

possible with the realization that there are no instant solutions to a problem that has been exercising peoples minds for the past 120 years. To raise expectations too high will not do in a time of revolutionary tendencies such as the present, when agitations for real or imagined rights may turn into self-fulfilled wishes before the time is ripe, to the great detriment of orderly government at that.

The Government of the day sees its task according to what it believes to be right and according to its vision of the future. Parallel development provides a foundation and sets a course for posterity. It is for those future generations to decide whether they want to continue on this course or whether they want to make adjustments which may be required in the fullness of time.

Appendix I

STATEMENT BY THE FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL PARTY - 27 MAY 1971

On 27 May 1971 the Federal Council of the National Party met under the Chairmanship of Mr. B. J. Vorster to deal with various matters. Afterwards the following unanimous statement with regard to the Coloureds was released:

"In view of continual misrepresentations and suspicionmongering from hostile quarters about the National Party's policy for the Coloured people, the Federal Council considers it necessary to state once again that the National Party's policy on relations so far as the Coloureds are concerned is based on the principle of parallel development, and that a pattern for the future of the Coloureds is not being sought in a pattern similar to that for the Bantu peoples.

The National Party believes that only on the road of parallel development will the Coloured people be able to maintain, develop and express their own identity as a separate community and thus take their rightful and worthy place in the Republic of South Africa.

The Federal Council of the National Party therefore wholeheartedly endorses the Government's point of view on Coloured policy as expressed in the following statement which was approved by the Cabinet - by the Honourable J. J. Loots, Minister of Coloured Affairs, on 4 December 1970:

- (a) The National Party rejects any policy or lack of policy which may lead to integration, on any basis whatsoever, between Whites and Coloureds, since this can only lead to unnecessary and serious friction between Whites and Coloureds and to the neglect of the Coloured population.
- (b) The National Party regards the idea of a homeland for the Coloureds as unpractical and impracticable because there is no historical Coloured territory available and because the established policy of giving Coloureds townships and rural areas of their own, which are scattered all over the country, can-

not be changed without causing serious disruption and injustice.

The Federal Council furthermore endorses the following practical policies of the Government in respect of the Coloured population:

1. The Coloured Persons Representative Council (C.P.R.C.), consisting of, inter alia, representatives of Coloured electoral divisions over the whole of South Africa, constitutes the legislative authority for all matters pertaining exclusively to the Coloureds which have already been entrusted to it and which may be entrusted to it in the future. In this connection the executive powers with regard to Coloured Affairs are vested in the Council's Executive.

The Representative Council is gradually becoming the umbrella authority over the established Coloured townships and rural areas.

2. Liaison between the White Parliament and the C.P.R.C. will be maintained through meetings between the Prime Minister and the Executive of the C.P.R.C., which will take place at least once a year or, if necessary, more frequently, and will be supplemented by regular consultations between the Executive and the Minister and Deputy Minister of Coloured Affairs, and other Ministers, as requested.

It is accepted that this liaison at the highest level between the White Parliament and the C.P.R.C. may be reviewed from time to time as future circumstances necessitate changes.

3. Local authorities for Coloured townships are being established gradually as circumstances require and will have to maintain liaison with White local authorities as well as with the C.P.R.C.

The whole system of administration, as it is developing, implies frequent and continual liaison between Coloured and White authorities, i.e. the C.P.R.C. and its organs and the local authorities, provincial authorities and the Government of the Republic.

The Federal Council believes that in this way the Coloured people who already have their own urban areas, townships and rural areas - areas where Coloureds can acquire full ownership and where they therefore also feel that they have their roots in South Africa - will be able, under the guidance of the Government and by their own efforts, to realise their full potential in the educational, economic, social and administrative spheres. In this way the Coloureds will develop a community life in the true sense.

4. It is the aim of the National Party that the Coloured population should be helped by the authorities to help themselves to an ever-increasing extent, since history has shown that this is the best way for a community to develop a healthy sense of pride which is so essential for progress and happiness.

5. This approach will help the Coloureds to use their labour more productively without ousting the Whites - a development which could be detrimental to White-Coloured relations. In addition, the principle of adequate remuneration for services according to their value is accepted, with due regard to historical circumstances and the financial means of the country.

6. The National Party therefore believes that only parallel development can guarantee a secure future for the Coloureds.

There is so much to be done to achieve this goal that there is a lifetime's work for all who have sound relations between Whites and Coloureds at heart. Original, practical ideas, on these lines will be a positive contribution towards improved relations as well as towards the natural organic development of the policy of parallel development.

POLITICAL RIGHTS: IN PERSPECTIVE

by N. J. J. Olivier

Historical Perspective

A. Before 1910

Cape Colony

When Representative Government was introduced by the British Government in 1852 (Cape of Good Hope Constitution Ordinance), the male franchise was non-racially qualified (occupation of property of a certain valuation or income).

The qualifications were changed subsequently (to a minor extent regarding the property or income qualifications), the most important addition being an educational one (the ability to write one's name, occupation and address). This addition seems to have been brought in primarily as a result of the inclusion of fairly large numbers of Africans within the Colony.

Any voter could be elected member of parliament and hold office.

When the Union of South Africa came into existence in 1910, the vote was entrenched (sec. 35 and 152 of the S. A. Act: 2/3rds majority required in joint session for legislation denying any person, on the basis of colour, the right to be registered as voter, if such person had the right to be registered as such in 1910). Members of Parliament could, however, only be persons "of European descent", i.e. Whites. This restriction did not apply to M.P.C.'s.

After annexation of the Transkeian territories a system of local and regional government was introduced (district councils, general councils), and a system of edictal legislation (on a territorial basis). In the Ciskeian areas the policy (initiated by Sir George Grey) was largely aimed at detribalizing and "civilizing" the African people.

Natal

With the introduction of Representative Government in Natal in 1856 (Charter of Natal), the franchise was also non-racially qualified (males only, possession of immovable property of a certain value, or occupation of property with a minimum rental).

Must be seen, as far as Africans are concerned against the background of the Shepstone policy of restructuring of tribal units, recognizing the African mode of government and African Law. In 1865 Africans virtually excluded from franchise. (Qualifications required difficult to achieve; application in final instance subject to absolute discretion of Lieutenant-Governor). By 1919 only 4 Africans registered as voters.

In 1883 an alternative income qualification was introduced.

In 1896 legislation was passed making it impossible for Asians to be registered as new voters. Those already registered were allowed to remain on the voters' roll, as long as they had the required qualifications (186 in 1911; none in 1948).

No distinction made between "Whites" and "Coloureds".

Transvaal and Orange Free State

The official policy was based on the principle of "no equality in church or state"; voting rights limited male citizens (burgers), who could only be whites. In the Transvaal legal prohibition of non-whites attending meetings of Volksraad.

Policy was, generally, to leave African tribes alone to govern themselves, with as little interference as possible.

During first British occupation, no change in policy.

After war of 1899 - 1902 - position remained unchanged, also after Transvaal and the Orange River Colony were given self-government (1906 - 1907).

The South Africa Act retained the position in Natal, Transvaal and Orange Free State as it was before 1910.

B. Developments since 1910

- 1930 - Extension of franchise to White women, without qualifications.
- 1931 - Removal of qualifications in the case of all white male voters.
- 1936 - African voters in the Cape Province placed on separate voters roll, entitled to elect 3 M.P.'s (Whites) and 2 M.P.C.'s (Whites) .
African's given right to elect (in indirect fashion) 4 white Senators.
Creation of Natives Representative Council (advisory capacity only) (Act 12/36, passed with 2/3rds majority).
- 1946 - Act No. 28 passed placing restriction on Asian's to acquire property, and providing for limited representation^{en} for Indian voters (qualification) Natal and Transvaal in Parliament (3 elected M.P.'s, 1 elected Senator - and 1 to be nominated); 3 M.P.C.'s in Natal to be elected by Indian voters.
Indian community rejected the Act and it was never implemented. This second part of the Act (dealing with political representation) repealed in 1948 (Act No. 47).
- 1951 - Native Representation Council abolished and initiation of Bantu Authorities system in homelands (Act No. 68).
- 1951 - Introduction of Separate Representation of Voters Act, to place all non-white non-African voters in the Cape Province on a separate roll. Act passed in ordinary way, declared ultra vires by Appeal Court.
- 1952 - High Court of Parliament Act, to invalidate judgment of Appeal Court. Likewise declared ultra vires.
- 1955 - Passing of Senate Act, and Act on Quorum of Appeal Court.
- 1956 - Act No. 9, validating Act No. 46 of 1951. Ruled intra vires by Appeal Court.
No registration of new Coloured voters in Natal allowed.
- Act No. 9 of 1956, removing the entrenchments in Secs. 35 and 152. In terms of this dispensation, Coloured voters in the Cape Province could elect 4 white M.P.'s and 3 white M.P.C.'s.
- 1968 - Act No. 50, removing the above-mentioned representatives from Parliament and the Cape Provincial Council.

In 1943 the first Coloured Advisory Council was instituted, followed by the Union Council on Coloured Affairs in terms of Act No. 46 of 1951. This was replaced by the Coloured Persons Representative Council in terms of Act No. 49 of 1964 as amended by Act Nos. 29/66, 52/68, 101/69 and 87/70.

In the Tvl., O.F.S. and Natal, voting for Local Government bodies (municipalities etc.) was and is, based on the Parliamentary Voter's roll, in other words, non-whites were excluded. In the Cape Province, prior to 1972, there was no legal discrimination on the basis of race or colour on this point. In 1972 the Cape Prov. Council passed an ordinance applying the principle operating the other 3 provinces also on the C.P.

The constitution, functions, powers and limitations of the C.R.C. have been discussed in general terms at this workshop.

By way of summary one can thus say that since 1910 there has been a definite process of deminution of coloured political rights, leading to ~~their~~ total disenfranchisement, on a national and local level during the last few years, and to the exclusion of the Coloureds from the normal, or ordinary, political processes. Instead, in terms of the policy of "separate development" the C.R.C. has been created, and the Governments' attitude seems to be that this Council could provide an adequate avenue and instrument for the expression and realization of the political needs and aspirations of the Coloured people, at least for the foreseeable future. The Government has stated categorically that it is not prepared to predict what the end of the road may be, and has declared itself unwilling to commit itself even to the general principle of eventual full citizenship for the Coloured people. It has expressed itself as indomitably opposed to the representation directly, of the Coloured people in the present Parliament. Machinery has been created for some form of liaison between the Cabinet and the C.R.C., through its Executive Committee and the Government has indicated that, if the need arises, this consultative machinery could be developed or extended, but has not indicated how. On the local level, the policy is that, in the Coloured townships or group areas, the Coloureds should develop their own forms of local government, and that the required liaison machinery between these Coloured councils and the relevant "White" councils be created since

it is self-evident that it will be impossible, in most cases, to duplicate public services. In general terms, the Government prefers to describe its policy as one of "parallel development", about which the following statements are relevant:

"... die beleid van parallelle ontwikkeling (behels) 'n beleid van parallelle bestuursinstellings op verskillende vlakke vir die Kleurlinge, met deurlopende skakeling en konsultasie met Blanke instellings op die verskeie vlakke...".

"Parallelle ontwikkeling behels 'n fondament in 'n koers wat ons vir ons nageslagte bepaal. Dit is vir hierdie nageslagte om te besluit of hulle daardie koers wil behou, en of hulle aanpassings gaan maak wat in die volheid van die tyd noodsaaklik word."

What is immediately obvious, is the, by comparison, absence of any reluctance on the part of the government to spell out its long-term policy as far as the African's are concerned. The last decade has been characterized by a growing desire to develop the Bantu homelands economically and constitutionally, even to the point of possible eventual independence. There may be people who have doubts as to whether the White Government and the White electorate will really go the whole hog, and grant these Homelands political independence (were they to ask for it) when it is fully realized what the full implication of such independence may be. Although I have certain reservation about the form and speed of the constitutional developments in these Homelands, I do not doubt, however, the sincerity of the Government regarding its declared intentions; I have the feeling that doubts expressed on this particular point sometimes emanate from a basic anti-Afrikaner attitude, sometimes motivated by a fear that the Homelands policy may succeed and may have the support of the Homeland African's and sometimes perhaps by outright malice. Anybody who still wishes to refer to people like Mr. Buthelezig, Mr. Matanzima, Mr. Mangophe, Prof. Ntsanwisi as being simply stooges of the White Government should consult a political psychiatrist at the earliest opportunity. The various Acts passed during the past decade, notably the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act, the Transkei Constitution Act, the Bantu Homelands Citizenship Act and the Bantu Homelands Constitution Act provide the framework for such development. I do not wish to be understood that I am entirely sa-

tisfied with the provisions of these various Acts. To my mind the Government will have to adopt far-reaching measures for the constitutional and economic development of the Homelands within the next five years in order to demonstrate its sincerity and to prove that the policy is viable. I am also convinced that the Homelands policy does not provide a satisfactory framework in which we could deal with the problems and aspirations of the permanently urbanized African population; and our refusal to acknowledge, accept, the existence of an urbanized African community is bound to lead to increasing frustration, bitterness and tensions.

as

Be that it may, as far as the Homelands policy itself is concerned, the Government, as I have stated above, has stated quite openly that, if any of these Homelands want to become independent, it will have the right to opt out of the present South African constitutional framework.

In view of the stated objective of Bantu policy, it then becomes quite incomprehensible why there should be reluctance to state, in equally clear terms, what the eventual objective or goal is in the case of the Coloureds. If one accepts that a separate Coloured Homeland is impracticable (and it is obvious that it is not only impracticable, but also devoid of any rational and ethical basis), one is forced to the conclusion that, in principle at least, the Coloured people have far less to look forward to, in terms of political rights, than the Africans. Not only is this unfair and untenable, but it shows up the inherent weakness of the policy of parallel development: the C.R.C. can never become a sovereign independent legislative body; the Coloured people can never opt out of the South African constitutional framework, by the very nature of things, they will forever form, in this sense, an integral, indivisible and inseparable part of this framework. It then stands to reason that the only way in which the Coloureds can really enjoy full citizenship rights would have to be within the broader South African framework, whatever the way may be in which it is to be done. The fundamental question is, of course, how this is to be achieved.

In this respect the dilemma we are faced with can be succinctly stated in the following terms:

- a) The present Government has made it quite clear that it will, under no circumstances, consider re-introducing a system whereby the Coloureds, directly or indirectly, will be represented in Parliament, or, at least, in the elected House of Assembly. One of the basic considerations seems to be that such an arrangement could place in our two-party system, the balance of power in the hands of these representatives of the Coloured people; this could only lead to increasing bitterness and strife.
- b) The present policy, and the political machinery introduced as the alternative to parliamentary representation is unacceptable to a substantial section of the Coloured community and as indicated above, can not be seen as providing a satisfactory basis for Coloured participation in our political processes.

The Government's attitude reflecting the feelings of the National Party and possibly a wider segment of white public opinion, is partly the function of traditional and deeprooted colour prejudice, but also flows from a positive nationalism on the part particularly of the Afrikaner, and from the fear that if the Coloureds were to be given parliamentary representation it is only natural that these representatives would make common cause with the opposition.

The attitude displayed by the opponents, within the Coloured community, to the present machinery (the C.R.C.) and policy is compounded of a deep feeling of bitterness against the Afrikaner Government - a result of the political disenfranchisement of the Coloureds and the application of the policy of "apartheid" in its various forms -, made worse by the feeling that they have been rejected and ejected out of a society of which they have been, and fundamentally are, an indivisible part (historically, biologically, culturally, economically and in every other sense); by an unwillingness to accept the good faith of the Government (and of the Whites generally), an inner conviction that the Whites will only keep these promises as long as it is in the interests of the Whites to do so, by the feeling that, if the C.R.C. is accepted, it would amount to support of the policy of apartheid, it would condone the policy of disenfranchisement and it would lend credibility to an institution that is fundamentally unacceptable. I have the impression that large numbers of the political elite of the Coloured community, for these reasons, have refused

to participate in the election for members of the C.R.C. and refuse obstinately to have anything to do with this institution and its activities and with the Coloured political parties. When in addition one has to consider that there seems to be growing hostility against the Whites, particularly amongst the younger people, the emergence of "brown power" (although at the moment only in rudimentary form), a certain measure of complete indifference to what the Whites may do or may not do plus fears, existing within the Coloured community of what the "apparatus of intimidation and victimization" could achieve - all these factors taken in conjunction present formidable obstacles to the successful utilization of the present machinery by the Coloureds. The absence of a sense of group solidarity and of group consciousness, and the inability of the Coloured parties and factions to present a unified platform and program of action and demands, have as further consequence the under-utilization of the potential inherent in the present arrangement.

Although I can understand the reluctance on the part of many Coloureds to accept and co-operate with the C.R.C., and despite the generally admitted fact - as indicated above - that, in long-term perspective, the policy of parallel development has fundamental defects, it seems to me that under the circumstances the C.R.C. presents the only possible instrument to bring about essential changes in policy and protect and promote the interest of the Coloured people. I wish to state clearly that this point of view does not necessarily entail a rejection of other forms of participation in our political processes. But from the point of view of practical politics it seems to me to be foolish not to use the means that are available at this juncture.

The question then arises: What should be done to make this body as effective an instrument as is possible; and what are some of the things the C.R.C. itself could do in order to bring about constructive change?

The first essential seems to be acceptance of the existence of the C.R.C. and a desire to employ it in the best possible way.

The second essential seems to be the creation of greater degree of unity amongst the various Coloured parties, and a clearer formulation of aspirations and demands. In other words, the C.R.C. should

become an instrument speaking with one voice in the sphere of legitimate Coloured grievances and demands.

In the third place, it seems that progress could be expedited if the Government is taken at its word and the good faith of the Government is accepted. In this report I would like to refer to the following impressive list of positive statements by the hon. Dr. Van der Merwe, adjunct minister of Coloured Affairs, in his paper presented at the workshop:

- a) "... I hope that we shall ... accept one another's motives as a sincere desire to contribute to a better deal for our Coloured population." (p. 221);
- b) with reference to government policy: "... the Government is willing to make adjustments where this is required by changed circumstances in these dynamic times." (p. 221);
- c) "But we shall proceed step by proven step - and leaps in the dark will be avoided. Progress and evolution will be based on practical experience ..." (p. 221);
- d) "That socio-economic improvement is not only the primary need of the Coloured population but also the Government's first and main objective, although not its only one, may be readily accepted" (p. 222);
- e) with reference to the policy of parallelism: "... the only basis for continued friendship as a result of good neighbourliness..." and "... the privileges and opportunities to be granted, in accordance with this policy, to the Coloured population in their own sphere..." (p. 223 + 223/224);
- f) "... the Coloured Persons Representative Council which, although at present only partially elected, is the first step on the road towards a wholly elected body." (p. 224);
- g) The rejection of the idea of a homeland, now and for the future (p. 224);
- h) "... socio-economic development and upliftment of the Coloured group is an inseparable part of the policy of parallel development." (p. 224);
- i) with reference to the relation between socio-economic upliftment in political development: "Government policy, is in fact, to do the one and not leave the other undone - in other words socio-economic advancement as well as political development." This political development should "... follow in the wake of socio-economic upliftment, rather than be in the vanguard." (p. 225).
- j) with reference to the fact that the majority of Council members are elected: "... the Government (has) proved its confidence in the development of the Coloured population." (p. 228);
- k) with reference to the Administration of Coloured Affairs: "... the Administration's entire establishment is based on a structure for Coloured staff, since all posts are eventually to be filled by Coloureds." ... "As more Coloureds are trained, they will be absorbed into the organisation and the White officers will gradually be withdrawn." (p. 232/233 + 233);

- l) See pages 233 + 234 in connection with the purpose and functions of the Administration of Coloured Affairs; p. 234 for the purpose and functions of the Dept. of Coloured Relations; p. 235 in connection with liaison between the Council and the Government;
- m) in connection with the machinery for liaison the Prime Minister is quoted: "Not for one single moment do I want to say - in fact I do not think the members of the Coloured Community can say this conclusively at the moment - that this will be the liaison for all time, because times and circumstances change ... that if and when there was a representative Coloured opinion, I would settle this matter with them. The recommendation that was made by them, was accepted by me just as it was. I believe it will work very satisfactorily in practice. I believe it will work in practice for many years, but as is the case with any agreement, if any of the parties to it feel that the time has arrived for it to be reviewed, they will be free to review it, and then it will be done. I do not have the slightest doubt that over the years it will be reviewed from time to time, until one will have found the ideal formula and a fixed formula" (p. 236);
- n) "The 'mother government' gradually grants rights according to the ability of the developing group to help itself and to accept responsibility." (p. 237);
- o) "... political aspirations and thinking can only operate within the bounds of the possible, taking into account the group set-up, traditional views, prejudices and customs, as well as the acceptability of any policy to predominant numbers of both groups concerned - in this case Whites and Coloureds. We have here one of the crucial requirements for the success of any policy and the first fact of political reality that has to be taken into account." (p. 238);
- p) "... this only applies if the White man acts according to his Christian conscience, also in respect of the welfare of the Non-White groups and even in respect of their aspirations to realise their own identity." (p. 238/239);
- q) "When improvements in the provision for the needs of the Coloureds are sought and pleaded for in the Coloured Persons Representative Council, where there is complete freedom of speech, this takes place in public for all to see and hear, and, if their cause is at all reasonable, it cannot be ignored by the Cabinet Minister in charge of these matters. The needs of the Coloureds cannot escape the attention and conscience of a White Parliament..." (p. 241);
- r) "Basically, it is our first duty as a Government rather to endeavour constantly to reconcile authority with justice towards all groups, and in this process the coercive authority of the State, has a function which may be exercised just as in countries recognised as highly civilised, where the same principles of justice to all are involved, but from another point of departure, namely compulsion to promote integration. We are not in agreement with this as far as South Africa is concerned, but our ultimate aim is no less exalted." (p. 242);
- s) "There are admittedly still many imperfections. Many things are still being done in the name of apartheid or separate development which belie the basically just aims of the policy. In particular, we still have a long way to go in regard to the recognition of human equality. Nor is the situation static and unchangeable as regards liaison and better methods of co-operation

between Whites and Coloureds with a view to even greater fulfilment of Coloured needs, also in the field of politics. Many forms of suspicion and distrust may disappear in the course of time. We shall proceed from one tested and tried step to the next. Meanwhile I should, in the first place, like to ask the Coloured political parties which still remain aloof to abandon their negative attitudes and to be prepared at least to give what has been created for the Coloureds a trial, in a positive way and in consultation with those Coloureds who are disposed to co-operate." (p. 242).

Nobody who wants to be fairminded can doubt the sincerity and the goodwill of the Government as outlined by Dr. Van der Merwe in his paper. A vast area is available for positive action by the C.R.C.

As regards the C.R.C. itself, if one were to accept that the various political parties were to retain their separate identities, it seems that the possibility should be explored of a joint committee, or joint committees, of the parties. Such a joint committee could e.g. consider:

- a) The powers and functions of the C.R.C. itself; in other words, what possible changes could be brought about in the existing legislation and practices to remove some of the curb and limitations.
- b) What new powers and functions should be transferred to the C.R.C. and to the Administration of Coloured Affairs.
- c) The existing machinery for liaison between the C.R.C. and the Government, and also the question of the advisability and practicability of direct liaison between the C.R.C. and Parliament.
- d) The appointment of people in the Administration of Coloured Affairs and the replacement, as expeditiously as possible, by qualified Coloureds or White officials.
- e) To define the fields where policies and practices hurtful to the Coloured people are being applied and implemented and which have nothing to do with the principles of "parallel development", and to consider what steps should be taken to effect change.

In terms of constructive action that the C.R.C. could take, the following amongst others, could also be considered:

- a) To demand that Coloureds be appointed to all statutory and semi-statutory bodies dealing with the Coloured people or Coloured interests, directly or indirectly, and to all Government bodies

or commissions dealing with matters affecting the Coloured community.

- b) To demand the abolition of all forms of discrimination and separation, when such discrimination and separation are not an essential outcome of the policy of separate or parallel development, and simply constitute an affront to human dignity.

It will not be sufficient merely to state the general principle; it is incumbent upon the C.R.C. to indicate concretely what specific actions or practices they find objectionable and unacceptable.

- c) To consider what steps should be taken, in accord with the expressed intentions of the Government, to promote the educational and material interests of the Coloured people.
- d) To protest improper treatment by White officials and Government Departments, if this should occur.
- e) To insist on the implementation of the principle of equal pay for equal work, and on the application of the principle of non-discrimination in employment opportunities and technical training.

Other aspects could undoubtedly be added to this list.

From the above it should be clear that I regard the C.R.C. as the major available instrument of change as far as policy and practice affecting the Coloureds are concerned, in the circumstances of today. From those who refuse to accept this, I would like to hear what alternative machinery is available or would become available in the near future.

I wish to reiterate that I do not see the C.R.C., even when it is developed to the maximum extent possible, as providing an adequate, satisfactory and final answer to the problem of participation by Coloureds in our political processes. But there is a fundamental difference between seeing the C.R.C. as a final solution, on the one hand, and utilizing it effectively as a means of bringing about change, on the other.

I may add that I see a similar role for the Indian Council. It stands to reason that the next logical step in the development of the Council should be to transform the Council into a wholly, or partly, elected body, and to transfer to the Council functions and

powers comparable at least to those enjoyed by the C.R.C. in terms of present legislation. No doubt there will be the same reluctance on the part of some members of the Asian community to accept, and co-operate with, such a Council as it found in the Coloured community vis-a-vis the C.R.C., and mainly for the same reasons. In reply, I can say no more than I have done above concerning the C.R.C.

The African leaders in the Homeland seemed to have been less hesitant to accept the various bodies provided for the constitutional development of the Homelands, and it is already obvious that these institutions are fast developing into relatively effective instruments of power. Whether this development will lead to the eventual political independence of these Homelands only the future will tell; as I have indicated, Government policy at least allows them the (at present theoretical) right to opt out of the existing constitutional framework.

The only body of people who, at the moment, seems not to be properly catered for - even on the level of an advisory body - are the urbanized African. At the moment the official policy is based on the principle that these Africans are citizens of the respective Homelands, and that they have to look to the Homeland governments for the expression of their political aspirations; and also that they are supposed, or presumed to be domiciled in the Homelands. In certain respects the present policy towards the urbanized African bears some resemblance to the policy that was followed towards the Asian community until 1961. Needless to say, I regard our present attitude on this point as unwise and untenable.

In other words, it seems likely to me that the C.R.C. itself could play a major role to secure eventual full citizenship for the Coloured. In what form that full citizenship will be realized in political terms, I do not know; it may be along one of the ways suggested by Prof. Cilliers in his paper. There are, however, also other possibilities. It is e.g. even possible that, on the pattern of the C.R.C., we could have similar bodies for the other "groups" in South Africa, and that these "groups" via these bodies, could then be represented in another institution which for example, could take the place of the present Senate; it could also be a totally new and separate body. This body could perhaps have supervisory

powers concerning matters of common interest and concern to all the groups; whether it will simply have advisory functions - acting on the principle that in order to prevent friction and conflict consensus will have to be achieved -, or could legislate in these spheres of common interest, is a question that will have to be answered at a later stage. In concrete terms this would amount to: The present Parliament (or House of Assembly) becoming the instrument dealing primarily with the separable and definable interests of the Whites; the C.R.C., the Indian Council, and the African Council will deal with the specific and definable interest respectively of the Coloureds, the Asians and the urbanized Africans. If the present - and at the moment completely incorrect - use of the term "Parliament" when referring to the C.R.C. is continued, we would then have a White "Parliament", a Coloured "Parliament", an Asian "Parliament" and an African "Parliament". Matters such as what the ratio of representation of these different "parliaments" may be on the joint body, and what the powers and functions of the joint body may be, will undoubtedly present serious obstacles but should not be insoluble. It is obvious that there could also be other ways in which to achieve full citizenship rights, politically, for all the people domiciled in our country. It seems clear to me that a policy or arrangement to be acceptable will have to reconcile the legitimate fears and aspirations and interests, of each group, with the common interest and welfare of all South Africans. A political policy, for example, that does not give adequate recognition to White interest, nationhood and self-determination has, to my mind, small chance of being accepted in South Africa, and even less chance of operating successfully. By the same token, a policy that disregards the legitimate political interests and aspiration of non-white citizens must inevitably lead to increasing friction and conflict. Sharing of power in the field of common interests and concerns is the only way in which the various "groups" will be able to secure fair and equitable treatment for itself and its members. Although the process may be slow, and sometimes painful, we have no other option but to move towards a situation in which racial or colour discrimination will no longer be present, and in which all South Africans, whatever their racial or cultural background, will be accepted as full and equal citizens.

VOTERS

Year	Whites		Persons	Bantu	Asians	Other and Mixed Races
	Men	Women				
1905	119 906	-	119 906	8 198	504	14 332
1909	121 336	-	121 336	6 637	783	13 611
1921	156 501	-	156 501	14 282	2 429	24 361
1927	173 391	-	173 391	16 481	1 898	24 193
1929	167 184	-	167 184	15 780	1 737	23 881
1931	176 449	176 209	352 658	12 271	1 680	24 698
1933	185 031	184 151	369 182	10 776	1 471	23 534
1935	190 903	191 200	382 103	10 628	1 401	23 392
1937	196 845	199 392	396 237	-	1 462	25 238
1939	203 056	207 949	411 005	-	1 566	28 273
1945	247 387	246 523	439 910	-	1 849	52 285
1948	252 057	262 984	515 041	-	-	47 329

NATAL PROVINCE

1911	29 259	-	29 259	-	186	-
1921	34 041	-	34 041	2	45	389
1927	45 772	-	45 772	3	18	284
1929	42 584	-	42 584	1	16	329
1931	44 976	42 698	87 674	1	15	326
1933	45 596	44 707	90 303	1	13	302
1935	45 802	45 960	91 762	1	10	343
1937	48 727	49 299	98 026	1	8	333
1939	50 672	51 741	102 413	1	4	286
1945	63 832	62 595	126 427	1	2	787
1948	67 629	70 829	138 458	-	-	1 163

Part IV

Black Viewpoint

BLACK IDENTITY IN THE UNITED STATES *)

by C. Eric Lincoln

This paper was not written specifically for this institute on Coloured people. Rather, this paper is about black identity in the United States, a phenomenon I know most intimately through the instrument of participant observations. Having lived all my life in America I think I can be authentic in what I have to say. Enjoying the assurance of free speech, I know I can be candid. And because I am American, and America is my country, it is my right and my duty to be critical, for informal and persistent criticism is the crucible in which the democratic experience must be constantly refined.

There are two cultures in America. One of them is black. The black culture is not the one by which America is known. The black culture is submerged - an underculture. The culture which projects the prevailing image of America is not black. It is white. This prevailing culture, this overculture is what is communicated by "American". Black people are American too, of a sort; but ordinarily, they are not meant when that word is used without a modifier of some kind. To be born in America, and to spend a lifetime engaged in cultural pantomime - acting out the rituals of the overculture - does not necessarily establish American identity nor insure recognition. Hence, there are Americans and other Americans. Those other Americans are deemed to lack some qualification essential to the recognised criteria of inclusion in the group which projects the national image, and which controls the forces which shape and define the common society in which the white overculture and the black underculture exist together. The missing qualification is color - or more accurately, the absence of color. To be American without qualification, you have to be white. People who lack this prime essential are not usually called "Americans" in common parlance. They are called "Negroes" or "coloured people", or by some other designation by which a critical message is intended to be

*) Excerpted from the book "The New Blacks and the Black Estate" to be published by William Morrow and Co. in the Fall of 1972

communicated, that they are other. The burden of the message is that certain schedules of differential treatment are to be applied. The people get the message and act accordingly.

Black people do not call themselves "Negroes". They resent being called "colored". They call themselves "Afro-Americans", or "Black Americans", or simply "Black". They recognize "Negro" as a semantic invention intended to dehumanize them. They see "colored" as the white man's strategy to confuse their identity and set them at odds with each other. As Black people, they appropriate whatever power color may have, reaffirm their pride in their African heritage, and ally themselves with the non-white legions the world over. Malcolm X said: "We are all black; different shades of black!"

A culture is determined by what the people do and how they do it. The what and the how of a given culture are regulated by attitudes and suppositions the people have about themselves, other people and orders of preference called values. An ideal culture would be one in which there was perfect ideological consensus expressed in uniform patterns of behavior. Such a culture does not exist, and if it did, it would be ideal only in a theoretical sense. It would stagnate from the lack of diversity and innovation. The prevailing culture which illustrates America, although it is certainly conversant with the stagnation, does not approach the theoretical ideal of homogeneity.

Such a possibility is negated by the wide spectrum of ethnic diversity which is the salient characteristic of the American commonwealth. America is a systematized conglomerate of minicultures: English, German, Irish, Italian, Greek, Slavic, and so on. It is "systematized", because there is a rational ordering of relationships which regulate behavior and reduce inter-ethnic conflict. It is "conglomerate", because the cultural histories of the several ethnic constituents are frequently of such great diversity and contrast as to make the system logically improbable. That the system does in fact exist as a working social order would seem to discount its improbability, and various kinds of socio-economic theories have been offered in explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon. One such theory is based on the notion that America is a great melting-pot in which ethnic and racial diversity

is melted and fused by the gentle heat of economic pursuit and social mobility. But melting-pot theory has been discredited by history and obviated by experience. The cultural transformations claimed by the melting-pot theorists do not take place, and enclaves of racial and ethnic diversity persist as salient features of American society.

What then is the adhesive by means of which the American social order hangs together - one miniculture improbably attached to another so that the heap functions as a coordinate system? If it is not the racial/ethnic fusion suggested by the melting-pot theory some other explanation is indicated. Weberian sociology suggests that the singular characteristic of the capitalist cultures is a frantic economic activity aimed at the accumulation of wealth which is conceived as a sign of divine favour. If this "protestant ethic" were in fact a sufficient explanation of capitalistic successes (or excesses) - and it is not - it could be argued that religion functioning as a cardinal value is capable subsuming all lesser values (such as those implied in racial/ethnic diversity), and successfully creating a functioning, homogenous social order out of a conglomerate of miniculture.

Melting-pot fusion might then be argued as a logical consequence of the primacy and force of economic values in a society grounded in the presuppositions of the protestant ethic. Obviously, the protestant ethic has produced no such phenomenon - social or religious - in the United States. But the supreme test of homogenizing effect of the protestant ethic must be seen not in America, but in Europe where two "world" wars have been fought among capitalist nations since Max Weber wrote The Protestant Ethic in 1905, and where there has been almost continuous conflict at some level among capitalist societies for the entire century since Adam Smith's definitive statement on the nature of capitalism was spelled out in The Wealth of Nations in 1776. If the protestant ethic has not succeeded in the establishment of a lasting entente cordiale in Europe where capitalist theory and the Calvinist theology on which the Protestant ethic is based, originated, it seems beyond reasonable expectation that the transplantation of the principal European cultures in America would accomplish significantly more under the aegis of that ethic. The isolation of America, and its unique status as a politically virgin territory theoretically free of the implications of European nationalism did provide an ideal

setting for the development of new systems of value and a new kind of social order. But the Europeans who came to America did not come as so many cultural and ethnic tabulae rasa; they brought with them the peculiar ethnocentricities which had illustrated their several cultures for centuries. Whatever new values they did in fact develop as distinctly "American" were superimposed upon a highly diversified sub-stratum of European cultures. The history of the Spanish, the English and the French settlers in America and their internecine warfare does not suggest that any of the various transplanted cultures was prepared to be voluntarily submerged in some other transplanted culture. Surely it was force of arms, or the threat of force by means of which the Anglo-Saxon culture eventually prevailed as the organizing principle - but not a homogenizing principle - of what has come to be called "American". The English-speaking settlers prevailed; the French, Spaniards and Russians were expelled, bought out, or frightened off. With the emergence of the United States as a national state, the Anglo-Saxon culture became the focal center around which all other immigrating mini-cultures were required to arrange and distribute themselves.

The special case of the exclusions of black people raises the question of whether the cultural differences of the European ethnic groups in America were more apparent than real, or whether there were not similarities - commonalities, which in the aggregate, outweighed and disciplined what differences there were. The order of the differences is striking, and important, but in almost every major instance, the ethnic diversity is contained by some larger unity! For example, Englishman, Pole, Italian and German may represent different nationalities - but they are all European! Anglican, Lutheran, Calvinist or Roman Catholic are sectarian expressions of one common religion. Nordics, Slavics, Alpines or Mediterraneans are all white! Only the several languages are not reducible to one universal, and they all have but two separate origins - Romance and Germanic!

The prime participants who shape and project the prevailing American culture then are European, Christian and white. This is a matter of no little significance if one is to understand anything about the cultural background against which American racial history has unwound and must be played out. There is nothing that is accidental, and very little that is incidental to the conflicting interests and relation-

ships which illustrate the cultural bifurcation between blacks and whites in America. There is meaning and consequence in every aspect of their differences.

The characterizing history of developing America is the history of the exploitation of certain non-white peoples for the benefit and the aggrandizement of the white Europeans who settled there. It was not however, in the first instance an exploitation of one race by another, but of one class by another. The settlers exploited and enslaved the Indians, but they also exploited and enslaved the poor and the powerless people of Europe - particularly of England, which in a sense represented fraternal, or at the very least, ethnonomic impressment. When the Indian slaves died off or dispersed themselves into the forests, and when the debtors' prisons and the poor-houses of England were exhausted as sources of involuntary labor; and when the supply of Europeans willing to sell themselves into "indenture" proved insufficient to satisfy the labor needs for a developing continent, black Africa was there, waiting in the purview of the Europeans in America, to supply all their labor needs. Free. Africa had an unlimited supply of human energy, which was readily available, easy to acquire, and easily converted to the turning of wheels, the picking of fibers, the tilling of soil, the nursing of children, the cooking of food, and so on. To the American settlers, the African was really an extraordinary machine: he could think, but his thinking could be controlled. He could be programmed for loyalty; and he was capable of initiative in the white man's interest if he could first be indoctrinated with a system of values which related his rewards and sanction to the protection and the projection of that interest.

It was inevitable that slavery should fasten upon the African with an intensity not experienced by the Indian or the poor European. Unlike the Indian, the African was totally estranged from his homeland, and once in America, he was without political or military organization or recourse. If he escaped, it was from one band of strangers to another. He had no sure way of knowing whether his fate would be improved or worsened. Unlike the European poor, he could be held in slavery for life rather than for a term of years. No government recognized by the settlers protected him. Crucial to the peculiar harshness of his bondage was the fact that he was not European; he

was not Christian; and he was not white. He stood in complete cultural and physical contrast to those who conceived themselves his masters, and they were quick to note that fact and to turn it into ideological and economic capital.

It is but a half step from "black is different from white" to "white is better than black". The European settlers in America made that conceptual transition before the American republic was born, and the implications of that claim constitute the gridwork of a value construct which to this day is central to the prevailing American culture. In short, the notion of racial superiority in general and black subjugation in particular is the essential cultural adhesive by means of which the symptomatized conglomerate of European minicultures hangs together. It is the salient ideological agreement common to all the parties. It is the logical fruit of the common European religion and religious identity vis-avis that of Africa under the peculiar exigencies incident to life in America. A common race, a common religion, a common European origin notwithstanding, the minicultures in America would have remained as fragmented as their parent cultures in Europe in the absence of a unifying ideology. The official ideology is expressed in the enlightenment philosophy embodied in the Declaration of Independence and the American Creed. The working ideology is expressed in what the people do and how they do it. The clue to the difference can be inferred from what was omitted from the final draft of the Declaration of Independence rather than what was included in it.

The notion of racial superiority is expressed as an irreducible "given" in the structuring of American society and the arrangements for the control and reservation of its principal values - economic sufficiency, education, social status and power. Any kind of power. As a "given", the notion of racial superiority may be considered debatable, but it is never considered dispensable. It is the "natural" way for white Americans to think, and the socialization of the American child begins with that assumption. In the prevailing culture, there is no other way to conceive society in America. White over black
WHITE
(black) is considered normative, moral, inevitable and forever - not only for America, but for all truly civilized societies in which these racially diverse groups co-exist. American foreign policy, and

American economic policy, both foreign and domestic leave no room for doubt. White over black is a functional imperative for the maintenance of our kind of society. Racial tribalism is the organizing principle which transcends all differences of language, religion, social status, politics and previous conditions of existence in the Old Country. The most recent white immigrant is immediately cued into the system, and long before he learns the language or the laws he learns that white-over-black is the modus vivendi magnus of life in America.

A hundred years ago Abraham Lincoln described America as being engaged in "a great civil war" to determine whether a nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal" could be expected to endure. We need not further belabor the point that the liberty in which the nation was conceived was racially restricted, and that the proposition to which it was dedicated vacuous in its application to black men. The point to be made presently is that the issues which confront the present generation are fundamentally the same as those confronting Mr. Lincoln's generation, and the test of the nation's ability to resolve and survive them is, if anything, more acute now than then. The American self-image is still one of a nation born of a compelling urge to freedom - dedicated from its inception to the principle of human equality. But that compelling urge has always had a racially selective expression, and the principle of equality has never been honored in the breach. Thomas Jefferson struggled valiantly to enoble the European experiment in America by incorporating in her founding document a commitment to the highest order of humanitarian values. The Declaration of Independence was no less a symbol of the struggle for freedom from British tyranny than it was the symbol of the struggle with the conscience of a nation about to be born. The question was: "In a new world with the unique opportunity to create a new civilization, what kind of civilization do we wish to create?" Our national history is the record of what we said - and of what we did. If the judgments of history were final and absolute, that would have been the end of the matter, sought to enforce the prerogatives they have assumed, have prevented generations of Americans, who were otherwise rational and otherwise humane, from realizing the expressed ideals of the founding fathers, and from enjoying the domestic peace and tranquility to which this civilization might have been entitled

Collection Number: AD1715

SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS (SAIRR), 1892-1974

PUBLISHER:

Collection Funder:- Atlantic Philanthropies Foundation

Publisher:- Historical Papers Research Archive

Location:- Johannesburg

©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the Historical Papers website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

People using these records relating to the archives of Historical Papers, The Library, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, are reminded that such records sometimes contain material which is uncorroborated, inaccurate, distorted or untrue. While these digital records are true facsimiles of paper documents and the information contained herein is obtained from sources believed to be accurate and reliable, Historical Papers, University of the Witwatersrand has not independently verified their content. Consequently, the University is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the website or any related information on third party websites accessible from this website.

This document forms part of the archive of the South African Institute of Race Relations (SAIRR), held at the Historical Papers Research Archive at The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.