are also essentially Christian doctrines—

and to the extent to which the Christian Church in Germany, Protestant and Catholic, has sought to uphold those doctrines, it also has had to suffer persecution. Christianity cannot, any more than Judaism, accept the doctrine of the totalitarian state, and the Christian community which toys with the weapon which that type of state has sought to use against Jewry is planting the seeds of destruction in its own body.

The second point is this. We now realise, or should realise, how anti-Semitism was an element in the technique used in the building up of dictatorship. It has been part of the unhappy role of the Jew in history to be the scapegoat of Christian nations, bearing as such the responsibility for their discontents, their disabilities and their disappointments. In our own time in particular we have seen how a people in distress, oppressed by its burdens, could be made gradually to regard the Jew as its enemy, the cause of all its ills; how in the mentality thus produced, it turned to those who presented themselves as its protectors against the danger, and conferred on them dictatorial power. As we look back to-day on the pre-war period in our own land, we can discern clearly how anti-Semitic movements were set on foot, which received not only initial inspiration, but also material aid, from outside. Anti-Semitism was used as both the precursor and the instrument of dictatorship in other countries—there were those who were ready to use it to subvert democratic institutions in our own. To-day it is an even stronger force than it was then—it is being sedulously fostered—we must not be foolishly blind to what this may imply. We must be alive to the possibility that when the Nazis are defeated, the poison of Naziism may still go on doing its deadly work.

I pass on to refer to the relations between Europeans and Asiatics in our land. It is hardly matter for argument that in this field our record, when judged in the light of the principles I sought to enunciate earlier on, scarcely bears examination. The self-interest of the European brought the Indian to South Africa; self-interest has sought to get rid of him from the country; self-interest in so far as this cannot be achieved, is determined to keep him in what is regarded as his place. Within

the last year we have seen how the Pretoria Agreement, a sincere and honest effort to find a solution of the problem in its most important aspect, that is, in so far as it affects Natal, has been shipwrecked as a result of a display of mass intolerance, which is one of the least creditable episodes in our history, and we have had to listen to an Indian leader before the bar of one of our legislative bodies describe the policy which it was being sought to enforce as "Hitler's policy applied by Hitler's enemies to subjects of the British Empire." The spirit of forbearance and understanding, for the cultivation of which General Smuts made so eloquent a plea in the Installation Address from which I have already quoted, has been conspicuous chiefly by its absence.

It is well that we should remind ourselves how the Indian came to South Africa. There has perhaps never been a better summing up of the attitude of the average European in South Africa to the Asiatic than that given by Lord Milner: "The Asiatics are strangers forcing themselves upon a community reluctant to receive them". When it is remembered that it was the same Lord Milner who brought a new lot of Asiatics—Chinese coolies—to work in the mines of the Witwatersrand, an essential inconsistency in that attitude, considered in its long-range aspect, is also brought to light. For it is an inescapable fact that Asiatics came to South Africa primarily not of their own initiative, but because the Europeans wished them to come—they remained because the Europeans wished them to remain. So it was in the days of the Dutch East India Company when the Malays first came to the Cape; so it was in the nineteenth century with the coming of the Indians. If our history proves anything it is this—that however we may regard our Asiatic problem, the fact that it came into existence is due to the European, and the European alone.

There was only one reason for the original introduction of immigrants from India to what is now the Union of South Africa—the desire of the Natal Colonists of those days to exploit the potential wealth of their coastal districts. The natives, so the sugar-planters declared, would not come out to work in

sufficient numbers from the reserves which Sir Theophilus Shepstone had set aside for them, and when they did come their labour was inefficient. The nascent sugar industry was denied the hope of expansion if it could not get the labour it required. But in not-too-distant Mauritius indentured Indian labour had set sugar-planting on its feet. Why should not Natal follow suit—and prosper similarly?

So the Government of India was asked to sanction the importation of Indian coolies. At first it was unwilling—ultimately it agreed, and in November 1860 the first shipload arrived. They came at the expense of the Natal Government, which allocated them to approved masters under a three-years' indenture. After the three years the labourer was required to re-indenture himself for a fourth year, or, if he wished, for two additional years. Thereafter he was free to live and work as he willed. After a further five years he had the right either to a free return passage or the equivalent of its cost in Crown land. The ultimate end of this policy was clear from the outset. The coolie was to be welcomed as a permanent settler in the Colony, and as a contributor to its prosperity. The conception of the Indian as a stranger forcing himself upon a reluctant community had not emerged.

His coming amply justified the predictions of those who had favoured it. The sugar industry prospered mightily, and in the words of a leading South African historian, Sugar became King in Natal. When in 1886 the Government of India forbade further importation of indentured labourers it was held to portend ruin for the Colony. With great difficulty the withdrawal of the ban was secured. Of course the coming of the Indian also brought disadvantages, which in due course asserted themselves. As a result the policy of Natal gradually changed, but the importation of indentured labour did not cease until 1911, and then it was the Government of India that stopped further recruiting.

I have recounted this story, not merely because it shows how it was the self-interest of the European that created this problem for us, but also because, by indicating the part played in it by

governmental authority in India as a consenting party, an unwilling consenting party, overborne by pressure from governmental authority in South Africa, it helps to emphasise the distinctive feature of this among our problems of race relations. Of the others we can say that they are our business alone—that no external government has anything to say about them—here we are on much less sure ground in making that contention. Again and again we are brought up with an unpleasant jolt against the fact that in this matter we are not just dealing with a quarter-of-a-million residents of South Africa—eighty per cent or more of South African birth—but also with an Indian nation or national group of about four hundred millions, a nation with a great cultural tradition, and the prospect of playing a very important part in the world in the future. Again and again in our attempts to settle the question of European-Indian relations in the Union we have found ourselves confronted with forces of wider than Union significance. So it was in the days when Smuts and Ghandi clashed—and as a result of the conflict there was forged in South Africa the weapon of Satyagraha, of Passive Resistance, which was subsequently to be used so effectively in India itself. So it was in the mid-twenties of this century, when legislative attempts to enforce Asiatic Segregation—the Bills were called Class Areas Bills—we politicians sometimes think that we can make unpalatable policies acceptable by calling a spade by some other name—so it was when those attempts led to the Round Table Conference of 1926, and the name of Srinavasa Sastri came to be held in honour in our land. So it has been again of late with the Pegging Act and the Natal Residential Property Regulation Ordinance. The imposition of sanctions by the Indian Government, the wild and whirling words used in the Indian legislature, are fresh in our memories, and the resentment caused thereby in South Africa is understandable enough. But it is also understandable that India should feel that it cannot disinterest itself from the grievances of the voteless descendants of those Indians whom, against its better judgment, it was importuned by South Africa to allow to come to our land. And it is strengthened in that

attitude by the recognition of its interest in the welfare of that section of our South African population, which the agreement reached at the Round Table Conference implies.

That then is a special feature of this problem—its international aspect. It is an embarrassing feature to us, and the appeal recently made in a Natal newspaper that an attempt should be made “to remove the problem finally from India’s sphere of interests” will no doubt be widely echoed. How is it to be done? The 1927 agreement admitted the stake of the Government of India in what is primarily our domestic problem, but it also pointed the way along which the removal of that stake can be secured. In that agreement the Government of the Union declared its firm belief and adherence to “the principle that it is the duty of every civilised Government to devise ways and means, and to take every possible step, for the uplifting of every section of their permanent population”, and its acceptance of “the view that in the provision of educational and other facilities the considerable number of Indians who remain part of the permanent population shall not be allowed to lag behind other sections of the people.” Those pronouncements of eighteen years ago were in full accord with Christian principles in their bearing on race relations. We have done a certain amount to give effect to them. But we have still a great deal to do before we can say to India—we have done what in the 1927 agreement we said we would do—your interest in our domestic affairs arising out of that document has now fallen away. Quite recently a Natal member of the Cabinet has felt constrained to say that “if Durban had shown a sense of responsibility and tried to tackle the housing problem in so far as it affected the Indians, there would have been no Indian problem in Durban to-day.” That same Minister has also said that “we cannot expect the Indian population, which now equals the European population in Natal, to be voiceless in the control of municipal and state affairs”. The plain fact is this. In 1927 the Government of the Union in effect affirmed its acceptance of a truth which I shall state in words that I have used before, the truth that the Ghetto damages not only those who dwell

there, but those who compel them to dwell there. So far we have failed to give convincing evidence that the Ghetto-creating mentality is not still with us. One can but hope that we shall not have to pay too heavy a price before we finally shake ourselves free of it.

In his address at the bar of the Provincial Council to which I have already referred, Mr. Kajeé summarised the fundamental issue in this way. "Does the European dominant group really want to solve racial strife, or does it prefer to establish its own supremacy even at the cost of racial strife? So long as the European section insists upon the economic and social inferiority of the Indian community, so long will there be racial strife; so long as the European community insists that the Indian shall have no representation on bodies which determine the destiny of Indians, so long will there be racial strife; so long as the Indians are depressed and segregated by statutes legally imposed by the dominant group, so long will there be racial strife." One may not agree with all the implications of those remarks—but none the less they present a challenge to public bodies and individual citizens in South Africa. We would do well to search our hearts as we confront it.

I pass on to utilise the short time still remaining to me in order to make a few remarks on the problem of relations between Europeans and Africans, which we call the Native problem, in this case also against the background of the principles which I described in the first part of this address. It will of course be obvious that it will not be possible for me to attempt an analysis of that problem, nor to seek to make a contribution of any significance to it; all that I have time for is a few passing comments.

I shall take as my text not the least profound of Mr. Churchill's sayings during the present war: "It is not given to the cleverest and most calculating of mortals to know with certainty what is their interest—yet it is given to quite a lot of simple folks to know what is their duty". With that as starting-point, I want to suggest a new touchstone for the attitude of the European peoples of this land towards this problem.

It is, I think, correct to say that at present our predominant national motive in approaching it is self-interest. Perhaps if we ponder the words of Mr. Churchill we shall realise what an uncertain guide self-interest is in these matters—how difficult it is to determine where our interest really does lie. I have already remarked on the tendency for the so-called realist in relation to the native problem to fail to see all the facts.

There will, of course, be those who will dispute my statement that our predominant motive is self-interest. They will refer in this connection to our accepted national policy of segregation. It is a policy which has had, which still has, the support of most excellent people, with no uncertainty in their minds as to the disinterestedness of their motives. It has been defended on grounds of Christian principle as being based on respect for the integrity of every race and of its culture. It is God's will, it is pointed out, that there should exist on earth different races and cultures, and it is therefore against God's will to promote race-mixture and culture mixture. There is a good deal to be said for this point of view. Segregation is sound in theory in so far as it is merely based on the concept of difference between one race and another—you may remember how Professor Hoernlé remarked in his Phelps-Stokes lectures that the liberal spirit may foster and encourage differences, provided they are different forms of human excellence, or different values which make human life worth living. But segregation is not sound—it certainly cannot be defended on grounds of Christian principle—in so far as it is based on the concept of the permanent inferiority of race to race, in so far as it implies the claim of a divine right attaching to a white skin. We must oppose, as Professor Hoernlé went on to point out, those man-made inequalities of opportunity and power which secure fullness of life to some, whilst denying it to others. It is for every South African, in so far as he supports Segregation as a policy, to lay his hand on his heart and ask himself, on which of the two concepts to which I have referred is it in his case based. So too Segregation in practice, as a policy of territorial separation, of the building up of areas where distinctive native development and progress can take

place, has achieved much for the promotion of native welfare and is capable of achieving very much more. To that extent also the support of Christian principle may be claimed. But what is not always realised is the limitation of the extent to which that policy can be applied. General Smuts's forthright statement in that regard when he addressed the Institute two years ago came as a shock to many. And in so far as Segregation does not mean effective territorial separation, in so far as it is merely an instrument in mixed areas for the upholding of the power and privilege of the European in a caste-society, based on the maintenance and furtherance of his interests, the argument from Christian principle falls away. We certainly show little respect for God-willed differences of race by the way in which we tend to treat the native in our towns and on our farms as one who is, and must remain, an inferior being. Let us be frank. For all too many South Africans the motive in supporting Segregation is that of self-interest. It is part of the technique of the white man's domination, a means of keeping the Native in his place. And such is the weakness of self-interest as a touchstone, that we tend to forget the validity of the truth, to which expression was first given in the United States, that you cannot permanently keep any element of the population in the ditch, if you are not prepared to stay there yourself—at least we lose sight of the extent to which native progress may minister to our own well-being.

Of the concept of Trusteeship I have already spoken. It too holds much of value, more than Segregation. It has of late been a forceful impulse towards native progress. But there, too, we come up against what I have on another occasion described as the pitfall of Trusteeship—we find that, consciously or unconsciously, we tend to let ourselves be influenced in the administration of the trust imposed upon us by the consideration of our own European interests, and not by the interests of our wards. To the extent that we do that the concept of Trusteeship must fail, and ultimately we may be worse rather than better off for having advanced it.

If then we reject self-interest as our touchstone—and, of

course, the consequence of the consistent use of it can only be the adoption of a policy of repression which must lead to disaster, not least for us Europeans—what are we to do? Professor Hoernlé, you will remember, analysed the possible lines of policy that might be followed in South Africa. His analysis led him to no very hopeful results. There was, however, one very important qualifying phrase in his exposition of the problem: “So long as the heart of White South Africa remains set on domination”. Does not that suggest that perhaps something might be gained if those who are dissatisfied with things as they are were to think not just in terms of a change of policy, but also in terms of a change of heart, a change of race attitudes? Is that quite as hopeless as some people seem to think to be. After all, while a sense of colour-distinctiveness is deeply embedded in the South African people, colour prejudice in the sense of hostility to non-Europeans is not. It is an unhappy fact that there is a feeling outside South Africa that the European South African is deliberately unfair to the non-European fellow citizen. That is not the case. There is a fundamental desire in the minds of our people to act justly towards the non-Europeans. In general our record in our dealings with the Native peoples of our land is a good one. The fact of the continued survival in increasing numbers of the black men in South Africa, in contrast with what has happened in other countries where men of different colours have met, shows that there has been an essential humanity in the attitude of white man towards black in this land. Even those who have most strenuously rejected the concept of equality between white man and black have none the less in their hearts recognised the participation of the black man in a common humanity. One of the features of Voortrekker practice in this regard was the acceptance of native servants as part of the family in the wider Roman sense of that term. All that is true. It is of course also true that colour prejudice does exist to a considerable extent, though as something artificial rather than natural, the creation largely of politicians, who have been aided in their efforts by the instinct of fear to which I referred earlier on.

Yet I cannot believe that the gospel of "Be just and fear not" will fall on deaf ears, nor that it is hopeless to suggest as an alternative touchstone to self-interest the touchstone of plain simple duty, the duty which in Mr. Churchill's words it is given to a lot of ordinary folks everyday to know and to practise.

Whenever I have myself sought to analyse the problems of Native policy, I have always in the last resort found myself left with the one key-word, development. It is that after all which gives their value to the concepts of Segregation and Trusteeship—it is that to which what I have called our plain, simple duty points us. The Native, both as participant in our common humanity, and as our ward, is entitled to facilities for the development of the best that is in him, with a view to his being enabled to bring his contribution to the stock of our country's welfare, and that not merely in the territorial areas set aside for him, but in all parts of the country where he lives. It was in terms of such things as education, health, housing, nutrition, better living conditions, that General Smuts chiefly spoke when addressing the Institute on the Basis of Trusteeship two years ago. We cannot evade the obligation to provide these facilities to the extent of our ability.

There will be those who will say that this means short-range palliatives, not a long-range solution. I do not dispute that statement. I admit that I can see no clear-cut approach to the native problem which leads to a determinable and final solution. I believe that we must be content with a partial vision of the goal, following in patience and faith the gleam of duty as we see it, hoping that full clarity and enlightenment will in time come.

Others again will be apprehensive of the dangers for the white man's position to which this path of development will lead. To them I can but say that the only alternative policy is that of repression, frank and unashamed, and unless we are to allow ourselves, under pressure of fear to accept repression as our policy, we can but go forward on that path, "holding fast to the profession of our faith without wavering".

In his Installation Address (I make no apology for referring

to it again), General Smuts spoke of the necessity in this country for us "to practise the larger faith and to follow the larger vision". He pointed to all our diversities as calling for "real generosity of outlook, breadth of view, and sweep of statesmanship" and he mentioned the factors, including our religion and the traditions of the stocks from which we spring, as pointing "to the path of goodwill, sympathy, understanding and tolerance as the real line of advance for us". That has really been the theme of this address. I can add to it no more than an expression of my conviction that there is no future for this as a Christian nation, save on the basis of a generous respect for the dignity of all men, an unwearying activity towards the removal of inequalities of opportunity, and an open-hearted readiness to concede to others what we regard the Fatherhood of God as meaning for ourselves.