

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

*"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"*

Vol. 25, No. 8

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

24th April 1959

## EDITORIAL

### WILL KHRUSHCHEV BE RIGHT?

About two years ago the Communist leader Khrushchev confidently predicted that our grandchildren would live under Socialism. If the present centralisation of Government and controls in the non-Communist world continues, Khrushchev may be proved right by events. One of the most disturbing features of our times is the fact that many individuals have lost the very appetite for freedom and personal responsibility. The progressive centralisation of power in all spheres has robbed the individual of his most divine attribute, individual initiative.

We return to this subject at a time when the Communist leaders appear to be prepared to allow more visitors from the non-Communist world to visit Communist countries. There appears to be little doubt that the Communists have observed with keen anticipation the undermining of the sense of individual freedom in the Western world as the State becomes more powerful and exercises more and more influence over all aspects of the individual's life. People, who have been taught to believe since birth that material activities and progress are synonymous terms, can be safely allowed to visit Communist countries to see enormous State-directed projects. They return to the non-Communist world telling all who will listen that, irrespective of what the West thinks of Communism as a political system, it cannot deny its "achievements."

One of the most penetrating observations we have seen on Mikoyan's visit to America, was that there was really nothing very surprising about the Communist leader getting on so well with the representatives of Big Finance and Big Industry; all were used to handling enormous power and basically thought in terms of power and large-scale planning. Irrespective of what terms are used to describe it, power centralised allows a small group of men to exercise control over all other men. And all power, no matter what instrument is used to exercise it, tends to corrupt. Corruption by power may not yet be as rampant or as obvious in the non-Communist world as it is in the Communist world, but it is growing rapidly as the concentration of power develops. There is absolutely no hope of averting the complete destruction of freedom unless the peoples of the non-Communist countries can halt the policies of centralisation and progressively compel

the decentralisation of power. The first necessity for the defeat of the Communist challenge is the defeat of every policy of monopoly in the non-Communist countries.

The principal instrument being used in the non-Communist world to further centralisation and monopoly is the centralised financial system. Most policies of monopoly in the economic sphere can be traced directly and indirectly to the centralised control of the creation and issue of financial credit. The alleged efficiency of large, centralised economic units is as bogus as the alleged efficiency of State projects in the Communist countries. The conclusion is inescapable that the controllers of international finance are, by their persistent support for economic centralism, deliberately pursuing a policy, which must destroy genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership. Their philosophy is, in fact, the same philosophy as that of the Communist. They use different instruments, but seek the same objective: centralised power against which the individual cannot revolt.

The late C. H. Douglas observed that the real threat to Western Civilization was a combination of the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world. All the available evidence proves that the richest men of the world have no real fear of the Communists, but welcome and encourage the activities of these gangsters in their drive for world power. Whether or not it is Mr. Khrushchev's socialism or some other ism will not matter very much from the point of view of the individual. He will have lost control of his own life. Nothing is more important at this crucial time in history than to encourage individuals to realise that if they cannot, or will not defeat all policies of centralism, their grandchildren will most certainly be serfs.

## NEWS SECTION

### **Dr. Soekarno's Dutch New Guinea Brothers:**

When Dr. Subandrio, the Indonesian Foreign Minister, was in Australia, he claimed that the Indonesians had a close affinity with the natives of Dutch New Guinea. In a recent despatch from Holland, *Truth* staff writer, Geoffrey Reading, who has visited Dutch New Guinea seven times, pointed out that Dr. Soekarno and his associates are hailing as their brothers some of the most primitive and savage native peoples in the whole world. Reading reports:

Every woman and female child in the Valley of the Baliem, central Dutch New Guinea, has had one or more of her fingers removed.

Daily the fingers of females, including tots three and four years old, are removed with stone axes as a compulsory and barbaric tribute to the dead. Almost daily thousands of warriors engage in battle.

\* The savages in the swamps of the Casuerine Coast, southern Dutch New Guinea, are cannibals.

\* When an enemy village is raided everyone—men women and children—is slain and the flesh consumed by the victors.

\* West of Merauke in the Flamingo Bay area, a bridegroom is tied to a post while all the men of the village first make love to his bride.

\* These are the indigenous people of Dutch New Guinea.

Christian missionaries state that these native people have no sense of pity and do not mourn. In spite of the obvious truth that it may take hundreds of years to civilize and to prepare these people for self-government as understood in the Western world. United Nations officials are urging that a time limit be set for granting these people "freedom."

Then, of course, they can send a "representative" to the United Nations and thus supply one more pawn for manipulation by the international power-lusters using U.N. as a major instrument for obtaining complete world power!

### **Parliamentary Salaries And Local Government:**

The following letter in the *Melbourne Age* of April 4 has resulted in widespread comment and support:

Sir. —As a municipal councillor and president of my shire, I read with keen interest the reasons advanced by the Richardson committee for the proposals to increase Parliamentary salaries, allowances and pensions substantially.

No reasonable person will object to members of Parliament being paid adequate salaries and allowances to enable them to uphold their responsibilities with dignity and efficiency, but the fact that thousands of members of local government throughout Australia give liberally of their time and energy without thought of any financial remuneration whatever, is surely a striking answer to the argument that men of calibre will not serve in a democracy unless they are offered extravagant financial inducements.

If the idea is fostered that the well being of the representatives of the electors is of greater importance than the well being of the electors, the ideal of service to one's fellows and principals will be undermined and the death of genuine democratic government hastened.

It is surely an appropriate time to direct attention to the fact that in recent years the responsibilities of local government have increased and that councillors find themselves dealing with questions, which come under the general heading of social services. For example, every year, councillors must consider how they can give some relief to pensioners who after years of service to their country in various spheres, including war service, find that there is no Richardson committee to recommend that their pensions be made more liberal. The increasing responsibilities of local government are ably and willingly shouldered by councillors without seeking any financial remuneration.

May I suggest that electors, incensed by the proposed Parliamentary salary increases, should, instead of becoming cynical about their political institutions, consider constructive action to ensure that local government controls the spending of a much greater proportion of the community's credit. The individual would obtain greater value for his money and have far more effective control over the spending of it. No local government would dare attempt what is at present proposed by the Federal Government.

The real answer to highly centralised government and the high financial costs associated with it is greater financial power for local government and the voluntary representation, which goes with it.

ERIC. D. BUTLER  
(President, Shire of Eltham).

## **Report of Address Held Over**

Mr. Eric Butler's recent address to Melbourne supporters, which we were to publish in this issue, has had to be held over until our next issue.

## ANGLICAN SYNOD PASSES RESOLUTION ON SOCIAL LIFE AND THE MORAL LAW

The following resolution, moved by Mr. J. W. Paine, of Casterton, was carried unanimously at the Ballarat Church of England Synod last week: "That this Synod believes that the Church should insist more strongly and authoritatively that all aspects of Social Life be subject to the Moral Law."

Speaking in support of his motion, Mr. Paine said:

In case there should be any doubt concerning the purpose of my motion, I desire to make it clear that I agree that the Christian Church should have nothing whatever to do with party politics, which are primarily contests for power; but if we accept the carefully fostered view of the Communists and other secularists, that the political, economic and financial systems should not be subjected to the Moral Law, upon which the Church is surely the supreme Authority, then how are we to check the growing abuse of material power which is the most disturbing feature of a civilization which many outstanding Christian thinkers have warned is disintegrating? I have no hesitation in stating, My Lord, that this is the most fundamental issue confronting Western Civilization today, and my motion is an humble attempt to draw attention to it and to foster thought and appropriate action.

Unfortunately, so many people have been cut off from the roots of their own history and traditions that they do not appreciate that the Christian Church played a decisive role in the development of all aspects of social life in Western Civilization.

When Caesar in the form of King John was seeking to establish a complete monopoly of power in England, the leading Churchmen of the day, men like the great Stephen Langton did not stand passively aside making the plea that the Church should not concern itself with politics. They insisted that the Moral Law, the basis of traditional individual rights, was a superior law, to which all, including King John, must submit.

Magna Carta was one of the great landmarks of English constitutional development produced by Christian influence. But today our priceless constitutional heritage is being lost. Caesar, in the form of modern governments, progressively creates what a former Lord Chief Justice of England called the New Despotism; constitutional safeguards of individual rights are undermined or swept aside as power is concentrated on all spheres; decentralised, local self-government is replaced by centralised government and a growing army of officials possessing enormous and irresponsible power; and taxation has become an instrument of oppression by which Caesar can forcefully take from the individual that which he has honestly acquired and then dictate the terms under which the individual may obtain a part of

his own money back.

I point out, my Lord, that I know personally of friends in our district who are being compelled to change their true sense of values in order to conform to present economic and financial policies, while many small city business organisations with which I had satisfactory dealings in the past have been swallowed up by policies of amalgamation. Centralisation is destroying both individuality and faith.

While it is true, my Lord, that a number of outstanding spokesmen for our Communion have drawn attention to the fact that every increase in the power of Caesar at the expense of the individual is in fact a further retreat from Christianity, the sad truth is that we are lacking in modern Stephen Langton's who are prepared to use their authority persistently to attack every political, economic or financial policy which violates the Christian conception of a society of free individuals personally responsible for their own lives.

Let me hasten to anticipate any suggestion that I am urging that Churchmen become experts on the techniques of politics and economics. The Church's true role is to pronounce authoritatively on true Christian principles and purpose and to leave it to the appropriate experts to find ways and means of applying the principles. If the Church is not prepared to re-establish itself in the field from which it has been driven, then large numbers of intelligent men and women outside the Church will continue to say that the Church has nothing of value to say concerning the great issues confronting mankind; that it is content to draw attention to comparatively minor individual weaknesses while hardly a whisper is heard concerning the materialistic policies which progressively force the individual to render so much unto Caesar that he has little left with which to serve God.

While not the only manifestation of materialistic philosophy in the world today, Communism is certainly the most challenging to Western Civilization because the dedicated Communist does not merely *believe* he knows the truth about reality; he subordinates his whole life, *his every action*, to furthering his beliefs. The dedicated Communist possesses a dynamic which today is lacking in Christianity. To meet this challenge of materialism the Christian Church must give

a lead by consistently relating its philosophy of freedom and individual responsibility to *specific* issues.

The time at my disposal does not enable me to do more than provide a brief outline of a vast subject, but I would like, my Lord, to give two important examples of issues upon which I believe the Church has failed to condemn serious infringements of the Moral Law and has left the individual comparatively defenceless against attacks upon his rights.

The first issue concerns education, a matter that many Anglicans were pleased to see was forcefully brought forward for discussion at the last Synod of the Melbourne Archdiocese.

The Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. Woods, recently stated in unambiguous language that he wanted to see more Church schools established. I can only express astonishment that all Christians do not see the necessity of more Church schools as a prime necessity for the preservation and extension of Christian values in society. But the truth must be faced that there are some Anglicans who, while paying lip service to freedom, resolutely refuse to support any financial policy, which would enable Christian parents to choose freely the type of education they desire for their children. It is simply a dishonest use of words to say that Christian parents have freedom of choice to send their children to a Church school. Today they are financially penalised if they seek a Church school education. This is not real freedom at all. More Church schools are impossible while parents are not permitted to use their own money freely to obtain for their children the type of education they desire. I am well aware of the many red-herrings used to divert attention from the fundamental principle involved concerning this question, but I ask members of this Synod to face this question as did the majority of the members of the Melbourne Synod.

So deeply rooted is the collectionist and materialistic philosophy today that some may wonder how the proposal to place sodium fluoride in the public water supplies can be related to the theme of my address, but I have no hesitation in submitting that here is another sample of the individual's inviolate rights being attacked while the Church remains silent. If the individual loses control of how his children's minds are to be developed, and what they are to consume, then that is the end of the traditional idea of Christian parenthood. The argument that fluoridation of water supplies reduces tooth decay in children without any affect upon health is, even if true, of little importance compared with the question of freedom of choice and personal responsibility.

Let me hasten to say, my Lord, that I am not

primarily concerned with the technical aspects of this question, although they are very important. But in dealing with the fundamental, the moral aspect, it is necessary for me to point out that the repeated statements concerning the alleged benefits of fluoridation, the claim that scientific and medical opinion all over the world favours fluoridation, and that only "cranks" are opposing it, are all evidence of a deliberate distortion of truth.

Speaking in America several years ago, the present Archbishop of Canterbury made the following serious warning: "In the world today more than ever before, the sense of truth is being distorted by the evils of propaganda and atrophied by moral decay. And freedom, without which truth cannot live, is threatened with extinction by the mounting forces of power groups of mass direction . . . All the conditions favour the spread of untruth and the curtailment of freedom."

The Archbishop of Canterbury's words are most applicable to much of the propaganda concerning: fluoridation. Eminent scientists of world repute, men like our own great authority on nutrition. Sir Stanton Hicks, have strongly opposed fluoridation. Christians should note particularly that Sir Stanton Hicks has drawn attention to the fact that the proposal to subject people to a policy of mass medication is a drastic departure from the traditional medical ethic that every person should be treated individually; that different individuals react differently to the introduction of drugs and poisons into their bodies.

There are large numbers of eminent scientists throughout the world who have had considerable first hand experience in research on fluorides, and who oppose fluoridation on both scientific and medical grounds. I can supply the statements of these scientists to any sufficiently interested in searching for the truth concerning a most important issue.

In concluding this address, I desire to stress my belief that the loss of our most wonderful Christian Heritage—Loyalty to God, Freedom of Choice, Perfect Love, and the Voice of Truth—can only be averted by the Christian Church. Will we be guided in this modern Society towards the subordination of the whole of Social Life to the Moral Law, or will the secular propagandists be successful in having us believe that progress can only be measured in terms of feverish economic activities, much of which robs the individual of true freedom of choice?

There is, my Lord, a point of no return in all things. I feel very strongly that we have almost reached it in the struggle to prevent complete disaster for our Western Civilization. The hour of trial is at hand.

## ARTICLE SECTION

## AN EXPLANATION OF SOUTH AFRICA'S "APARTHEID" POLICY

The following is a condensation of an article by Mr. Wentzel C. du Plessis, Ambassador of South Africa to the United States, in the "U.S. News and World Report" of February 20:

It is not my intention to defend South Africa's policies here but rather to explain them. Why I make this distinction is that, although the question of the relationship between men of different colour is one of universal interest, my country's policies in regard to this issue are exclusively of domestic concern. They are not intended for export; we do not ask others to follow us, although we do ask for their understanding.

My task is a particularly difficult one, not because it is so difficult to explain "apartheid" but because it touches on a problem, which presents itself in all countries in one form or another.

Apartheid, or separatism accompanied by differential development, shows itself in many forms in all societies of the world.

When men have to live together within the confines of a common boundary and they are as different from one another as the peoples of the Union of South Africa, *then* you have to adopt a policy which not only takes cognizance of that difference, in its essence as well as in its varying degrees, but also a policy which will be workable and just toward the weaker as well as the stronger.

And remember in this connection that in South Africa the non-whites are numerically the stronger and the whites the weaker, but in competitive capacity the whites are the stronger and the non-whites are weaker.

So the wise man who is called upon to govern, will *inter alia*, have to consider two things:

- (a) the facts of life as he finds them, and
- (b) the needs engendered by those facts.

If he does not do this, but governs according to his own or maybe somebody else's theories, possibly applicable to and workable in entirely different circumstances, he will be defeated by the very facts he has chosen to disregard.

The tragedy will be that not only will *he* be defeated, but millions whose affairs and lives were in his hands as a sacred trust will go down into disruption and defeat with him.

Within the boundaries of the Union we have living together 14.2 million people who, in their main groupings, are composed as follows:

Whites: 3 million, speaking two languages.

Bantu [native tribes]: 9.5 million, speaking many languages.

Coloureds [mixed white and non-white]: 1.3 million, speaking two languages.

Asians: 400,000 speaking many languages.

It is important that I should now stress two facts, which are basic to the policy I am trying to explain:

1. Both the white and the Bantu people have historically justifiable claims to the country, and
2. By and large, the Bantu are still in possession of the territories in the Union of South Africa, which were theirs at the time when their migratory tide from Central Africa southward, met the advancing northward tide of the white migrants. Similarly, the whites are in possession of the territory, which they, at that time, found largely to be unoccupied. These are the areas hereinafter referred to as white areas and Bantu areas.

It is true that, at the present time, the Bantu areas comprise only about 12.5 percent of the total extent of the country, but this means 60,000 square miles of good agricultural land. Comparatively speaking, the Bantu areas are larger than England and Wales, twice the size of Ireland, four times the area of Denmark and of Holland, five and a half times the area of Belgium.

These are not the only territories occupied by the Bantu in Southern Africa. They also occupy three territories still under British administration; namely, Basutoland—an enclave within our borders—and Swaziland and Bechuanaland—which are on our borders and which together have an area of 295,000 square miles.

In order to achieve the ends of good government in the circumstances I have outlined, we have given form and substance as well as legal sanction to a policy of separate or differential development which itself gradually evolved from all the conditions obtaining in South Africa where so many people who are so different from one another have to live together in peace or, failing this, have to resort to a process of elimination of the weaker by the stronger.

The policy is a discriminatory policy, and I frankly admit that, in the measures flowing forth from the policy, there is discrimination based on colour; but it is not one-sided discrimination in



favour of the white man, as the world is so often asked to believe!

It would therefore be more correct to describe it as differentiation instead of discrimination. This policy of differentiation works both ways, as these few examples will show:

White men are not allowed to purchase and own land in the Bantu areas and, conversely, Bantu may not purchase and own land in the white areas, except where the purchase is approved by the Government exclusively for the purpose of eliminating white islands in Bantu areas or of black islands in white areas.

Many eminent persons say that all land should be made subject to the ordinary forces of economic competition, and we are criticized for not giving the Bantu the right of ownership in white areas.

Should all land be opened up to economic competition, it is not the Bantu who would benefit but the competitively stronger whites, because Bantu lands would be bought up in a comparatively short time.

The Bantu would then have become a landless race of serfs. Where Bantu live in white urban areas they are given extended tenure—up to 30 years—of the houses they build or buy there, but not ownership of land.

As the Bantu develop commercial skills, trading rights in Bantu areas are progressively being reserved to them. New licenses are not issued to white traders in Bantu areas. Conversely, Bantu traders do not receive trading licenses in white residential areas but they do receive full trading rights in Bantu residential areas in white urban territory. Already there are quite a number of prosperous Bantu traders in these areas.

The white man is prohibited by law from having more than one wife but the Bantu system of polygamy is not illegal. The Bantu can have as many wives as he can afford to buy. This may possibly be interpreted by many as discrimination in the white man's favor!

A few thousand highly evolved Bantu enjoy exemption from the law, which prohibits the sale of hard liquor to their fellows. They are, however, allowed to make a wholesome, nutritious beer—mostly from millet—that has a small alcoholic content. This prohibition on the sale of intoxicants naturally lends itself to abuse and unfortunately results in continuous police action, as in the days of prohibition in the United States.

For this we have been and are now being made subject to the severest form of criticism.

We exercise control over the movement of persons from the Bantu to the white urban areas and from the white into the Bantu areas.

If we did not exercise strict control over the movement of Bantu to white urban areas the cities

and towns would simply be flooded by Bantu, the majority of whom would be workless.

Can you imagine what the position then would be in regard to housing, sanitation, health, education and crime? Hunger, disease and death are not respecters of persons and would exact a high price from us, but the highest of all from the Bantu, if we did not have regulatory procedures in regard to the movement of persons. This, surely, must be self-evident.

Conversely, the white population again is not allowed freedom of movement in the Bantu areas. This too is subject to regulation, and permits are required by whites who wish to enter or visit these areas.

These examples will illustrate how this policy of differentiation works in practice, and I now return to the general principles underlying that policy.

I have already pointed out that, on the one hand, our policy is based on the inescapable fact that men, although equal, are not the same—and in South Africa they are *very* different. I added that, on the other hand, it is based on the needs arising from our circumstances.

Let us, therefore, now look at these circumstances a little more closely.

The Union of South Africa is the most highly industrialized state on the continent of Africa. It has a viable and complex economy established by the initiative, know-how and capital of the white man, assisted by the labour of the Bantu.

This partnership of initiative, trained skills, capital and labour still forms the foundation, the support and the structure of our economy today and will continue to do so as far as we can foresee.

It is often said that, without the labour of the Bantu, our economy in many important sectors would stand in grave jeopardy.

This is probably true for the moment, although, with increasing mechanization and with the advent of automation, the labour pattern will undergo important changes, which cannot yet be fully anticipated.

It is equally true, however—and this is not often said by our critics—that the Bantu has little else to sell but his labour, unskilled as it mostly is, and that, if there were no market—a market provided by the white man—he would find himself in dire and distressing circumstances.

The white man is not to blame for this situation, which is due to the historical fact that, in primitive Bantu society, it was not the man who was the labourer but the woman, and that economically they confined themselves to animal husbandry, with a modicum of agricultural development on a purely subsistence basis.

There was no carry-over from one year to another; there was not even the beginning of an attempt at industrial development.

Due to our protectionist policy, which has increasingly safeguarded the Bantu from the scourges of disease and famine, they have greatly increased in number. Where they numbered 4 million in 1910, they are now 9.5 million.

Keeping these millions in comparative well being, has placed a considerable strain on South African resources.

As part of the effort to provide an outlet for Bantu labour and to lead them out of economic isolation and distress while at the same time making their labour fruitful and productive, all South African Governments, to this day, have followed a policy of closing our borders to the importation of unskilled white labour from abroad.

Looking now to economic development in the Bantu's own areas, it is our policy to encourage and to assist them to develop their territories, so that it can be a homeland for them in name as well as in fact.

The Bantu areas have some of the best agricultural land in the Union, and we are teaching the Bantu modern methods of agriculture, animal husbandry and soil conservation.

A comprehensive programme of afforestation and of sugarcane and sisal production is in execution. Increased production is quite clearly reflecting their advance in education.

But this is not enough. There must also be industrialization, a concept that until a short time ago, was utterly strange to them, as was the idea that a man could work and still be a pride unto his women. In order to be healthy and economically sound, this industrialization must be proceeded with gradually, which is not the same as saying that it must be proceeded with slowly.

We know that time is now moving at a much faster rate, and we are keeping pace with it as best we can.

To this end, about 100 industrial villages are being created in the Bantu territories where there were none before.

Here the Bantu industrialist and capitalist, merchant, professional man, craftsman, employer and employee have room to develop their capacities and to enjoy their rights—including political rights—subject to the risks and responsibilities which go with those rights.

This, for a considerable time to come, will have to take place under the professional guidance and supervision of white men, who will withdraw as the skills and capacities of their pupils increase.

In these villages, we are introducing a new concept, namely, individual ownership of land as distinct from tribal ownership. But the Bantu will

be protected in his ownership in that he will only be able to sell his land to a member of his own race, whose rights of ownership and of occupation are also safeguarded.

Are we then moving toward a position of total apartheid or total separation as many people hope and others fear?

An answer to this question requires an answer first to another question and that is: What is meant by the word "total"?

Does it, for instance, mean complete and tightly sealed geographical and also physical separation? This most important question exercises many minds and will take shape and form under the pressure of events.

Let us, therefore, take a closer look at the issue, and let me say at once that here we are also entering the field of political relationships. It is in this field that the charge is made against us that our politics are politics of inequality and therefore unjust and harsh.

On the basis of other human rights no charge can be sustained because our Bantu community have at their disposal educational, social and health services to a greater extent than most non-white communities in Africa, the Middle East and Asia—and I am perfectly well aware that I am talking of the biggest part of the world.

An important part of our educational policy is to teach not only the three R's but also to provide practical education so that the Bantu can find and hold a proper place in developing Africa. To this end, he must be taught to accept and to be able to exercise the responsibilities which are necessary if he wants to remain in balance in this new world. Of these, the main responsibility is that he must ever more be able to govern himself, in other words to exercise political responsibilities.

In the past he has leaned too heavily on the white man; now he must learn to stand on his own feet in a world, which, in many ways, is strange to him. How are we going to do this?

An answer to the question brings into play the sharpest of all divergences. There are those who advocate integrating into white society those Bantu who have reached the necessary stage of development and giving them full rights in all fields in all areas of the country. This will, of course, mean the creation of a mixed society. It will also mean splitting the Bantu by drawing some artificial line of division throughout their whole structure.

In the religious field they are already today split into more than 1,300 sects and are spiritually torn asunder. So, we are asked also to split them politically, educationally, economically and sociologically, thereby depriving the majority, who have not nearly reached the required stage of de-

development, of the assistance and of the leaving services of their more educated compatriots.

Who must lift the ever-increasing Bantu millions? Must the white man continue to do it all by himself?

Would it not be a healthier and happier process if the Bantu tackles the task largely by and for himself?

If the Bantu must do this by and for himself—and, for a long time, with the assistance of the white community—then the developed and educated Bantu must not be divorced from his own society but must turn back into it. A tremendous job and opportunities await him there.

Others say—and they include the Communists—that universal franchise is the answer. Give everybody over a certain age the vote, whether they want it or not, whether they understand the privileges as well as the responsibilities that go with it or not.

To put it plainly and shortly: This would mean an end of order and of good government in South Africa, the end of economic viability, and, at the same time, national suicide for the white community and also for the larger part of the multi-tribal and multilingual Bantu community.

I have yet to learn that suicide is a Christian virtue, and we therefore reject such a policy completely.

In the Bantu areas, Bantu rights are supreme and politically they are being led at a rapid pace toward the greatest measure of self-government permitted by their stage of development. We do not believe—as some who profess to be experts do—that the chieftain system is dead and that the tribal organization has had its day. We may differ in this, but we, in the Union, believe that events will prove us right not only in the Union but also elsewhere.

The old gods of Africa do not die so easily, and to disregard the tribal system as something of the past is to disregard a potent factor in Bantu life. After all, the Bantu has his roots in this system and has been governed by its laws and conventions for thousands of years. We are, therefore, strengthening the system and reconstituting the authority of the chiefs where such authority has tended to become disrupted under the pressure of events.

We are, however, not confining ourselves to this, but, in terms of the Bantu Authorities Act, we proceed from the single tribal authority to the grouped regional authority and from the regional authority to the comprehensive territorial authority.

In the election of these authorities, democratic institutions enter into the picture because, whereas the tribal authority plays a role limited to the tribe only, the regional authority, constituted on an elective basis from the component tribal au-

thorities, exercises authority over a wider region covering the jurisdictional areas of various tribes. This is still further extended in the territorial authority, which is virtually a Bantu parliament or congress, where various regional authorities combine in one authoritative body to exercise jurisdiction over a large area.

Powers of taxation and of civil and criminal jurisdiction are being increasingly extended to these various authorities, so that in this way the Bantu may more and more reach the stage where they can govern themselves in their own areas.

Many people are aware of the negative aspects of apartheid but not so many are aware of its positive aspects. If my approach is criticized because its main emphasis is on the positive aspects, I can only reply that my object has been to furnish information on a sector of our policy, which is not often brought to public attention.

The negative aspects of the policy, which can be summarized by saying that equal rights are not accorded to the Bantu in the white man's area's and are also withheld from the white man in the Bantu areas, are more than balanced by the positive aspects which I now restate briefly:

1. By the act of separation, it reduces the possibility of friction and correspondingly assures harmonious coexistence.

2. It assures to the white man as well as to the Bantu his continued and unhampered existence in a country to which both rightly lay claim and to which both rightly belong.

3. It removes from the white man the threat of ultimate political domination by the numerically superior Bantu and from the Bantu the threat of continued economic domination by the white man.

4. It assures to the Union of South Africa political stability, with economic viability, in so far as these are not disturbed by outside interference such as Communist penetration and subversion.

5. It assures to the Bantu the interest and assistance of the more experienced and competitively stronger white race in his development to maturity and in his adjustment to the stresses of the times.

6. It is based on the recognition of the fundamentally important fact that the Bantu has the right to be himself and that to be himself he has primarily to draw, as indeed he must, upon the sources of his own being for that form and that substance which alone can and will make of him a whole man. Only in this way will he retain his self-respect, and only by retaining his self-respect, will he gain and will he be entitled to hold the respect of others. Along this path we are endeavouring to help him.