

D1
763
B41s

-13

The South African ...

A
A
0
0
1
0
9
2
5
4
3
6



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THE
SOUTH AFRICAN
NATIVE PROBLEM.

— A —

SUGGESTED SOLUTION

BY

FRED. W. BELL.

*(Being a Paper read before the Union Club of South Africa,
and the Native Affairs Society of the Transvaal,
on 14th October, 1909).*

—
(REPRINTED BY REQUEST).

—
PRICE THREEPENCE.

—
PUBLISHED BY THE CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY.

DT
753
D 4 5

NOTE.

This Paper is printed as originally written. When delivered several portions were omitted on account of its length. Reprinted from the "Transvaal Leader."

The Native Question

A Suggested Solution

[BY FRED. W. BELL.]

In a paper on the native franchise, delivered in Johannesburg last December to the Transvaal Native Affairs Society, I remarked that upon some subsequent occasion opportunity might be afforded for contributing a few ideas regarding native representation. The following reflections are offered as a contribution towards the solution of a problem which admittedly will tax to the utmost the resources of the ablest of South African statesmen.

And here I may remark that though upon the former occasion I had the greatest confidence in my position, and no doubt in my own mind, in the light of all available evidence, that the white race was fully justified in withholding its democratic form of franchise from the native, in the present instance I offer the solutions which have suggested themselves with diffidence, and as no plenary declaration and solution. Regarding the two primary principles I enunciate, however, I have no doubts. The above reservations have allusion merely to matter of detail.

It may be advisable before proceeding clearly to define my own attitude towards the black man in this country. After a personal experience of the native in South Africa extending since boyhood, I repudiate unhesitatingly any feeling of hostility to the black race. I have no sympathy with those who disparage the Kafir by stigmatising him as the "lazy nigger." The necessities of the native have not yet made him the slave of work that the white man has become in the Western world owing to the exactions of our individualistic and competitive systems. Nevertheless, almost all South African railway extension from the seventies onwards, the opening of our diamond mines, the rough work on the mines of the Rand, as well as the manual labour at our ports, has practically all been performed by the native. I am not contending that this has necessarily been beneficial to South Africa; I merely relate the fact, and say that the white man in this country should be the last to revile the Kafir for lack of energy. But though appreciative of the Kafir in his natural environment, I am forced to confess that his contact with the

white man in our industrial centres has been by no means wholly beneficial.

Prior to the growth of mining in South Africa the contact of the native with the white man may, as a rule, have had a wholesome and educative effect upon the former. The white man merited and retained the respect of the native, as in those days the master—generally an old-time Colonial, whether a farmer or townsman—understood the Kafir, and knew how he should be treated. But with the expansion of mining and with the large influx of undesirable Europeans, the white man and woman at the point of contact between the races, on the mines and in the towns, not only by failing to understand the native or to earn his respect, but also by lowering the white race in his eyes, have done incalculable harm. This intermingling in large centres has been injurious to both races. The white man becomes generalised until he descends to the level of the native, and the native also becomes degraded. In his own sphere, I regard the native as a national asset. But I regard him as an asset to be nurtured, not to be squandered; as a people to be guided, and neither exploited industrially nor politically for the selfish purposes of the white man; as a people to be helped, to be saved from themselves as well as from those who use them for their own ends, and saved also from professing friends who place them in a false position, and who surely will engender grave trouble in the future, however well intended be their motives.

I would aid the natural development of the native race in every way possible along his own lines, and promote and foster native crafts and industries. But I would urge the necessity of recognising fundamental facts and principles, and ever keeping them in view. The natives may be made great agricultural producers, and thus, without oppression or repression, become large contributors to the general prosperity and to the revenues of the State. As an agriculturist in his own territories, under guidance, he might become a very important factor in the development of the country.

AN APPEAL

Having thus defined my attitude towards the native, I desire in the remarks which follow to endeavour to show the necessity on our part for conscious effort and sacrifice if we would extricate ourselves from the position into which we have gradually drifted. Otherwise we must be content to drop back in the scale of nations to the position of a conglomeration of half-breeds, a bastard child of Nature fallen from our high estate.

Let me appeal to you all as South Africans, now at the birth of the new Commonwealth. However we may disagree on points of detail, or however differently we may regard the native, three aims must be common to all. We desire to further the welfare of South Africa, the welfare of the white race, and the welfare of the natives. Let us all as members of the dominant race further these common aims and consider the dangers which are ahead.

In conversation recently with a prominent Transvaaler well on in years, one bred and born in South Africa, I was met with the retort, "What's the good of worrying? The present policy is sufficient for my time, anyway." Let us imagine a similar line of reasoning in respect to another great national question. Suppose for sake of argument that a member of the House of Commons in England by some possibility knew that his life was limited to five years. Imagine such an individual declining to consider the Estimates concerning naval construction ahead of that period because the present condition of the Navy was "good enough for his time"! Though these cases be not precisely similar, yet in the same manner that individual responsibility rests upon each representative of the people in the British Parliament for the Navy, upon which Great Britain's existence depends, so does individual responsibility devolve upon every one of us in South Africa at the present time. We owe it to the State not only that we ponder well and consider the question, but that we decide upon the course we shall follow, for the future welfare of the country depends upon the policy we adopt.

DEGENERATION OF BOTH RACES.

The present policy of drift must be ended for three cogent reasons. It tends towards the moral degradation of both the white and the black races; it tends towards the industrial extinction of the whites; and, further, in the continuance of our present systems, from a political standpoint, we have not only the possibility of the dominance of the black race over the white, but we raise issues and encourage tendencies, the logical outcome of which, in the far future, must inevitably result in a struggle by force of arms for supremacy between the races.

As regards the moral degeneration of both races through intermingling, the fact is so apparent that little evidence need be adduced in support of the contention. Whether it be in the United States of America or in South Africa the result has

been the same. The commingling of the races has been harmful to both. The white man relying on the labour of the black becomes less self-reliant and resourceful. An object-lesson is afforded on the American Continent by a comparison between the whites in the Southern States and the people of Canada. If we turn to the Southern Hemisphere we might contrast the white population of Australasia with that of South Africa. For energy, enterprise and resourcefulness, there is simply no comparison between the peoples mentioned—and the difference has largely been caused by the presence of the black man. Further, the harmful effects are not confined to the field of physical labour, but manifest themselves in the moral fibre of the people. And not only is the white man degraded, but the same may be said of the Ethiop. If the native could be guided and trained by the best of the white men doubtless the result would be different, but naturally in all social intercourse between the races (excepting the relative positions of master and servant) it is the lowest of the white race who usually contact the black. Thus it is the native becomes acquainted with the worst aspect of our civilisation, and too readily adopts the vices of the higher race, and at the same time, so often, becomes released from the wholesome restraints of tribal rule. Let anyone (whose knowledge extends over the period) compare the morality of the natives living amongst white communities, or even, alas! now very often in their kraals, with that of the natives in their own territories, say, 30 years ago. More than 20 years ago I lived amongst the natives in the interior, and I know of what I speak. Notwithstanding all which may be admitted as harmful, and calling for amendment, in native rule, such as their disregard for human life, or in the lack of certain virtues strangely absent in the Kafir (for instance, feelings of gratitude and mercy), it must be admitted that the form of government amongst the native tribes apparently ordained by Nature, at all events has restrained them in a manner which our systems most signally fail to achieve. And in this connection the evidence from the United States is overwhelming. Putting the coloured people out of the question and taking the full-blooded negro in America, the morality amongst that class is far lower than that of our natives who are living in their natural state and apart from the whites.

INDUSTRIAL EXTINCTION OF WHITES.

Economically and industrially our present course will be none the less fatal to the well-being of both races, and to the State. As in the past, the presence of the native will continue to result in the deterioration of the white man as a worker. We never can succeed in raising a sound and prosperous white community on the basis of black labour. The most thoughtful observers are almost unanimous in their opinion that industrial education is the kind best suited to the native. But let us pause and consider what the result of such education will be if the races be not separated. The tendency will ever be to employ nominally "cheap" labour. And as a result of the employment of cheap native labour, not only will this be at the cost of efficiency, but the white population generally, and the white labourer in particular, will be bound to suffer. The white labourer and tradesman will no more be able to compete with such cheap industrial production, at the hands of black labour, than the white storekeeper to-day can compete with the coolie trader. Thus white emigration will be additionally retarded. And instead of the rising white generation being brought up as apprentices—as they should be—thereby being enabled to become qualified tradesmen, skilled in the handicrafts, the native will still further be encouraged to usurp the heritage of white children. And as the tendency is for "education" (in the commonly accepted meaning of the term), to increase amongst the natives, and for an ever-growing number to be enabled to enter into competition with the white man, we will, in the future, have, as in the United States, native tradesmen, native salesmen, native clerks, native lawyers, native doctors, and what not, all competing with and adversely affecting the interests of the white man, for it is unreasonable, as well as impossible, to adopt a policy which provides the native with the opportunity for qualifying for such occupations and then to deny him the right to follow them. On the other hand, the most ardent friend of the native cannot reasonably object to those qualified in the trades and professions named working and practising amongst their own race, or endeavouring to graft upon their systems that which may suitably be taken from ours and adapted to their own.

NATIONAL DANGER.

When we come to consider the third tendency to which allusion was made, which is a political rather than a social or industrial matter—indeed, a national or racial issue—not only will it be necessary to treat the subject at greater length, but evidence must be sought from other lands. Our natives must be considered (as they are) as part of the negro race. I will not now attempt to discuss whether the negroid races—of which the Bantu is one—are negroes or not. On the evidence of authorities, the fact is demonstrable that such races belong to the negro family. Therefore we have to consider the nature of the black race and take our evidence not alone from South Africa.

And wherever we turn the facts point to one conclusion—the black man (as has been said of money) has ever been a good servant, but a bad master. The attitude of the black man when placed in possession of power—and political power will surely be his if the present policy be pursued—affords striking evidence in support of the contention that he is not possessed of the sense of responsibility necessary for the exercise of authority. And the instinctive antagonism which manifests itself in each race when opposed to the other will become a dangerous factor on the side of the black man, unrestrained by the sense of moral responsibility which only the most advanced races have developed. F. A. Durham, himself a black man, in his book "The Lone Star of Liberia," says:—"The Liberian Constitution confers citizenship on none save those of African descent, and for this policy the Liberians are certainly to be commended and congratulated. If citizenship were to be conferred on the white man, why, Liberia would simply be swamped by the white man. . . . The Liberians will be foolish indeed if they ever confer citizenship on the white man; should they ever do so, they would be simply sharpening a sword for their own heads and planting the seed of a race problem which would threaten the very existence of the Liberian Republic. No man who is not of African descent can be a Liberian citizen."

In Hayti, Mr. Hesketh Pritchard (in his work, "Where Black Rules White") says:—"The foreigner may be said to have practically no rights—he can own no property in land. . . . Government policy is directed towards keeping out the foreigner. The white man under the present Government has no rights the black need respect, save those which can be en-

forced by his diplomatic representative, which means by the brute force of his nation."

Such inherent hostility is not confined to places where the blacks hold sway. Mr. Bart Kennedy, the well-known author, who recently visited America on behalf of the London "Daily Mail," after declaring that the negro question in America was exactly of the same nature as the negro question in South Africa, says that the issue is simply "which race is to dominate," as the two races are too far apart to blend or to unite. "Negroes hate white men," says Mr. Kennedy, "and they have good reason to hate them, and they have as little love for white hypocrites who hold the negroes' country, while at the same time they deplore his wrongs, as they have for the whites who are more honest and frank in the matter. I have worked with negroes cutting sugar-cane in the fields of Louisiana," continues Mr. Kennedy, "and there I came upon first-hand proof of their feeling against white men. There was a sullen, smouldering, terrible resentment that flamed up when chance occurred. And this feeling was directed not only against the Americans of the South—it was directed against all men who were white. That there was strong reason for this is not to the point. The point is only that it exists, and that it is not to be placated by any political device. The negro means to fight when he can. And here in my present visit to America I again note the feeling. It has grown since I was last here. The negro is now becoming openly hostile to the white man."

Mr. Meredith Townsend, writing on "The Negro Problem in America," also shows that the whites and blacks in that country are becoming more antagonistic, and that the differences and dislikes which divide them are greater now than ever.

Similar evidence is not wanting from this country. Mr. J. W. Shepstone, C.M.G., late Secretary for Native Affairs, Natal, and late Judge, Native High Court, in that Colony, writing to "The Times of Natal" in 1907, after showing how hypocritical we have been in the past in our dealings with the natives, says:—"But we must now separate; we must live apart and let each govern themselves in their own way, then may we have peace and contentment, and have only one danger to guard against, and that would be an attack." After pointing out that the refugee natives in Natal, who were supposed to be friendly and loyal to the British, only needed opportunity and a common cause to unite with the natives

in Zululand against the white Colonists, Mr. Shepstone asserts that the "fire of unbridgable racialism" is still smouldering, "and may break out when we least expect it." In a further communication to the paper named, Mr. Shepstone pointed out that no two races could be found with greater dissimilarities than the white and the black races in South Africa, and that the black man in his heart of hearts still objects to and resents the white man's presence. The feeling on the part of the natives, he says, is "too deep to be cured or glossed over by ameliorating legislation." Mr. Shepstone concludes: "My motto has always been 'Adopt the least of two evils,' and the least of these two in this case is to locate the black man on his own land and the white man on his, and let each manage his own affairs. But if the present course be persisted in, the volcano which has already shown signs of activity will not bear the strain much longer, when the question of supremacy must then declare itself."

As indicating that native opinion is not altogether at variance with that expressed by Mr. J. W. Shepstone, I append the following extract from the native newspaper "Izwi Labantu," published in the Eastern Province of the Cape Colony, as reproduced in the "East London Dispatch" of September 11, 1908:—"The Mome Gorge has not settled the Zulu question, nor will bullets or brandy—ha! brandy, the last resort of a despairing policy—be any the more successful, for the full-blooded Kafir woman can breed them (sic) quicker than your anaemic hirelings can shoot them down. Our view, on the contrary, is that the black should be careful that he is not degraded by contact with the white man, and forsooth all history shows that there is more of this than otherwise."

This arrogant spirit of contempt or dislike for the white man by the black, which betrays itself whenever the black man feels he has the upper hand, was typically illustrated recently in the Trans-kei, when Enoch Mamba, a native member of the Transkeian Territories General Council, refused to sit at the same table with one of the white district engineers who was engaged upon surveying work in connection with the operations of the Council, because, forsooth, of the latter's subordinate position as one of "his servants"!

DANGER STILL PRESENT.

It is customary for the apologists for the native franchise at the Cape to point with pride to native affairs within that Colony. It must be conceded that the policy pur-

sued in accordance with the spirit of the Glen Grey Act, and the tendency to let the natives manage their own domestic affairs in their own territories, has in many ways, justified its adoption. This much is to the credit of the Cape, just as the practice of allowing the black man a sham equality and equal voting rights in white centres has proved harmful, and is dangerous; but, speaking, generally and broadly of the Cape Colony, it must be admitted by all, as a matter of historical fact, that the policy of conceding political privileges to the black man is still in its experimental stage, and, further, that it is an experiment which has not yet justified itself by results over a sufficiently long period—either in South Africa or the United States of America—to warrant its adoption or endorsement.

In many respects the native has characteristics of the savage and the child. His nature is such that his savage instincts may be tamed, or he may be trained as a child. Savage animals, too, may be tamed and trained, but their nature cannot be changed. A tiger may be tamed, yet opportunity and the taste of blood may arouse savage instincts which will not be restrained. The "call of the wild" will compel response. And so with the native, if their interests be made antagonistic, when time and opportunity be favourable, the dominance of the white race will be disputed, if not challenged, by the black. And in this connection, as against the smooth words of "sentimental philanthropists" at the Cape, we have the statement of Colonel Sir Aubrey Wools-Sampson, which he supports by irrefutable evidence, that during the recent native troubles in Natal, Kafirs in the Cape Colony were preparing to join with the Zulus against the whites in South Africa. A concerted movement of blacks against whites was afoot.

From the foregoing we see that the native is by no means content with the sham equality which his professed friends have accorded him when living and commingling with the white man in the Cape Colony. On the other hand, in native territories like Bechuanaland, where the black man is developing along his own line, or in the Transkeian and other territories under the operation of the Glen Grey Act, we find far greater contentment and higher morality than we do in the United States of America, or in those places of South Africa where the negro is brought into contact with a civilisation which is so utterly unsuited to his nature.

If the races are not to be kept separate, but are permitted to become opposing factors in political and industrial life, notwith-

standing the immense numerical superiority of the natives, it is not to be expected that the dominant race will give place to the other without protest and a struggle. But what will this mean to the country? Internecine strife; discord and confusion and endless trouble. Is this the heritage we are going to leave our children? To this are we going to foredoom posterity?

THREE POLICIES.

We are now at the parting of the ways. This is our seed time. What policy shall we adopt? It has been said that three courses only are before us—extermination, assimilation, or segregation. I make bold to say that if segregation, or separation, be not adopted, extermination will come about through assimilation, but it will be the white race which will be absorbed! The coloured people are the flux between the conflicting elements. It has frequently been asserted that the native question will not be settled for many generations to come. It may rather be said that if the native and coloured questions be not settled in one generation, at least to the extent of deciding upon and adopting some such policy as here suggested, the white question will be very effectually settled by the black one! If the negro question be alarming, and is considered a serious problem in the United States of America, where the black man is as one to eight, what shall be said of the problem in this country, where the proportion is almost reversed? According to the latest census returns, in the United States the "negro" population is 10 millions, or equal to about one-eighth of the white inhabitants. In Southern Africa, the blacks are six millions, or about six times as numerous as the whites.

SEPARATION INEVITABLE.

Apart from the undesirability of the intermingling of the black and white races, or of allowing to each equal participation in the same political or social systems, we are confronted with the absolute impracticability of such propositions. The attitude now adopted by Mr. W. P. Schreiner and others lands them in the absurd position of regarding the native on the one hand as an equal, entitled to equal rights and privileges politically with the white man, yet on the other as an inferior to whom firearms and the use of liquor should be denied!

Such politicians are illogical in the extreme. If the position adopted by negro apologists be tenable, or if such people be true to their principles, they should insist upon the "rights" of natives to sit as jurymen or hold high positions in the administration of justice. Their principles and professions cannot stand the test of practice. In other words, their ideas are impracticable.

De Tocqueville, who, three-quarters of a century ago, with remarkable foresight predicted the civil war in America and its determining cause, saw the futility of expecting that the black and white races could dwell together, permanently, in unity. The two streams may proceed alongside of each other, but must be kept apart. Writing on "The Situation of the Black Population in the United States and the Dangers with which its Presence Threatens the Whites," about 30 years before the civil war, that talented observer said:—"The most formidable of all the ills which threaten the existence of the Union arises from the presence of a black population upon its territory, and in contemplating the cause of the present embarrassments or the future dangers of the United States, the observer is invariably led to consider this as a primary fact. . . ." The negroes and the whites must be wholly apart or wholly mingle. I have already expressed the conviction which I entertain as to the latter event. I do not imagine that the white and black races will ever live in any country upon an equal footing."

In a footnote to the passage just quoted, De Tocqueville remarks, "This opinion is sanctioned by authorities infinitely weightier than mine"; he then quotes Jefferson as saying:—"Nothing is more clearly written in the Book of Destiny than the emancipation of the blacks; and it is equally certain that the two races will never live in a state of equal freedom under the same government, so insurmountable are the barriers which Nature, habit and opinions have established between them."

If we turn from the opinions uttered in America in the early part of last century to those of the present day, we find the same ideas expressed. In a recent number of the "North American Review," Mr. M. F. Morris (formerly Associate Justice Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia), in the course of an argument, in which he contends that the grant of the franchise to the negro in America was illegal, inasmuch as the Fifteenth Amendment by which it was

conceded, was, in reality, no amendment at all but an addition, which therefore should have been passed by the unanimous consent of the United States, says: "It is useless, it is supremely absurd, to ignore the fact that mankind is divided into five or more great races, fundamentally differing from each other in their manners and customs, in their laws and usages, in their physical and mental characteristics, in their intellectual and moral development; and that they have been accustomed for ages to regard the great problems of human existence from a different standpoint. These races have been developed in different parts of the globe; and it was evidently the intention of the Creator—we may call it a law of Nature if we choose—that, to a certain extent, they should remain separate and distinct and not commingle with each other. No attempt to fuse them has ever been successful. They may, perhaps, be well developed apart; but experience has shown conclusively, that when commingled, the inferior race is not elevated, and the superior race is degraded. This is the law of Nature. It is useless to enquire why it is so. It is worse than useless, it is wicked to seek to array ourselves against it. It may be laid down as axiomatic that no two of the races can co-exist upon the same soil upon terms of equality with each other, either social or political."

ALL FOR SEPARATION.

The Hon. John Temple Graves, a noted Southern journalist, says of the negro problem in the States:—"The race question is more threatening now than it has been in 20 years, the tension is greater and the antagonism deeper. The separation of the races is the logical inevitable and only possible solution of the problem. These two opposite and antagonistic races cannot live together under the same Government and equal laws."

Mr. Stone, in his work, "Studies in the American Race Problem," as indicating that it is not only South that is now averse from negro suffrage, says:—"We have but to follow the situations presented at recurring elections in those northern cities and States in which the negro is an important political factor, and to catch the utterances of men of all shades of opinion, sometimes unguardedly, sometimes deliberately made, to realise the discontent which the negro voter breeds."

Such notable evidence as above recorded cannot be lightly put aside, for

COLOURED AND NATIVE QUESTIONS DISTINCT.

To avoid confusion of thought before an attempt is made to formulate a native policy, the coloured question must be separated from that of the native. Space will not here permit an attempt to outline a policy in detail to be adopted towards the coloured population. Suffice it to say that class legislation is unavoidable, for unless we have equality of peoples how can uniformity of treatment apply? I would prevent the commingling in the way of mixing the blood of "native" and "coloured" races, by as stringent measures as should be taken to prevent the commingling of that of the white and black races. I would encourage a pride of race, or class, amongst the coloured people. At elections, games, and in all social life and functions, I would protect class from class. By such means would the classes not only be kept apart, but the production of new half-breeds would be checked. But as the tendency of evolution is ever upward and onward, and as Nature's evolutionary laws cannot be stayed, I would make provision for the acceptance among whites of those who had "uitgebastrd." This, South Africa has always done, and considering that in this country—particularly at the Cape—our "coloured" population have within their veins in many cases a strain of Asiatic blood, they differ from the negro half-breeds in the United States.

That which we glibly call the "native problem" will never be solved while we confuse like with unlike, or regulate our actions by expediency, and the exigencies of the moment. Only by the recognition of facts and principles can the issue be made clear. On this account, therefore, as a preliminary, it will be necessary to separate the "coloured" from the "native" question, and then to deal with each in a manner consistent with the principles we recognise. We must adopt class legislation, for as Mr. W. P. Schreiner has truly remarked:—"The sooner we recognise that class legislation is necessary the better, for if ever there were a country where it is clear that all men are not equal it is this country."

Here I may be permitted to remark that though I would not exclude all coloured people from the participation of the franchise, I would not, on the other hand, give the privilege to all. Many so-called "coloured people," descendants of Bushmen and Hottentots, though light-coloured in appearance, have even less claim to be excluded from the defini-

America is the one country where the experiment has been tried of regarding the white and black races, politically, as equal. In 1776 we have the United States declaring it to be a "self-evident truth" that "all men are created equal," and in 1909, we have President Taft clearing negro officials out of office. Such are the contrasts we are forced to face when we set ourselves in opposition to Nature.

Professor A. H. Keane, late Vice-President of the Royal Anthropological Institution of England, who has made a personal study of the negro for the last 30 years, refers to Dr. R. W. Shufeldt of Washington, U.S.A., as "the greatest authority in America on the mental capacity and social status of the negro," and in a communication forwarded to me last May, with reference to the unsatisfactory position of affairs regarding the negro in the United States, Dr. Keane declares that he "holds with Dr. Shufeldt that the only ultimate remedy for the growing evil must be 'separation.'"

"The Solution of Segregation" has been thoughtfully and ably set forth by Mr. H. J. Croker, of this town, in a paper published locally, a paper which has not received the attention it deserves, for though certain details alluded to by Mr. Croker may be impracticable, his general principles are sound, and his conclusions are unavoidable in the light of existing facts and circumstances.

One of the most recent utterances in favour of separation is to be found in an article by Mr. Wm. Archer, published in "McClure's Magazine" last July, under the heading of "Black and White in the South." After asserting that only four possibilities are open there in the future, that student of the question sums up in favour of separation. His words are:—"This (segregation) is usually ridiculed as an absolutely Utopian scheme, and at the outset of my investigations I, myself, regarded it in that light. But the more I saw, and read, and thought, the oftener did segregation recur to me as the one possible way of escape from an otherwise intolerable situation." Mr. Archer does not suggest the instant wholesale and violent deportation of blacks; this, of course, he regards as impossible, but "between that and the inert acquiescence in the ubiquity of the negro throughout the Southern States, there are," he says, "many courses," and the one recommended is the eventual concentration in one area, and the formation of a Negro State.

tion of "native" adopted by the South African Native Affairs Commission than the half-caste kafir. And in recommending that concessions be made to the "coloured" people, as apart from the native, it was only "the best therefrom" to whom I recommended that electoral privileges should be given. I believe high standards are desirable with coloured people as with whites. Notwithstanding the democratic tendencies of the age, I confess I do not believe in "the rule of ignorance." It is unwise to delegate powers of government to the least worthy and the most backward.

A SUGGESTED COMPROMISE.

The delegates at the Convention appeared to desire that the general principles and broad issues of the draft Act should be accepted by the various Colonies, rather than that their work should have been jeopardised, and possibly upset, by re-consideration and amendment, although it was recognised that the Northern Colonies were by no means in favour of the compromise arrived at regarding the black vote. In connection with the franchise, I would offer a suggestion which I think is not wholly devoid of merit, and which should prove acceptable to the people of United South Africa. The position may be said to be that the Transvaal and the Orange Free State are hostile even to a coloured franchise, as well as to the black vote. Natal seems willing to show some consideration to colour, though, as a whole, is, I think, also averse to the native vote. The Cape Colony classes native and coloured as politically equal with white, and thereby, I believe, threatens the South Africa of the future with direful consequences. As I feel sure concessions must be made to the "coloured population" (in contradistinction to the black), the suggestion I should make is that a certain proportion of representatives be accorded to the coloured population as a whole throughout South Africa, and that in consideration of this concession on the part of the three Northern Colonies, the Cape should allow the "black vote" to die out with the present holders, on the understanding that the requirements of the native should be met in the manner suggested later.

To preserve the distinction between white and coloured each should be put on a separate electoral roll and should hold their elections on days separate and apart. It is frequently urged that it is impossible to draw a colour line in South Africa. I admit the difficulty, but it is

not an insuperable one. If the definition of "native" put forward by the South African Native Affairs Commission be objected to, the "native" might be broadly taken to be the woolly-haired individual of negro type, and the "coloured" as the non-white straight-haired half-caste.

As evidence of the possibility of overcoming the difficulty regarding the differentiation of colour, the Rev. Chas. Phillips of Johannesburg has given testimony which cannot be gainsaid. That gentleman, who has had an exceptionally large experience in this matter, through his dealings with the coloured classes, declares that in the Transvaal, in practice, the difficulty is overcome in connection with educational affairs and school children. Certain schools are set apart for black children, others for coloured, and others exclusively for white, which distinctions are maintained. Where the races have become blended, of course, difficulties will present themselves, and delicate positions may arise, but, in individual cases apparent or real hardships will have to be endured. Such considerations are small in comparison with the future welfare of the commonwealth.

Evidence of a weighty nature is afforded by the pronouncement of Sir Henry de Villiers, at the Paarl, last March, during a discussion on the draft Act and the interpretation of the term "European descent." Sir Henry said:—"Our census returns show the difference between 'Europeans,' and 'coloured,' and 'native,' and up to the present no difficulty has arisen in the classification, and therefore there is no reason to suppose any difficulty will arise hereafter."

These words carry additional weight by the fact that not only was Sir Henry de Villiers the President of the Union Conference, and of the Legislative Council of the Cape of Good Hope, but was also, in his position as Chief Justice of the Cape, the highest judicial authority in the one Colony where the coloured and native questions have become most complicated.

Having endeavoured in the foregoing, briefly, to review past conditions and then to show that the strongest possible reasons exist for the separation of the black and white races in this country, and, in a manner, having prepared the way for what is to follow, after an interval, in the concluding portion of my paper, I shall attempt to outline what I believe to be a desirable and practicable policy to be adopted and pursued in regard to the native.

THE NATIVE QUESTION.

PRIMARY PRINCIPLES.

We now come to the crux of the whole question, that is what attitude are we going to adopt towards the native? What principles shall we lay down, and what course shall we consistently pursue? As regards our dealings with the black man, I would enunciate two primary principles as the corner-stone to our native policy, and two only.

- (a) That the native is a lower race, and as such should be aided and guided by the white race.
- (b) That in every way possible and practicable the line of cleavage between the white and the black races should be maintained, and that each race should be encouraged to develop separately along its own natural line.

These ideas might be elaborated at great length. However, I will content myself with presenting some thoughts which suggest themselves as consistent with the principles laid down. And though we can neither attempt nor expect immediately to reverse or undo the effects of the past, we may ever improve the position by making all future legislation subservient to the principles adopted. As the native question is at the root of all others, we should consider all questions in relation to a settled, fixed and continuous native policy. A first essential is uniformity of legislation towards all great classes of natives. By this I by no means imply uniformity of treatment to individuals. With different races and tribes, varying conditions, and differing stages of development, uniformity of laws is impossible, but uniform underlying principles can be maintained. Manifestly it is impossible to treat natives who have hardly emerged from savagery in the same manner as others, for instance, living under the operation of the Glen Grey Act, whose work on their allotments might be held up as an example of intelligent industry to many "poor whites."

Naturally, it would be inconsistent with the first principle laid down, i.e., "that the native is a lower race and should be aided and guided by whites," that he should be a participator in the white man's franchise, or mix in his politics, or that he should, unaided, rule himself. Still more would it be inconsistent that he should either aid in governing the higher race, or be permitted eventually to control its politics. That which is de-

signed as "the white man's liquor" should be kept from the native absolutely. Although education, where the natives are willing to pay for it themselves, cannot be withheld, yet it should not be forced upon them. Indeed, excepting industrial education, I am not sure that I would encourage "education" in the generally accepted meaning of the term, and whatever educational enterprise and scholastic work amongst the natives may be carried on should be subsidised and controlled by the State. By such means could pernicious influences be minimised.

Regarding the second principle laid down, I should say it was rather "discouragement of mixing" than forcible separation. "Segregation" is the ideal. However, as people so often conjure bogeys in their mind by the use of a term, I would for the present content myself by discouraging the intermingling of the races, with the ideal separation, socially, industrially, politically and geographically, as the eventual goal. This goal should be kept ever in view, even if impossible of immediate attainment. Obviously the principle of separation and segregation cannot in existing circumstances be uniformly applied. Comparatively recent acquisitions like Bechuanaland and Rhodesia present their own peculiar difficulties. But as evolutionary growth implies adaptation to environment, in the development of Southern Africa we may recognise the operation of natural law without violating general principles. However, the objective must be kept in view, and we must constantly and consistently do whatever is practicable towards its attainment. Though it be impracticable at once to separate black from white, and to sweep back the black mass beyond any fixed boundaries, or to effect the individual withdrawal of the black man from amongst the whites on any specific date, yet by the recognition of the necessity for and the adoption of a set policy, and by the acknowledgment of principles, we may encourage the separation, and thereby ensure that the South Africa of the future may at least remain white in patches. We can start our policy on right lines, so that posterity may be given the opportunity of settling the question. But, unless we are cautious, we may so shackle those who come after us that they will be powerless. We may "shunt" our policy on to wrong lines, so that it will be impossible later to retrace the "points" necessary to enable us to get upon the right track again. And, as in divergent

straight lines the distance multiplies at ever-increasing ratios, so will the difficulties for posterity increase if we deflect from the true course now. De'ay is madly suicidal. The present is the time for decision. Now is the time for action.

THE TRUE SOLUTION.

If I were asked for a solution of the native problem in South Africa in a few words, I would say that it lay in the application and extension of the principle embodied in the Glen Grey Act. It is the "principle" of this Act rather than its details with which we are concerned, which principle is that the natives should live territorially apart from the white man, and, in his own areas, under the guidance of the white man, manage his own local affairs. Mr. Rhodes found himself in conflict with the provisions of the Constitution Ordinance and had to adapt himself to circumstances. Although section 17 of the Parliamentary Voters Registration Act (14 of 1887), supported by Mr. Rhodes, enacted that holders of ground under communal or tribal occupation should not ipso facto be qualified for registration for the Parliamentary franchise, and although the Glen Grey Act (25 of 1894) further declared that all land allocated under its provisions should for purposes of section 17 of Law 14 of 1887 (above alluded to) be considered as held on communal tenure, yet natives otherwise coming within the provisions of the Constitution Ordinance have been permitted to qualify for Parliamentary registration.

Assuming then—as would have been the case under Mr. Rhodes' Glen Grey Act but for natives having been smuggled in to the participation of the white man's franchise through the provisions of the Constitution Ordinance of 1852—that no electoral privileges were accorded to the natives, I would look to the application of the principle and the spirit of the Glen Grey Act (altered in its details and adapted to special circumstances) as the true native policy to be adopted in Southern Africa.

However, contingent upon the good behaviour of the chiefs, the native territories not yet ready for the application of the Glen Grey principle should not be disturbed or forced to come under the provisions of that Act. With reference to paramount native chiefs, it must be admitted (as the sense of moral responsibility I so often allude to cannot yet be conceded as an attribute to the native) that their power is always to a certain extent a source of danger, yet,

with wise chiefs, their influence may be used as a powerful factor for good, and in all cases their exemplary behaviour should be the sole guarantee for their continuance in power. Should the power of a paramount chief be broken—as Cetywayo's was—and his territory be divided—as in the case of Zululand—it is not to say that the minor chiefs who might then be installed in power should not still be permitted to rule, or that such territory should be immediately placed under the operation of the principle of the Glen Grey Act. In such a contingency we should rule, as we so often have successfully ruled native peoples, through their own chiefs and headmen. Regarding the Glen Grey Act an important consideration which should not be lost sight of is that, under its operation, native areas will be able to carry and sustain a far larger population than land occupied in the extravagant manner at present in vogue in territories such as Bechuanaland Protectorate, Basutoland or Swaziland. This is a fact of considerable importance, for, if the white and black people in South Africa are to follow their natural development, separately and apart, provision in the way of land will have to be made for the native by the white man, to allow for the future expansion of the black race.

Separation along the lines I suggest is taken exception to by some who declare it to be impracticable. To this I would reply that what a United South Africa dares and determines it can do. Whatever we dare we may do, and we cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs, nor can we prevent the white inhabitants from being overwhelmed without effort and sacrifice, nor without inconvenience to classes. But small classes must be sacrificed for the welfare of great masses, and the greatest good for the greatest number must prevail. The policy necessary for the good of the Commonwealth must be adopted even though it should be necessary in the process that compensation should be paid at public expense.

SACRIFICE NECESSARY.

It is urged, and not without some show of reason, that if, while accepting the general principle of discouraging the intermingling of whites and blacks, the native be employed in bulk on the mines, individual employment of natives in urban centres as well as on farms must also be permitted. Individual enterprise, it is contended, should have equal advantage with the mining industry regard-

ing the employment of "cheap labour." I will not here enter into the debatable question whether native labour in reality is cheap. But I do say that if white South Africa decides upon the necessity and the adoption of a certain policy regarding the employment generally of black labour in certain areas, legislative enactments (in the same way that the Transvaal Labour Importation Ordinance restricted the employment of Chinese to the mining industry) could regulate the employment of native labour, which might then come and go in bulk to the mines. A united South Africa must determine the policy to be pursued. The country's future and the welfare of posterity are surely considerations of sufficient weight to influence our attitude and action. If at the present juncture we cannot rise to the occasion and make the necessary sacrifices in full, one thing undoubtedly we can do, and that is acknowledge principles, set forth a definite aim, and subordinate all legislation to root principles. We can then stay the evil. Ours is the opportunity to decide whether we leave posterity a possible or a hopeless task. As examples of what I would recommend, I would, by every means possible, encourage the employment of white labour outside the areas set apart for natives. White immigration of a decent sort (not the unrestricted importation of the scum of Europe nor the establishment of matrimonial agencies under the guise of "immigration schemes") should be assisted to aid the solution of our labour difficulties. The employment of labour-saving machinery and all that tended towards the employment of white labour should be encouraged, while on the other hand no artificial aids should be extended towards the employment of native labour in white areas. Indeed, I would make the individual black man in white areas as much a "fish out of water" as the white man would be in black territories. The native should have no *locus standi* in white territories and the inconvenience of his position would act, automatically, as a stimulus to separation. The white man must be protected from the black man, and the black from the white. In opposition blacks and whites are each antagonists, industrially, socially and politically. But separately and apart each may follow his own line of progress without detriment to the other.

As instancing the hopelessness of the position—not in point of fact, but as regards the attitude of our own people—and as indicative of the lack of resolution on the part of the white race,

we find in many quarters a tendency complacently to submit to what is regarded as the inevitable. Such people say that we have already gone so far on wrong lines that the future of the white man in South Africa is beyond redemption: it is easier to say this than to make a stand; they have no inclination to bestir themselves for an ideal: thus many who recognise the dangers which I forecast, nevertheless but faint-heartedly support the idea of the separation of the races. "What is the use?" a friend plaintively pleaded, "you are only staving off the evil." I make bold to say that though in a few hundred years white and black might live peacefully and prosperously apart in the great South Africa of the future, if they intermingle and share the same political privileges and systems—i.e., continue along the lines we are now drifting—less than a hundred years will witness the white man's undoing. The chief difficulty admittedly will lie with ourselves. We are loth to make the necessary sacrifices. We desire result without effort. We glibly talk of "a white man's country," yet we appear content to build our economic structures on the basis of black labour. By no means is it certain that if Draconian laws were promulgated absolutely prohibiting the employment of natives in white areas, lasting good would not result. Although the patient might suffer shock from the operation, perchance a healthier condition might be induced. However, this is too much to hope for. The cure must rather be slow and tedious, but we must insist that the condition be ever improved by right treatment.

NATIVE REPRESENTATION.

By the adoption of the policy recommended the vexed question of native franchise, or "representation" as ordinarily understood, would no longer exist. I have no sympathy with any of the ideas of Houses of Representatives for the natives. Our democratic systems (too often abused and controlled by the few to the detriment of the many even amongst white communities) are not in the slightest degree applicable or suitable to the native. Even if the native had developed the sense of moral responsibility necessary in all cases for the proper exercise of such power as our democratic forms of government afford—which I stoutly maintain he has not done—in the interests of the natives themselves, it may be said our systems are

utterly unsuited to their requirements. Most of the matters in which he is immediately concerned, all his own local affairs, demand more instant attention than our ponderous constitutional machines bestow. The native's needs are rather such as can be met by the operation of local self-government. The Kafir, as an able administrator of natives has observed, is most conservative. He is no preacher of equality. But with his keen appreciative sense of justice, the native respects the exercise of authority and power justly wielded. And all that our democratic rule connotes is as far removed from his own natural form of government as any it is possible to imagine. As Mr. A. R. Colquhoun, late Administrator of Rhodesia, says:—"It must never be forgotten that the subject races, whether in Africa or Asia, have the most deeply-rooted prejudice in favour of paternal rule, and never have evolved a representative, much less a democratic, form of government; and just so far as democracy attains its highest ideal in our eyes, it becomes to them formless and ineffective."

In speaking of representation in connection with the native, let us pause and consider into what classes they resolve. An authority of no mean standing grouped the natives for me under five heads: (a) those living under jurisdiction of paramount chiefs, (b) those living under minor chiefs and headmen, (c) those living on mission stations, (d) those living on farms, and (e) those employed in urban or mining centres. Obviously the above are not arbitrary divisions separate and distinct. Indeed so much do they overlap that I will content myself with classifying the native broadly into two great divisions:—

- (1) Those who are living under the jurisdiction of their chiefs, or headmen, and who are strictly amenable to native laws and customs.
- (2) Those who have become divorced from their natural environment, and who have become permanently attached to the white man and his systems.

Naturally it is the latter class with which it will be most difficult to deal. Comprising the first great group are the majority of those employed upon the mines, and I might also say those engaged in private employ in the towns in the Transvaal, and the greater the number amongst us coming under the first classification the easier becomes our problem. "No man can serve two masters," nor can a native owing allegiance

to his chief and living under the jurisdiction of tribal rule reasonably expect to have representation in the systems of the white man. It is this breaking up of tribal rule, and our enticing the native away from his natural state and environment, that has so enormously increased our difficulties. This it is that has made the problem so perplexing. It is the so-called "civilised" and "educated" native who gives us most concern. By what I believe to be our wrong methods we have created an unnatural product, and at the same time, it must be admitted, a class for which we are the more directly responsible. Such natives cannot with justice be forced back to the environment from which we have drawn them, nor can they be allowed to become part of either our social systems or our body politic. But they must be discouraged from remaining amongst the white men, and encouraged to return to their own kind. And under the scheme I suggest a fruitful field would be afforded for the talent of such natives in the settlements under communal tenure where they would have opportunity of aiding and teaching their own people.

The policy I recommend would provide for the progressive evolution of the native from his raw state, lying under the personal rule of his chief, to the higher development of a community interested in assisting and supporting his own local systems of self-government as in the Transkeian Territories under the working of the Glen Grey Act. In this latter stage the natives would not necessarily be beyond the control of their chiefs or headmen; and their general Councils (which should only be Provincial or Territorial) would in all cases be presided over by a white commissioner or magistrate. Scope would thus be afforded for the development of the native individuality, and as a race, and at the same time he would be saved from that which in the white man's systems is harmful in the extreme. And though the native would in such a scheme be guided and controlled by high-placed and responsible white officials he would nevertheless be afforded opportunity for natural advancement.

NATIVE ADMINISTRATION.

Here a few words concerning officials and native administration may not be out of place. I remember, in Sir Bartle Frere's time, in the 'seventies, Mr. Merriam asserted that "it was cheaper to

have a Kafir war every 10 years than to maintain an efficient frontier defence!" I would alter the phrase and say that it would be cheaper, far, to have the best and most highly paid officials in native administration, than to have a Kafir war, and native unrest an ever-present contingency. I believe that the conflict between the natives and the white man, which so many well-informed students of the native question regard as inevitable, might be avoided by the adoption of a fixed and unalterable native policy along some such lines as above indicated. A thorough understanding could be arrived at between the respective races. The native would see the advantages of the policy of separation, which could be shown to be of benefit to himself as well as to the white man. As the Kafir knows, Nature does not mix up swarms of black and white ants. Different kinds go separately.

CONCERNING "AUTHORITIES."

In considering the native problem it is necessary to regard facts, rather than fancies or unreasonable opinions. But, if assumptions I put forward be true, as I believe they demonstrably are, then other opinions I hold, and recommendations I advocate, follow as a natural consequence. They are of the nature of corollaries. If the native, as a race, be congenitally incapable of the highest development, or of evolving the sense of moral responsibility equal to the Caucasian, the combined opinion of missionaries, even supported by that of officials with life-long experience in native affairs, will not alter the fact. An official may have been an official for so long a period that he may have become incapable of taking an independent view. A man may have knowledge of the natives, as individuals, but may take fundamentally wrong views of the race. And, from a political standpoint, the native must be regarded as a race rather than as an individual. To understand the negro as a people he must be studied in many lands. America, to us, notably affords a fruitful field for study. And not only must the native be regarded as a race, but as one of the several great branches of the human family peopling the globe, and also as one of the factors in the great evolutionary scheme of which mankind forms a part. As a race, I regard the negro as a great big kindergarten class—"a racial child," as Lord Selborne remarked, and science and history show that (as a race) he remains a child. But by no means do I suggest that the child should be neglected.

But to return to the question of officials and administration. Regarding the personnel of the Native Affairs Department, just as it is the truest economy to the State to have men of the highest character and ability as teachers at a remuneration which will attract and retain such a class, so with the native officials similar qualifications, though highly paid for, are the least costly in the end, and should always be insisted upon.

In addition to character and ability, in the general sense of the terms, all those dealing with the native, officially, should be sympathetic towards the race, have an interest in their affairs and welfare, and, without exception, magistrates and native commissioners should be compelled to become acquainted with the language of the people with whom they have to deal. The character of the native is such that personal confidence between officials in daily intercourse with him cannot be established through the medium of a third person. A native will confide in one to whom he can speak personally in his own language, though his mind might appear a blank when questioned through the medium of an interpreter.

FUTURE ADMINISTRATION.

As regards future administration and policy, not only must it be sympathetic in its attitude, honest in its purpose, but continuous in its application, and, necessarily, therefore, above and beyond the influence of the exigencies and immoralities of party politics. If the desirability be admitted of placing the management of railways and ports in the Union Administration in expert hands, how much more is this necessary in the matter of native affairs? Not only is the native question of supreme importance, and not only is the white man's responsibility in this connection so great, but the peace and welfare of South Africa, present and future, hangs upon the issue.

United South Africa must forthwith decide upon a definite policy. And what that policy shall be white South Africa alone must determine. Further, the consideration of native affairs and of the details of the policy to be adopted should be taken in hand and worked out by experts, and should not be subject to the dictates and wiles of ill-informed political partisans, so many of whom are ever ready to use the native as a pawn in party politics. Suggestions have been made regarding the

appointment of a body of three to advise the Governor-General in Council on native affairs, somewhat after the provision made for the management of railways and ports in paragraph 128 of the Act of Union, or for the government of the Territories as provided for within its schedule. But a council of three is not large enough. If such a council were established to-day, comprising those, in recent years, most prominent in South Africa in connection with native affairs. I have no hesitation in saying, if left to these three—their names at once suggest themselves—the policy of *laissez faire* would be perpetuated. A council of that number would prove dangerously small in practice. I would rather suggest the formation of a permanent council for native affairs, whose members should retain office for life. This council would be an advisory body to the Union Parliament in all matters connected with native affairs, and should also be a chamber of revision regarding local legislation affecting natives which might be passed by any of the provincial councils. Such permanent council should be composed of representatives from all the different provinces and territories, together with, say, five non-official members. With reference to the appointment of the representatives of the Provinces or Territories for such a council, although these should be chosen from officials and native commissioners, the best and the most suitable should be chosen irrespective of seniority of service or appointment. The issues are too great to be dependent upon personal considerations or upon the exactions of official practice or routine. I would recommend that the native council should sit contemporaneously with the Union Parliament, and when out of session that the members should be as free from the trammels of office as members of Parliament. Instead of killing initiative and the power of independent thought by official routine, in times of recess the greatest facilities should be afforded members of the Permanent Council for personally visiting native territories and reserves, so that they might continually keep in touch with native affairs and requirements. The problem should be their life-long study. It would be necessary to make provision for special meetings of the Permanent Council in case of necessity or emergency, in the same way that Cabinet Councils may be summoned.

But though such a permanent council composed of experts would be more capable of dealing with native affairs than

any of the Parliaments of the past, yet even they should be bound by certain fixed principles decided upon by the Union Parliament, from which no departure should under any circumstances be possible. The members of the Native Council should be required solemnly to subscribe to these principles in the same way as members of the Legislature swear allegiance to their Sovereign. The appointment of members of the Permanent Native Council should be made under similar conditions to those laid down for the appointment of judges, in paragraph 100 of the South Africa Act, and the principle embodied in section 132 (by which the Board of Railway and Harbour Commissioners should advise the Government) should be recognised and made operative as regards the Permanent Council for Native Affairs.

Instead of having—as provided by the schedule in the South Africa Act—separate small commissions for each of the territories for the purpose of advising the Prime Minister upon all matters relating to the administration of, or legislation for, the Territory (under which system commissions of one territory might cling to principles and advocate political measures diametrically opposed to those recommended by the commission of another territory) I should enact that native rule over Territories, and all other portions of the Union in which natives alone congregate, should be prompted and dictated by one large central body, such as the Permanent Council for Native Affairs above suggested would provide.

THE ALTERNATIVE.

After having propounded in outline what I believe to be a natural, reasonable and practical policy, let us now consider the alternative. Having suggested a scheme which I believe will retard the assimilation in Southern Africa of the yellow fringe by the white race, and which will at least preserve patches of white—for be it remembered, South Africa never was, is not now, and never will in its entirety be a "white man's country"—let us turn to the consideration of what inevitably must ensue if the races do not separate. Let us picture in our imagination what the home of our children will be in the future if we continue in the course we are drifting at present. Let us see to what end existing tendencies are inevitably drawing us.

In the first place, our present policy, or rather I should say our want of policy, will result in an ever-increasing new

coloured population as the consequence of social intercourse between the white and black and the black and the coloured populations. It has been said that the policy I recommend will put a premium on miscegenation. I deny this absolutely. The measures I suggest, by creating and fostering a pride of class, will result in the separation of different classes. The more black and white be separated, obviously, the less they will mix. On the other hand, upon the lines along which we are being resistlessly drawn, at ever-increasing momentum, we are destined to become a mongrel race, growing darker all the while, the lowest stratum of the white race sinking to the level of the native, the natives meanwhile losing their own virtues and becoming affected by the vices of the whites. Thus socially and morally present tendencies are for evil rather than good, and are towards the eventual assimilation of the white race by the black.

Unless the two streams flow separately—like parallel lines which never meet—so surely as a wine-glassful of ink will absorb a tea-spoonful of water, in the distant future the white element will merge into the coloured mass and South Africa will become in reality a black man's country.

BASUTOLAND.

Before concluding, a few words may be said with special allusion to Basutoland. Basutoland as we all know stands unique amongst the native territories. And in considering Basutoland we cannot be blind to its past history, nor to the existing circumstances which have arisen out of that history. It must be admitted that from the white man's point of view Basutoland is too independent, though nominally ruled by the Imperial Government, and the spirit or attitude of the nation is reflected in the individual. Whether or not Basutoland comes into the Union, and whether or not the attitude or action of the chiefs or people in the future be correct, there can be no doubt in the mind of any who approve of the general principles laid down in this paper, that Basutoland must be left intact. I know that an overwhelming majority of the whites in South Africa—till they reflect—would endorse the remark so frequently and so lightly made that "We must break up Basutoland." We must preserve Basutoland, or, as an alternative provide other land for its people. If by any overt act on the part of the chiefs or people of Basutoland, they should merit reprisals, adequate

punishment may be meted out to the delinquents. Chieftains may be deposed, or people penalised, and certainly disarmament insisted upon so soon as the present unfortunate possession of firearms by the Basutos be abused, but we must never attempt to scatter the Basutos amongst the whites in South Africa unless we are prepared to violate our principles. And this we cannot do. We may not say, "Let us do evil that good may come of it." So long as the white man asserts his position as the dominant race, so long do the native territories remain the white man's trust. For responsibility can never be divorced from power.

NATIVE TERRITORIES GENERALLY.

A few words here may not be out of place regarding native territories generally. If in South Africa white patches be preserved, large patches of black must also exist. And, as the natives in South Africa are of different varieties, though generically of one kind, certain tribes must retain certain separate areas. Native territories should be maintained as well as territories for the whites. Indeed it is a pity, to my mind, that Zululand is now being peopled by Europeans, as I likewise consider it regrettable that Swaziland was not preserved intact as a native reserve. This might have been done without injustice to any one, as the fullest compensation could have been awarded to white concession-holders. We must provide for the necessities of our policy. We cannot evade the logic of facts, and unless we are determined to exterminate the black man in South Africa—an unthinkable proposition—provision must be made for his increase. If we look at the position in the cold light of fact it cannot but be admitted that in South Africa the European and the Bantu have each appropriated the land formerly inhabited by the Bushman and Hottentot. Since the first conflict, the European pressing up from the south-west and the black man working down from the north-east, the white man has resistlessly moved forward, occupying or possessing the territory for the time being held by the Kafirs. Different tribes of the Bantu did formerly exactly what the white man did later. Moselikatse—the Rhodes of his own time—appropriated Matabeleland, and Tshaka and other chiefs have done precisely the same thing and occupied the territory of the weaker tribes in the "struggle for existence." In former times the vanquished could sometimes settle in pastures new; thus, in the

past, boundaries and territories were ever changing. But now that Africa has been partitioned and appropriated by the various European Powers, in the manner witnessed during the last century, there is no room for future territorial expansion of the native, nor are discontented tribes able to occupy new tracts of any considerable size. In other words, in the process of the "civilisation" of South Africa, the white man has precluded on the part of the black man the possibility of territorial expansion. In assuming the power which we exercise over the lower race we thus have incurred a responsibility. And now we are faced broadly with the alternative of either allowing the black man to become inextricably mixed up with ourselves or allowing him areas for his own occupation and expansion. Should the black man be allowed to develop apart from the white man—and evidence of the recognition of the desirability of this principle, to a certain extent, may be seen in the schedule of the South Africa Act—it should always be insisted that in the native territories not only should intoxicating liquors be excluded, but, in the interests of the natives themselves, prospecting for minerals or precious stones, and mining, should be strictly prohibited. All that which tends towards the disintegration of native territories should be discouraged. When we find deep thinkers and serious students of the black problem in America strongly advocating the formation of a separate negro State, it is a scathing comment on our unwisdom that we seek to demolish that which it should be our policy to construct.

UNITE ON PRINCIPLES.

A friendly critic has suggested that I have dwelt more on principles, and dealt less with details of construction than I might have done, in what I have alluded to as a "constructive paper." This precisely has been my intention. It is over details that differences and discord arise. The most at present we may hope for is to unite a majority on general principles. It would be for the Permanent Native Council gradually to develop a constructive native policy in detail. While so many hold divergent views, is it not something to become agreed on broad lines? Is it not something—nay a great deal—if after wandering aimlessly and after having been driven hither and thither by force of circumstances, we get on to the right track and pledge ourselves to recognise unalterable prin-

ciples, and boldly set forth with a definite aim in view? If in any way I can aid in bringing about this result, any time or labour or thought given in the effort will not have been in vain.

PRINCIPAL POINTS.

Briefly then to review my points—I recommend that the whites and the blacks should be separated, and that though the coloured population should remain in proximity with the white rather than be forced over to the black mass, yet that we should keep the coloured and white as much apart as possible, and in all cases encourage a pride of race or class. That, having separated the native from the white, we should protect each from the other, and by every possible means aid the development of the black man along his natural lines. That we should recognise our responsibility to the full towards the lower race and that we should guide as well as endeavour to aid his development. That in the administration of native affairs we should enlist the services only of those with the best brains and finest character, willing to undertake such service, and that the natives should be governed through their own chiefs and headmen. That native affairs should be considered and determined by a specially appointed permanent body, independent of political changes or party, yet bound by, and pledged to, definite and fixed principles. By such means, in this land, we might reduce chaos to order, gradually, for no sudden and drastic change will be possible, and a settled, fixed and continuous policy could be inaugurated to the benefit of the separate races and to the country as a whole.

OURS THE FAULT AND OURS THE REMEDY.

A survey of the whole position forces but one conclusion upon us, a conclusion from which there is no escape. A definite policy must be decided upon, and that, without delay. As well might we build an "ocean liner" and send it to sea without rudder or compass, or send an air-ship without steering-gear to contend against the winds of heaven, and expect either to reach a given point, as provide the most perfect administration for the purpose of government of the natives and expect it to achieve success without a definite aim in view. Not only must a definite policy be decided upon, but a policy based upon right principles, for principles vindicate themselves, and so

surely as we violate principles will they revenge themselves upon us. An ultimate goal must be striven for. Obviously black and white must separate or mix. They must have equal rights together or they must not. Distinct races, in divergent circumstances, must be treated differently or as one people. What shall our choice be? Little reflection will be needed to choose aright, but the choice once having been made, sacrifice and resolution will be necessary to carry out the intended policy. In indolence or in selfish mood we may ignore the teachings of prudence and of history; in ignorance

we may break down the barriers of Nature and adopt wrong principles; in sloth we may sacrifice the future for the present; in blindness we may cry peace where there is no peace and shut our eyes to the obvious, but of one thing we may rest assured: "Whatsoever we sow that also shall we reap." Such dicta are as applicable to nations as to communities or individuals. And this is our seed time! What shall we sow? The future shall bear witness. "On your own heads, in your own hands, the sin and the saving lies."



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

6666 JAN 10 1977



AA 001 092 543 6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55



PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
THIS FROM THE SHELF

LOS ANGELES

Univers.

7-7-71

