

## THE ORIGIN OF APARTHEID IN SOUTH AFRICA

In 1948 apartheid meant "the segregation of the most important ethnic groups and sub-groups in their own areas where every group (would) be enabled to develop into a self-sufficient unit".<sup>1</sup> Despite this definition apartheid has been traced to the religious views of the Afrikaner only. A recent example of this approach is the article of Professor J. Alton Templin in *Church History* of September 1968. He made use of the formulated policies of the Dutch Reformed Church or the Afrikaner Bond. His obviously incomplete historical sources did not prevent his conclusion that in spite of the violent death of Prime Minister Dr H. F. Verwoerd apartheid cannot be changed because his successor, Mr B. J. Vorster, is bound by the Afrikaner's theological ideology about race superiority and an elect nation.

Apartheid cannot be explained in religious terms only. This is obvious from the above definition and the fact that the idea of an elect nation is not a unique Afrikaner conception. Anglo-Saxons believed the same thing. In addition they believed that they were destined by God to rule others. If some Afrikaners of the 19th Century shared these follies with other nations of Western Europe they were simply no exception to the general rule. But an unusual flight of fancy is necessary to reconcile such views with the formulated policies of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Afrikaner Bond, and the above definition which was not taken from the Bible but formulated by anthropologists and politicians and incorporated in the programme of the National Party.

The roots of the policy can be traced to the national divisions of Western Europe, the British Parliamentary system, the constitutional struggle in Canada, the Cape Colony, Natal, and the events that led to the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902. Apartheid might not have attracted so much attention if it had not become involved in the struggle for political supremacy in South Africa or if its implementation had not coincided with America's endeavours to solve her own colour problem and Britain's effort to prevent the dissolution of her multi-racial empire. As a result of these considerations apartheid has been stigmatised as oppressive in order to get support against the ruling Afrikaner National Party.

It must be mentioned at the outset that apartheid originated in English Natal during the 19th Century. It was considerably influenced by Natal's Bantu Administration under Theophilus Shepstone, the views of anthropologists and party politics.

To understand the evolution of apartheid, attention must be given to those policies which the English element initiated in order to remain politically dominant or to govern the Bantu. These policies were afterwards adopted by Afrikaners, and they can be classified as follows:

Krüger, D. W.: *S.A. Parties and Policies*, p. 404.

1. "equal" political rights irrespective of race but subject to certain constitutional safeguards which left political dominance in English hands;
2. total exclusion of coloureds from the franchise;
3. territorial separation of the English districts of the Cape Colony on the Canadian model;
4. federation of certain territories in order to get local self-government for the English element;
5. separate representation for blacks in the Upper or Lower House of Parliament;
6. total social, economic, and political segregation of the races;
7. Ethnic differentiation. (Since 1948 this policy was combined with separate representation and local political institutions for ethnic groups.)

The definition of apartheid contains the word "segregation" which evidently came from the United States of America. Segregation was propagated in South Africa by the English Labour Party from the beginning of this century in order to protect the thousands of white labourers and poor whites against cheap black labour on the mines, the main source of employment outside the agricultural field and the civil service. In the words of one of the intellectual leaders, segregation rested "upon the deep and sure foundations of our diverse needs and our diverse human nature . . . and finally it affords the only possible prospects of the survival of our own race in South Africa".<sup>2</sup> The survival of our own race still occupies the minds of many people in South Africa as can be seen from the legislation with regard to mixed marriages, immorality, job reservation, and the general uncertainty with regard to mixed sports, entertainment and public meetings.

As for ethnic groups and sub-groups, attention must be drawn to Bantu policy in English Natal. The Natal Native Affairs Commission of 1906-7, which investigated a Zulu rebellion of 1906, recommended ethnic differentiation because "equality results not from artificial restraints, but springs from likeness in essentials, and a political system which works admirably when applied to homogeneous equals, results only in chaos when generated into a nostrum and administered universally".<sup>3</sup> This quotation was taken from the book of some unknown political philosopher, perhaps an American. It is nevertheless remarkable, because ever since 1849 Natal recognised the Bantu tribal system, traditions and laws. This was done because British law could not supplant them without causing anarchy and chaos. A few decades later Natal codified Bantu law and for a long time the Natal policy was very successful. Consequently the Pact Government of Hertzog (National Party) and Creswell (S.A. Labour Party) passed the Native Administration Act of 1927 which introduced the Natal policy for the whole of South Africa.

2. *The State*, June, 1909: articles by W. J. Wybergh.

3. Report of the Natal Native Affairs Commission, 1906-7, p. 11.

This was done because the view had gained ground that progress might best be assured by recognising Bantu institutions, laws, and traditions. Earlier attempts in the Cape Colony to replace such institutions by the European system of administration had been unsuccessful. In this manner "apartheid" became a South African policy but in 1927 people spoke of indirect rule. At the outset more attention was given to tribal institutions than to ethnic groups. This wider concept was embodied in the National Party programme in 1948.

In 1946 the word "apartheid" was also used for separate representation which was introduced for Indians who were disfranchised by Natal as far back as 1894-6. Separate representation was introduced for Natal Bantu in 1893. From 1926 the Pact Government tried to introduce it for all South African Bantu. It was at this stage that "liberal" historians such as W. M. Macmillan started their crusade against Hertzog because the Cape Liberals were afraid that they might lose the political support of the coloured voters. It was not until 1936 that the United Party introduced separate representation for the Cape Bantu only. In 1946 this party introduced it for Indians. Separate representation for Coloureds was introduced by the National Party in 1956 after a very bitter struggle with the United Party because it affected the balance of white political parties considerably. Separate representation for Coloureds was raised for the first time in 1932 when the National Party of the Cape Province passed a resolution at a party congress in Stellenbosch. The suggestion came from Dr D. F. Malan, the Cape leader of the party, who did not inform Hertzog, the national leader of the party, in advance. It must be mentioned however, that the more separate representation affected the balance of parties, the greater the outcry became against it.

But where did separate representation originate? It was introduced for Maoris in New Zealand during the 19th Century. From 1874 to 1893 English Natal struggled to introduce it in order to protect the white colonists against the vast majority of Bantu. Natal succeeded in 1893 at a time when Englishmen generally believed that the Anglo-Saxons were destined to rule others. Henceforth the Bantu of Natal were represented separately in the Upper House by nominated white representatives. Although Natal colonists began with the agitation for separate representation, English colonists in the Cape Colony also sporadically toyed with the idea from 1886, but did very little about it for fear of the white Afrikaner majority. However, after the Afrikaner Republics had been crushed by the British in 1899-1902, the S.A. Native Affairs Commission, 1903-5 (an English commission), recommended separate representation in order to avoid the disturbance of the balance of parties in the constituencies. Englishmen then believed that they were in the majority in South Africa. This is evident from the draft redistribution bill which was brought before the Cape Parliament after the Jameson Raid and the agitation for the franchise in the Transvaal. Black support could be dispensed with and there was until then no demonstrations for "equal" political rights by the English Churches. It became a

“religious issue” in 1908-9, at a time when against all expectations the Cape, Transvaal, and the Free State were again governed by Afrikaner political parties. The successes of the war were apparently destroyed on the political platform, hence the religious crusade in the Cape Colony.

With these English policies as a guide, one can look back at the evolution of the Afrikaner's race attitude. From the coming of Jan van Riebeeck in 1652 to the Cape of Good Hope, there was equality of black and white Christians in the Dutch Reformed Church<sup>4</sup> and in the Cape schools. Missionary work was done in the congregations and not separately as was the case with missionary societies from Europe. A slight modification of church policy was introduced by the Cape Synod of 1857 because of a threatened schism in the Church in the “English” district of Albany (Eastern Cape) and in the Transvaal. The principle of indigenous churches or the so-called “daughter churches” was not adopted until 1881, at a time when the Dutch Reformed Church took over most of the institutions of the missionary societies.

Secession from the Cape Synod was strongly propagated in the Transvaal by the Rev. Mr D. van der Hoff who had come from the Netherlands in November 1852. Amongst his reasons for secession he mentioned equality of coloured and white in the Cape Church. This agitation started during the Cape constitutional struggle of 1850-54. It was during this struggle that the English element, more particularly on the eastern frontier, agitated against franchise rights for coloureds who had supported Afrikaners during the first election of May 1850.

The upheaval which followed the election of 1850 in the Cape Colony was caused by the lack of proper constitutional safeguards. English officials who had drafted the 1848 constitution placed political supremacy in the hands of the English minority by means of the same devices which had been used in French Canada. There the British used the vote of the governor, the nominated Executive Council and the nominated Legislative Council to curb French political aspirations in the elective Legislative Assembly. The French rebellion of 1837 was directed against these safeguards. The French demanded an elective Legislative Council in order to overcome their subservience to the English in that Council. The English minority and the British government were not prepared to grant this request. In order to swamp the French and destroy their political position, Lord Durham rejected an elective Upper House. Instead he proposed the unification of Upper and Lower Canada. The English element would then be in the majority and swamp the French in both Houses. Durham's proposals were embodied in the Canadian constitution of 1840 which served as a model for the draft Cape constitution of 1848.

Although the French did not get an elective Upper House, Britain granted it to the Cape Colony in 1850 because one of the judges had recommended it on account of the unpopularity of the existing nominated

4. Kriel, C. J.: *Die Geskiedenis van die N.G. Sendingkerk in Suid-Afrika*, pp. 54-59.

Legislative Council which was introduced in 1834. This British decision unleashed a constitutional struggle which changed the Gape of Good Hope into a veritable Cape of Storms. Englishmen were face to face with the problems of a heterogeneous population and representative government. Lord Stanley, Secretary of State for the Colonies, had warned them in 1842 against the dangers of representatives government "because it had been found to be a task of almost insuperable difficulty to reconcile the principle of free institutions with the legal equality between different races. At the Cape of Good Hope, more than in almost any other possessions of the British Crown, the elements of society were more heterogeneous and dissimilar and in addition these elements were separated from each other by distinctions almost indelible".<sup>5</sup> Consequently the English colonists were not to submit meekly to an elective Upper House.

According to the Letters Patent the draft constitution was to be completed by the existing Legislative Council. It was very difficult for the Governor, Sir Harry Smith, to carry out this instruction because the anti-convict agitation of 1849 had estranged the Afrikaners. The latter were also estranged by the annexation of Voortrekker territory in 1848 and the shooting of the young Voortrekker, Thomas Dreyer, in order to intimidate the Voortrekkers who had lost the Battle of Boomplaats in 1848 against Sir Harry. The latter could therefore not persuade any influential Afrikaners to fill the five vacancies which had occurred on the Council during the anti-convict agitation. To get Afrikaner support he requested the municipal and road board voters to nominate five candidates for appointment on the Council. Afrikaner leaders agreed to this procedure on condition that the five who received the majority of votes would be appointed. The Governor ignored this because the English Settlers were hopelessly outvoted on account of the support Afrikaners received from the coloureds, more particularly the Kat River Hottentots in the district of Albany. They voted en masse for Andries Stockenström, the bitter enemy of the Governor and his annexation policy. The Settler candidate, Robert Godlonton, editor of the *Graham's Town Journal*, appeared eleventh on the list of elected candidates. The election results showed that the political position of the Settlers would be seriously affected by the two elective Houses of Parliament.

In spite of the election results and in the face of Afrikaner opposition, the Governor created a majority of seven against four on the Council. The seven included the five English speaking official members and two English colonists. He hoped to introduce new safeguards in order to regain political supremacy for the Settlers. When the Council met, William Porter, the Attorney-General who had drafted the constitution of 1848, set about creating new safeguards. He thought the ex-slaves would support the Settlers against the Afrikaners. Therefore he lowered the voter's qualifications from R100 to R50 fixed property, but tactfully gave as his main reason a desire to exclude vagrants only. The Afrikaner

5. G.H. 1/29 no. 62: Lord Stanley to the Cape Governor, 15.4.1842.

representatives, including Andries Stockenström, who had proposed Ordinance no. 50 of 1828, were not against legal or political equality of coloureds and whites. They had always wanted a law against vagrancy and therefore supported Porter's amendment unanimously. Thereafter many other safeguards were introduced, viz. the division of the Colony between east and west, the allocation of members to those areas irrespective of the number of voters in each, the cumulative vote for the Legislative Council and for Cape Town for the sake of the English element there, and a R4,000 unencumbered fixed property qualification for members of the Legislative Council. By means of this high qualification Porter hoped to regain that House for the Settlers. This last safeguard caused trouble straightaway. The four Afrikaner representatives resisted it to the uttermost but every motion was defeated by four votes against seven. Consequently they resigned, drew up their own constitution and received the support of the Afrikaner colonists and the coloureds by way of petitions.

Robert Godlonton who had been appointed in spite of Afrikaner protest and who had always been distrustful of the coloureds and the London Missionary Society, immediately realised that the low franchise qualification was a mistake. Consequently he encouraged the Settlers to petition against it.<sup>6</sup> At this stage the dissensions were aggravated by the outbreak of the Eighth Frontier War in December 1850 and the rebellion of the Kat River Hottentots in 1851. The Settlers made use of these events to persuade Britain to change the constitution of the elective Upper House, raise the franchise qualifications or disfranchise the coloured population altogether.

These requests were not the only causes of embitterment. Political opportunists usually try to gain their ends by fishing in troubled waters. In order to get a nominated Upper House, or to delay the introduction of representative government, or to defeat the constitution altogether, John Montagu, the Colonial Secretary, industriously spread reports among the blacks that the whites intended restoring them to slavery. At the same time he tried to create a panic among the whites by a rumour that the blacks were concocting an insurrection to massacre them all.<sup>7</sup> These falsehoods infuriated the Afrikaners, especially because Stockenström was made the scapegoat for this so-called war of races.

While this struggle was going on in the Cape Colony, Major Warden, the British Resident in the Orange River Sovereignty, was defeated by the Basutos. Towards the end of February, 1852 the greatest shock came when the *Birkenhead* and its load of soldiers, guns, ammunition, and horses for the frontier were wrecked on the shark infested Cape coast. The red blood of the horses and soldiers who were torn to pieces by the sharks, caused a general panich in English ranks. Consequently the Settlers viewed everyone who was not white with suspicion.<sup>8</sup> They

6. *Graham's Town Journal*, 16.11.1850 and 7.12.1850.

7. *Observer*, 2.12.1851: Stockenström to Lord Russell.

8. *Ibid.*, 24.6.1851.

reminded Britain that "the diversity of race, the extensive influence of the Dutch colonists, and the exercise of a common language by the Dutch, Malay, and Hottentot communities, was a further fact, the consideration of which, with the evil of the low franchise, placed at once this large majority in the ascendancy, to the imminent peril and jeopardy of the rights and privileges of the English colonists".<sup>9</sup>

These considerations and events, caused a split in the ranks of the English colonists. The majority considered it dangerous to rely on the support of coloureds against Afrikaners. Porter tried to heal the breach but failed. Henceforth his followers, the so-called Cape Liberals, formed an independent section of English political opinion in South Africa. The "conservative" views of the majority of Settlers finally culminated in the election manifesto of their leader, Robert Godlonton. He viewed "the universal suffrage in a colony like this as a reckless and dangerous experiment, involving a great wrong to the European inhabitants, jeopardising property, and fraught with future mischief".<sup>10</sup> As a result of the struggle for supremacy there emerged two English "parties" which have influenced political divisions until this very day.

Although the conservative Settlers did not succeed in excluding the coloureds from the Cape franchise, their influence spread to the Voortrekker Republics and Natal. It must be mentioned that the Piet Retief manifesto of 1837 is merely a repetition of complaints of Settlers which appeared in the *Graham's Town Journal* from January 1835 and in the book of Robert Godlonton of 1835: *The Irruption of the Kaffir Hordes*. These Settler grievances were published in order to justify the annexation of Bantu territory by Governor Sir Benjamin D'Urban and to persuade Britain to agree to the annexation. In this manner they influenced the Great Trek. By a strange coincidence of events the Settlers influenced the Voortrekkers for a second time during the constitutional upheaval of 1850-54. This is evident from the constitutional development in the Republics. Voortrekker constitutions up to 1853 clearly show that the Voortrekkers had not properly considered the position of blacks in their midst. The first so-called constitution which mentioned a coloured person was the Thirty-three Articles of 1844. It prevented Bastards, with whom whites had been in conflict during the preceding years in the southern Free State, from attending meetings or acting as judges. Otherwise no clause specifically excluded blacks from the franchise, or restricted it to whites only. Even the constitution that was drawn up at Lydenburg (Eastern Transvaal) in 1853, i.e. after the Cape struggle had entered its third year, showed that the methods used by the Settlers to "check the numerical preponderance" of other races had not been brought home to the Transvalers by 1853.

The first decided change in the approach to the non-whites came in 1854 when the Free State, with a fairly large English population, became

9. P.P. Vol. VII (Cape Archives) No. 16 of 25.4.1852.

10. *Graham's Town Journal*, 17.9.1853.

independent. The Free State constitution was drafted by J. Groenendaal, A. Coqui, and J. M. Orpen, who were not Voortrekkers but members of the "English party" in the Free State.<sup>11</sup> This English element had been in close contact with the Settlers of the Cape Colony and their views were expressed by the *Friend of the Sovereignty* which was owned by Robert Godlonton. J. M. Orpen was fully aware of the struggle in the Cape Colony because he did military service there and his parents lived at Colesberg. Orpen, who lived until the 1920's, claimed that he had proposed "a considerable portion of the clauses of the constitution" and that he had drawn up the Commando Law. According to Orpen this law gave the franchise to "all male white inhabitants who had reached the age of military service. That list of burghers then formed at any moment the electoral roll".<sup>12</sup> Orpen's statement is fully in agreement with clause I and II of the Free State constitution.

The fact that he used the word *white* is interesting, because the Cape Settlers continually demanded protection for whites against coloureds. When Major Warden could not get troops from the Cape Colony, he appealed to the Dutch burghers of the Sovereignty to help him against "the common enemy of the white man".<sup>13</sup> According to Watermeyer, editor of the *Cape of Good Hope Observer*, the Settlers "viewed all who were not white with suspicion . . ." <sup>14</sup> Warden also "hoped the year 1851 would decide the mastery between the white and the coloured race, both here and in the colony".<sup>15</sup>

The influence of the Settlers on the Free State constitution is unmistakable. No mention was made in the constitution of the position of coloureds in the Dutch Reformed Church. In explanation it must be stated that no religious issues were at stake in the Free State. The Dutch Reformed Church in this territory retained its relations with the Cape Synod and recognised the Church laws of the Cape in spite of the policy of equality of black and white Christians. Voortrekker Sarel Celliers lived in the Free State and attended the meetings of the Synod.

After the matter had been settled in the Free State, the Transvaalers appointed a commission at Pienaars River in September 1855 to draw up a new constitution. Van der Hoff was present at the meeting. It was this commission that excluded the non-whites in the Transvaal. But to understand their recommendation attention must be given to the church schism in the Transvaal which gave birth to the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk. From August 1854 the Lydenburg congregation no longer recognised Van der Hoff as their minister of religion and blamed him for having encouraged severance of relations with the Cape Synod.<sup>16</sup> H. T. Bührmann of Lydenburg (a Hollander) wrote a letter to the Cape Synod

11. Van Jaarsveld, F. A.: *Die eenheidstrewes van die Republikeinse Afrikaners*, Vol. I, p. 226.

12. Orpen, J. M.: *Reminiscences of Life in S.A.*, pp. 203-4.

13. *The Friend*, 26.5.1851.

14. *The Cape of Good Hope Observer*, 24.6.1851.

15. *The Friend*, 26.5.1851.

16. Hanekom, T. N. (ed.): *Ons Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk*, pp. 176-8.



on 8 November 1854 about the matter and asked inter alia whether the church law of the Cape applied to Transvaal congregations, and whether separate buildings for congregations of Natives (Bantu) could be erected. Bührmann asked these questions because they were being used by Van der Hoff to encourage distrust against the Synod.<sup>17</sup> In his letter he mentioned that Van der Hoff "had made them believe that: . . . 3) The Colonial Church laws were not good for them because of equality of coloureds and the white population, etc. etc.; and that no change in their favour would be made by the Synod in this respect".<sup>18</sup>

The letter was sent to the Presbytery of Transgariep which met at Winburg in the Free State. A commission was appointed consisting of H. E. Faure, Andrew Murray (jnr), and A. A. Louw who were ministers of religion, and H. W. Wessels an elder, and C. Liebenberg a deacon. They sent a pastoral letter to Lydenburg which stated that although the congregations in the Transvaal were not obliged to accept Cape Church law, the commission could not think of a "case in which our Church Regulations would not be applicable to the Trans Vaal communities. Here, in the Free State, independence is complete and still the church law has been adopted in its entirety. All restrictions whereby the churches in the colony are held in connexion with the 'English Government' are wholly inapplicable to the Trans Vaal communities, as well as those of the Free State . . ." <sup>19</sup> As for the colour question, the commission referred to "the very numerous instances" in which separate buildings had been erected for Natives in the Cape Colony and admitted that the Synod "recognizes the existing differences in rank and station, everywhere established by the Lord," but warned that "the promise of God's word is cherished by her: 'I will give thee the heathen for an inheritance, and the ends of the earth for a possession' (Ps. 2, 8). Hence, she regards it as a duty, to promote the spread of God's Kingdom among the heathen".<sup>20</sup>

In addition to the pastoral letter, the Rev. Mr J. H. Neethling and the Rev. Mr A. A. Louw were also sent to the Transvaal. During their visit they were struck by the hostility of Van der Hoff and his supporters. The matters which were most bitterly disputed were the British Government, the oath of allegiance and equality of black and white: ". . . but equality, that was the great bugbear, which troubled the Transvaal . . . Mr Wolmarans (an elder) was the spokesman, but where he failed in this art, Mr Van der Hoff took over from him. The conversation, or whatever it may be called, was mostly about equality. It helped little whether we proved with examples that in many congregations every offence for coloureds and whites was presumed. We had to deal with this point until we were weary of it."<sup>21</sup>

---

17. *The Friend*, 3.11.1855.

18. *Ibid.* (My translation.)

19. *Ibid.*, 10.11.1855.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Gerdener, G. B. A.: *Boustowwe vir Kerkgeskiedenis*, Report of Neethling and Louw, 17.9.1856, p. 625. (My translation.)

From these statements it appears that Van der Hoff was the leader of the secession movement and the agitation against equality. At first glance this accusation seems unjustified, because Van der Hoff was a newcomer to South Africa. But it must be born in mind that if any man in the Transvaal knew the struggle with regard to equality and the colour question, he was that man. He was delayed in Cape Town for five months after his arrival from the Netherlands. This happened at a time when the constitutional struggle had reached a climax and was receiving considerable attention in the press. In addition he was lodged by the editor of *De Zuid-Afrikaan*. This brought him into daily contact with the agitation before he left for the Transvaal. His influence on the commission and the constitution of November 1855 must have been considerable because he had considerable influence in the Transvaal and on M. W. Pretorius, who became President in 1857 and who "entre nous followed my advice in every respect".<sup>22</sup> Van der Hoff's influence is emphasised by J. W. Spruyt, another Hollander. He wrote to Professor Lauts in the Netherlands on 25 August 1854: "De Heer van der Hoff doet zich meer en meer kennen, als een despoot, die, des noods met geweld, alles aan zijn willekeurig gezag wil onderwerpen . . ." <sup>23</sup> Van der Hoff's views about equality of white and black are reflected in a letter which he wrote on behalf of M. W. Pretorius to the Anti-Slavery Society in London.<sup>24</sup> In this letter he attacked the missionaries about equality of black and white. This shows how he was misled by the propaganda of the British Settlers in the *Graham's Town Journal* and the *Graaff-Reinet Herald* against the missionaries of the London Missionary Society. These missionaries had nothing to do with the draft constitution or political rights or the British decision to grant the Cape an elective Upper House. The missionaries were brought into the fray by Godlonton who accused missionary Read for encouraging the Kat River Hottentots to vote en masse for Stockenström. In view of these events the wording of clause 11 of the constitution is very significant: "The (people) do not want equality of coloureds and white inhabitants, after having got the conviction that equality would not be to the advantage of the Republic".<sup>25</sup>

This conviction must have been of very recent origin because the preceding clause is undoubtedly a reply to the pastoral letter: "The (people) desire the spread of Christendom (Christianity) among the heathen but subject to precautionary measures against deception and fraud (cheating)".<sup>26</sup> There is also a remarkable correspondence between this provision and the views of the *Graaff-Reinet Herald* and the *Graham's Town Journal*. Godlonton wrote on 16 June, 1855 that "false ideas and false statements in reference to the colored classes have been the curse of the

22. Engelbrecht, S. P.: *Geschiedenis van de N.Herv. Kerk*, Annexure XXXVI, XLV, XLVIII, S.P.E. IV/9.

23. *Ibid.*

24. *Ibid.*

25. S.A. Archival Records: Transvaal, R.930/55, annexure 54.

26. *Ibid.* (My translation.)

Colony . . .” The editor of *De Zuid-Afrikaan* found clause 11 so strange that he remarked that “their good sense and their religious sentiments are evidently in conflict”.<sup>27</sup> From these quotations it appears that Settler views greatly influenced Van der Hoff and the Transvaal constitution.

Although clause 69 again refused Bastards admission to meetings, clause 11 did not exclude coloureds from the Church. This happened in February, 1858 as a result of the continued struggle in the Transvaal. Lydenburg set the ball rolling with a manifesto on 8 March 1856 in which the provisions with regard to separate facilities were based on clause 1 of the 1853 constitution and not on the Bible.<sup>28</sup> Lydenburg ignored the draft constitution of 1855 because of the estrangement which had started at Pienaars River between the two factions. Lydenburg’s opponents revised the constitution of 1855. They deleted their conviction of 1855 and combined clauses 10 and 11 in clause 9. Again no mention was made of the Church. This amendment was supplemented by the church laws of Van der Hoff’s supporters which were drafted at meetings of the united church councils at Pretoria on 24 February 1857 and at Potchefstroom on 22 December 1857. The latter meeting took place after the session of the Cape Synod which made a concession on 6 November 1857 with regard to the serving of the mass. Clause 25 which regulated the attendance of church services, empowered a church council to prevent a person who might give “offence and annoyance” to the congregation from attending a service. But this provision like the Lydenburg decision was subject to clause 9 of the constitution whereas clause 24 which allowed each church council to make its own internal regulations was subject to existing church laws and regulations.<sup>29</sup>

By this time Van der Hoff denied that he had made a “bugbear” of the colour question. In fact he denied on 30 November 1857 all his previous reasons for secession from the Cape Synod. He had found a new excuse. At this time there was a movement afoot to introduce English as a medium in the Groote Kerk, Cape Town. Christoffel Brand, the first Speaker of the Cape Parliament, objected to this movement. Van der Hoff then took this as an excuse for secession from the Cape Synod “terwyl de gelykstelling, de zoogenaamde Bullebak van den Heer Neethling voor my nooit een Bullebak was, maar wel het streven naar priesterheerschappy en de poging tot vernietiging der Nederlandsch-gereformeerde Kerk. Spoedig heb ik dit ingezien, thans word ik er hoe langer zoo meer in bevestigd, en verklaar dus by deze, dat ik my met geen ander doel van de K. Synode afgescheiden had, dan om tegenstand te bieden tegen de priesterheerschappy, die de meerderheid der K. Synode schynt te bezielen, . . . en daarby liefde, innige liefde voor de Kerk myner vaderen die door de Synode, ondersteund door Engelsche Afrikaanders, met ondergang schynt bedreigd te worden”.<sup>30</sup>

27. *De Zuid-Afrikaan*, 13.12.1855.

28. Gerdener, G. B. A.: *Boustowwe vir Kerkgeskiedenis*, art. 2, p. 627-8.

29. *Staats Courant*, 28.5.1858.

30. S.P.E. IV/9 (Archives of the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk).

In spite of Van der Hoff's denial of his objections to equality of white and black Christians, the Gordian knot was already cut. The Lydenburg manifesto of 1856 and the resolutions of February and December 1857 influenced the constitution of February 1858. However, attention must first be given to the Synod meeting of November 1857 which was attended by delegates of the Cape Colony and the Presbytery of Transgariep. Of the latter, Lydenburg was not represented but Natal and the Free State sent their representatives which included Sarel Celliers. This was therefore a meeting of Cape Afrikaners and Voortrekkers.

The Cape Synod considered two motions with regard to separate facilities for coloureds and whites. These were tabled because of a recommendation in 1855 by the Presbytery of Albany that mass be served separately at Stockenström, a little town on the Kat River Settlement for Hottentots. The congregation originally consisted of Bastards and was under the jurisdiction of Graaff-Reinet from 1831. In 1855 it was under that of Albany. Whites also settled in this area, but more particularly after 1853 when the Cape Governor sold the land of rebel Hottentots to white colonists. For a long time coloureds and whites attended the same church services and mass. In 1855 forty-five whites asked the church council to permit them having their own mass on the first Sunday after the joint mass had been served. They requested this in order "that we should not hinder one another".<sup>31</sup> The church council turned it down because it feared a schism in the congregation. The council also pointed out that such a step would be contrary to church regulations and the Bible.

Not satisfied with the outcome, the petitioners sent a deputation to the church council and asked that a separate mass be served after the joint mass had been served. They wanted to use their own cups! The church council refused to withdraw its decision but referred the matter to the Presbytery of Albany which unanimously recommended that one or more tables be set separately for white members after the joint mass had been served, in order to meet the "prejudices and weaknesses" of those concerned.<sup>32</sup>

This recommendation caused a stir and the matter was therefore brought to the attention of the Synod in November 1857 by the Rev. Mr R. Shand of Tulbagh. He explained that separate serving of the mass to coloureds was contrary to the regulations of the Church which recognised no difference of colour and he feared that prejudice against coloureds would increase.<sup>33</sup> Those who discussed the motions wished it were possible to persuade some country people to abandon unchristian prejudices and to accept those whom God had taken as His children. Although prominent ministers of religion such as Dr Heyns, Dr Andrew Murray, N. J. Hofmeyr, and G. W. A. van der Lingen strongly con-

31. Hanekom, T. N.: *Ons N.G. Kerk*, op. cit., p. 319. (My translation).

32. *Ibid.*

33. *De Zuid-Afrikaan*, 9.11.1857.

demned the colour prejudice,<sup>34</sup> they realised that it was impossible to eradicate prejudice by force. At last the motion of Andrew Murray (senior) of Graaff-Reinet was accepted which reaffirmed the policy of equality but for practical considerations and in order to avoid further disruption of church unity, allowed separate facilities for those who desired them.<sup>35</sup> Murray, whose sons-in-law (Neethling and Louw) had visited the Transvaal in 1856, undoubtedly had the church schism in mind when he drafted his motion. But this concession simply meant separate facilities and not a separate church (Kerkgenootschap) for white and coloured. Van der Hoff was informed of this implication by the Presbytery of Transgariep in 1859. The letter was written by A. A. Louw.<sup>36</sup>

This discussion brings one however, right back in the heart of the Settler areas. These Settlers, apart from the many conflicts between whites and blacks on the frontier, must have had considerable influence on race attitudes because ever since the Kat River Hottentots had voted for Stockenström in 1850, Robert Godlonton attacked this settlement in his newspapers, in pamphlets, the Legislative Council, and then in Parliament. The agitation against the settlement grew so strong that the Governor sold the land of rebel Hottentots to whites who gradually took over the whole settlement. During the parliamentary session of 1855, Godlonton seconded a motion for an investigation of the rebellion as he wished to unmask the role of the philanthropists, more particularly the missionaries of the London Missionary Society. A select committee was appointed and its report was published in detail in the *Journal*.<sup>37</sup>

As a result of this investigation Godlonton wrote on 14 April 1855 that the Kat River affairs "are voted an intolerable bore by every reasonable man — are a source of continual irritation, as well as great hindrance to the legitimate business of Parliament".<sup>38</sup> When the report was published he wrote on 16 June 1855, i.e. before the pastoral letter to Lydenburg and the constitution of November, 1855, that "false ideas and false statements in reference to the colored classes have been the curse of the Colony, and it is only as these are exploded, that the Colony can expect to avoid in future these evils, with which it has been so grievously afflicted".<sup>39</sup> It is therefore not amazing that estrangement of races took place in this area.

Godlonton also attacked Stockenström, the father of this settlement, whose views he thought "were merely the offspring of a mind fevered with the wildest chimeras respecting the Hottentots of the Kat River".<sup>40</sup> These insults were aimed at an Afrikaner politician who was elected as a member of the Legislative Council by an overwhelming majority in 1850 and 1853. Furthermore he was supported by the coloureds who

34. Kriel, C. J.: *Gesk. van die N.G. Sendingkerk in S.A.*, p. 59.

35. *De Zuid-Afrikaan*, 9.11.1857.

36. Gerdener, G. B. A.: *Boustowwe*, Letter of 30.10.1859, p. 677.

37. *Graham's Town Journal*, 16.6.1855.

38. *Ibid.*, 14.4.1855.

39. *Ibid.*, 16.6.1855.

40. *Ibid.*

were now being persecuted by the Settlers. For Afrikaners to refuse to receive mass with them would therefore also have had serious political implications especially during the by-election which took place in 1855. Small wonder the church council of Stockenström feared a schism in the congregation and the decision of the Presbytery of Albany caused a stir.

The race and church struggle culminated in the Transvaal constitution of February 1858. It was completed at Rustenburg in February 1858 by a commission of fourteen members under the chairmanship of W. Robinson, a Settler and trusted friend of M. W. Pretorius, the President of the Transvaal Republic. Of the fourteen members, who again revised clause 9, there was only the dissentient vote of S. J. Kruger who had assisted with the constitution of 1853 at Lydenburg. On the 11th he withdrew his objection and the now famous clause 9 was unanimously accepted: "The people will not allow equality of coloureds and white inhabitants, neither in the Church nor in the State".<sup>41</sup> This was the first time that the provision with regard to the Church was included in the constitution although it was the natural outcome of the course of events since 1855. Equality of black and white Christians remained a bone of contention between the two Churches until they were united in 1883. Then the Nederduitsch Hervormde Kerk apparently persuaded the Dutch Reformed Church to adopt the principle of no equality in the Transvaal.

Total exclusion from the franchise remained of effect even when the Transvaal was annexed by Britain in 1877. The Transvaal was annexed by Theophilus Shepstone who introduced much of Natal's Bantu administration. The exclusion of coloureds from the franchise remained until 1936 when the United Party of Prime Minister J. B. M. Hertzog partly implemented the policy of Natal and the recommendations of the S.A. Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5.

The "conservative" views of the English Settlers also spread to Natal. In 1856 Natal received representative government and the franchise was restricted by means of fixed property qualifications. Natal Settlers were under the impression that Ordinance no. 3 of 1849 excluded all the Bantu who were subject to Native Law. Lt. Governor John Scott soon realised this mistake,<sup>42</sup> and in 1865 Law no. 11 excluded the Bantu from the franchise by means of very complicated voter's qualification.<sup>43</sup>

The Settlers in the Cape Colony did not give up their struggle. In 1853 many contemplated trekking to the Orange River Sovereignty or elsewhere in order to form an independent government. They even thought of boycotting the first election. However, after 1854 they tried to evade the consequences of the 1853 constitution and the influence of a multi-racial community by means of federation or separation of the English districts from the Afrikaner districts. At the same time they opposed the introduction of Responsible Government for fear of an Afrikaner

41. *Staats Courant*, 5.3.1858. (My translation.)

42. G.H. 105: No. 106, Scott to Newcastle, 25.9.1863.

43. *Natal Government Gazette*, 1865.

ministry and the influence of blacks on party government. In this respect they were supported by Governors Sir George Grey and Sir Philip Wodehouse. Separation was impossible and in spite of many efforts no satisfactory federal solution could be found for the problem. Finally, despite strenuous opposition, Responsible Government was introduced in 1872 by a majority of one. It created a new crisis.

The constitutional struggle showed that even safeguards caused friction. This was especially the case with regard to the division of the Colony between east and west. In order to break the hold the Settlers had on the Legislative Council, the Seven Circles Act of 1874 was passed. Henceforth the Colony was divided into seven circles, each of which sent three members to the Legislative Council. It was hoped that this arrangement would help to overcome the division between English colonists and Afrikaners. The *Eastern Province Herald* however, assured the colonists that: "No Seven Circles Bill, nor seventy seven Seven Circles Bills, will annihilate it . . . We are separated not alone by bad roads and bridgeless rivers, by lofty mountains and by long and weary distances, but by what is more important — by differences of blood and language; by diversity of interests and modes of thought . . . In the one Province the Dutch preponderate, in the other the English . . . 'their ways are not as our ways', there is no deep community of feeling betwixt us . . ."44

The Seven Circles Act hardly solved anything. At this stage the separation movement was revived and Lord Carnarvon, Secretary of State for the Colonies, followed it up with his federation scheme. This immediately revived the struggle because he foolishly recognised the eastern Settlers whose political position had been broken by the Seven Circles Act and the introduction of Responsible Government in 1872. They supported him in order to gain local self-government and a way out of the multi-racial dilemma.

Carnarvon experienced stiff opposition because the Cape Afrikaners and the Cape Liberals received the support of the Afrikaners of the Transvaal and the Free State who were very dissatisfied about the annexation of Basutoland and the Diamond Fields. Carnarvon's scheme could not make any progress against this combined opposition. Therefore he allowed Natal to annex the Transvaal in 1877 in order to form a confederation without the Cape Colony. In this way Natal's ideas were brought to the Transvaal by Theophilus Shepstone, e.g. in so far as the head of the administration became the Paramount Chief of the Bantu and no franchise rights for them. The annexation of the Transvaal was followed by a number of Bantu wars in Natal, the Cape Colony, Transvaal, and Basutoland. These wars created an opportunity for the Transvaalers to regain their independence by means of a few brilliant battles, 1880-1881. This success sent a wave of Afrikaner nationalism throughout South Africa and helped to consolidate the Cape Afrikaners politically.

44. *Eastern Province Herald*, 26.6.1874, 5.6.1875, 29.6.1875.

This new nation alarmed the Settlers, because it led to the formation of a strong political party.

Until 1878 there were no political parties except farmers' associations in the Eastern Colony. In 1878 an Afrikaner party was established in the Western Colony with a "liberal" race policy. In 1878 another was established by S. J. du Toit which received its main support in the Eastern Colony which included the Afrikaner Midlands. This party considered restricting membership to whites only. This is more or less a repetition of the race attitudes which threatened church unity. However, with twelve votes against forty-seven the eastern policy was rejected in 1883 when the two parties were amalgamated under the leadership of Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr who established the party of 1878.<sup>45</sup> The new party, the Afrikaner Bond, caused a stir in the ranks of the British community, because with the introduction of Responsible Government in 1872 and the passing of the Seven Circles Act of 1874, they had not only lost two very important safeguards but had not gained local self-government since Carnarvon's federation scheme was a failure. Many Settlers looked anxiously for protection. In this dark hour the enticing voice came. Under the influence of certain Cape Liberals, a considerable number of Settlers turned to the Bantu for political support.<sup>46</sup>

This in turn alarmed the Afrikaner Bond which insisted that the 'blanket vote' be restricted and that civilised persons only be allowed to vote.<sup>47</sup> Cecil Rhodes, a fervent imperialist who realised that Carnarvon had failed because of Afrikaner opposition, made use of this dilemma to get the support of the Afrikaner Bond for his federation scheme. Consequently the voters' list was purified in 1887 of those Bantu voters who did not possess fixed private property but communal property. In order to exclude more Bantu voters, the voter's qualifications were raised with the support of the Cape Liberals,<sup>48</sup> and in 1893 J. M. Orpen proposed the Constitution Amendment Ordinance to prevent Cape Town Malays from using the cumulative vote. During this year Natal received Responsible Government and a Parliament of two Houses after a struggle of nineteen years. The nominated Upper House was specially introduced to give seven white nominated representatives to the Bantu. The idea was to prevent them from disturbing the balance of parties in the Lower House and to keep political supremacy in the hands of the white colonists. In 1896 Natal also excluded the Indians from the parliamentary franchise for the same considerations.

Cecil Rhodes realised that he would not achieve federation of South Africa without the support of Natal and Republican Afrikaners unless special attention was given to the franchise. Therefore, he declared him-

45. Hofmeyr, J. H.: *Het leven van J. H. Hofmeyr*, p. 230.

46. *The Journal*, 2.6.1883, 14.7.1883, 28.2.1884, 26.5.1887.  
*Excaliber*, 25.3.1887, 1.4.1887, 29.4.1887.  
*Barkly East Reporter*, 30.5.1887.  
*Eastern Province Herald*, 1.6.1887, 6.6.1887.

47. *De Zuid-Afrikaan*, 9.7.1887.

48. *Cape Hansard*, 1892: House of Assembly, pp. 165-9, 185-6.



self in favour of "equal rights for all *white* men south of the Zambesi".<sup>49</sup> This policy was also adopted by many Eastern Settlers and the Transvaal Uitlanders who hoped to get the vote.<sup>50</sup> In this manner franchise rights were used to achieve political supremacy or the acquisition of territory.

The struggle for British supremacy in South Africa led to the fierce struggle for the franchise for British Uitlanders in the Transvaal. Of these Uitlanders more than 15,000 came from the Cape Colony. It is not amasing that Transvaal Afrikaners were as afraid of political rights for them as the Settlers were of Afrikaner predominance in the Cape Colony. The struggle in the Transvaal led to the Jameson Raid in 1895-6 and War of 1899-1902. During this war Lord Milner, the British High Commissioner, who considered parliamentary government "uniformly bad"<sup>51</sup> for a heterogeneous population, even tried to force federation on South Africa without consulting the electorate. Britain refused his request which was supported by the English Progressive Party. But it took South Africa sixty years and more than 50,000 lives during a war which cost Britain over R400,000,000 to prove for themselves that Lord Stanley was right when he warned in 1842 against representative government for a heterogeneous population.

The struggle for supremacy and constitutional safeguards was renewed after the war, because Lord Milner and the English Progressive Party in the Transvaal were as unwilling of sharing equal political rights with the defeated Afrikaners as the latter were before the war of sharing it with the Uitlanders.<sup>52</sup> In the end the Transvaal and the Free State received parliaments with *nominated* Upper House granted by the *Liberal Party* of Britain! This is a clear indication that in spite of the war which had been fought for franchise rights, Britain considered unrestricted political rights undesirable even for civilised whites.

It must be added that Great Britain never insisted on complete political equality of black and white. In 1850 Britain wanted a "due balance" in the constitution.<sup>53</sup> Carnarvon's Permissive Federation Bill of 1875 provided that the Bantu would be represented "in such a manner as shall be deemed by Her Majesty to be without danger to the stability of the Government".<sup>54</sup> Britain also agreed to the constitutional changes of Natal and the Cape Colony. When the Republics were defeated Britain agreed that the franchise should not be given to the coloured population before the introduction of representative government, but "if then given, it will be so limited as to secure the just predominance of the white race".<sup>55</sup>

49. Millin, S. G.: *Rhodes*, p. 221.  
*Eastern Province Herald*, 9.3.1898, 11.3.1898.  
*The Journal*, 12.3.1898.

50. Headlam, C.: *Milner Papers*, Vol. I, p. 468.

51. *Ibid.*, Vol. II: Milner to Ramsay Collins, p. 511.

52. Le May, G. H. L.: *British supremacy in S.A.*, pp. 157-181.

53. G.H. 1/41: no. 440/4 of 31.1.1850.

54. P.P. Vol. VIII: Permissive Confederation Bill, clause 22.

55. Headlam, C.: *Milner Papers*, Vol. II, p. 213.

Although representative government started in 1850 with "equal" political rights subject to certain constitutional safeguards, the tendency during the following half century was not towards greater equality but further restriction of political rights. The political interests of a heterogeneous population could not be satisfactorily safeguarded in this kind of constitution. All the conflicts, rebellions, wars, and every drop of blood that was shed, proved that Lord Stanley was right. At the Cape of Storms it was found to be a task of insuperable difficulty to reconcile the principle of free institutions with the legal equality between different races.

After the war South Africans were faced with the task of finding new ways of reconciling the political, social, economic, and race interests which had become more complex on account of the war and the struggle for political supremacy. It was at this stage that the reports of the S.A. Native Affairs Commission of 1903-5, the Indigency Commission of 1906, the Natal Native Affairs Commission of 1906-7, and the Transvaal Mining Industry Commission of 1908 served as guides for future planning. The S.A. Native Affairs Commission recommended inter alia a Council System for the Bantu and separate political representation in the central parliament.<sup>56</sup> The Commission even recommended a separate university college for the Bantu. This recommendation co-incided with compulsory separation of black and white pupils in 1905. This separation was introduced by Dr Jameson and his Progressive Party in the Cape Colony. The idea was to mould a native tongue, and "develop a system of education which (would) give to the native the best fruits of civilization, instead of teaching him to imitate its superficial qualities".<sup>57</sup>

As a result of this new education policy Fort Hare College was established a few years after unification. The university colleges which have been established after 1959 are closely connected with the recommendations of 1905, but they make special provision for the linguistic differences of the ethnic groups.

The predominantly English trade unions insisted on a "white labour policy"<sup>58</sup> in order to protect the standard of living of white labourers against the competition of cheap Chinese, Asiatic, and coloured labour. This eventually gave rise to the segregation policy of the S.A. Labour Party. The supporters of segregation rejected integration as an impossible solution of the race problem. They recommended segregation because it rested "upon the deep and sure foundations of our diverse needs and our diverse human nature. It seeks by removing the causes of friction to increase our mutual respect and good feeling; and it aims at the supremacy of neither race, but the freedom and natural development of both, and finally it affords the only possible prospects of the survival of our own race in South Africa".<sup>59</sup>

56. Report of the S.A. Native Affairs Commission, 1903-5.

57. *The State*, June, 1909: Articles by W. J. Wybergh.

58. Transvaal Mining Industry Commission, 1908.

59. *The State*, June, 1909, pp. 610 and 612.

These views accorded well with the ideas of the Natal Native Affairs Commission which recommended different forms of government for black and white because democracy was too abstract for the Bantu. The Commission emphasised the necessity of recognising ethnic differences, the tribal system, traditions, and laws.

It was because of these new political concepts and past policies that it was possible for Colonel Greene of Natal to propose and achieve the restriction of membership of the Union Parliament to British subjects of European descent.<sup>60</sup> A motion that political rights be extended to all civilised men was rejected by the National Convention because civilisation could not be defined.<sup>61</sup> In order to satisfy the Afrikaner Bond and the Cape Liberals who still depended on coloured support, the Convention entrenched the existing coloured franchise by a two-thirds majority of both Houses of Parliament. However, in view of the new segregation policy, ethnic differentiation, separate representation, and past conflicts many politicians were opposed to the entrenched franchise. They were afraid it might prevent a solution of the problems created by a heterogeneous population.<sup>62</sup>

For various reasons such as the after effects of the war, the struggle against anglicisation and the poor white problem, Afrikaners did not give much attention to political rights for coloureds and to Bantu administration before 1926. In this year Premier J. B. M. Hertzog and his Pact Government wanted to give separate representation to the Bantu in both Houses of Parliament. The Natal members of the opposition insisted on representation in the Senate only, because they feared that representation in the Assembly would disturb the balance of parties.<sup>63</sup> Except separate representation, Hertzog also wanted to give the Bantu of all South Africa an elected Representative Council. He struggled for many years but could not get a two-thirds majority for his plans. His opponents gradually whittled down the seven members for the Assembly to three for the Cape Bantu only, but in spite of these concessions he could not get the required majority. This majority was made possible only when a new alignment of political parties took place in 1934. English politicians, more particularly of Natal, then persuaded Hertzog to abolish representation in the Assembly altogether.<sup>64</sup> The existing Bantu voters remained on the common roll and they could vote for white candidates. But the "con-

60. S.A. National Convention: Minutes of proceedings, pp. 59 and 65.  
Walton, E. H.: *The Inner History of the National Convention of S.A.*, pp. 52, 122-128.

61. Malan, F. S.: *Konvensie Dagboek*.

S.A. National Convention: Minutes of Proceedings.

62. Transvaal Debates: Both Houses, 1909: Speech of Smuts, p. 56.  
Transvaal, Beide Huizen: Eerste Parlement debatte, 1909, pp. 198, 256-267, 354-5.  
*Rand Daily Mail*, 3.3.1909: Rosebank Closer Union Society.  
*The Star*, 5.3.1909: Constitution Amendment Association.

63. Gesamentlike sitting van beide Huise, 1929: 20.2.1929. Compare speeches on pp. 114, 139, 134-135, 142, 144.

64. *Ibid.*, speech of Hertzog, pp. 134-135.  
Joint Select Committee, pp. 17 and 54.

servative” British Dominion Party with its vicious Cape Liberal tail, then adopted a very opportunistic step for a by-election with regard to these Bantu voters. Consequently the Bantu voters were put on a separate roll and given three representatives in the Assembly instead.

During the joint session of both Houses, Dr D. F. Malan, leader of the “purified” National Party, proposed separate representation for the Coloureds also.<sup>65</sup> This was in line with the resolution taken at Stellenbosch during a party congress in 1932. Parliament rejected Malan’s motion by 132 votes against 22. Coloureds were not given separate representation until 1956.

Walter B. Madeley of the S.A. Labour Party, seconded by M. J. van den Berg, repeated his proposal of 1930 that the Bantu be totally separated from the rest of the population. He hoped to solve the political, social, and economic problems in this way and at the same time protect the poor whites.<sup>66</sup> Parliament rejected the proposal as an impractical solution of the problem. F. S. Malan told Madeley that it was already too late to separate the races. Thereafter the United Party Bill was adopted by an overwhelming majority, viz. 169 votes against 11. Of the latter there were three ex-Bond Afrikaners, one socialist, and two Cape Liberals. The rest were “conservative” Englishmen of Natal who were playing the Cape Liberal role. Political “liberalism” had never reached such a low ebb in the history of South Africa.

Many members of Parliament had grave doubts about the Natives’ Representative Council which was granted to South African Bantu. It had few responsibilities and its composition made no provision for ethnic differences. All the Bantu ethnic groups were simply lumped together. This weakness was recognised when the National Party formulated its policy of apartheid before the 1948 election. As a result of this policy the Natives’ Representative Council was abolished and gradually substituted by tribal, local, regional, and territorial authorities for each ethnic group. The Xhosa ethnic group received a parliament in 1963 and there is talk that an ethnic group may become independent. The Coloureds and Indians have also received Councils. Consequently separate representation for the coloured population was abolished in 1959 and 1968. Much attention is given to the economic development of Bantu homelands and to the education of the coloured population generally.

Independence of Bantu ethnic groups and their homelands are confronted by a very serious problem. Economic development has brought 58 per cent of the Bantu population to the white areas. In addition the homelands are so scattered that it seems impossible consolidating them. Consequently there are two political parties which oppose independence. The Progressive Party thinks it is possible to avoid partition of South Africa by means of a very rigid constitution. The proposed constitutional safeguards are so restrictive that they might paralyse any future govern-

65. Joint Session, 1936: Debates, 49 and 58.

66. *Ibid.*, p. 193.

ment and bring about a repetition of past constitutional conflicts. The United Party appears willing to recognise ethnic development and local self-government, but instead of independence, wants to return to separate representation for the Bantu, Indians and Coloureds in the two Houses of Parliament. This Party has not yet indicated whether it considers giving separate representation to the ethnic groups or whether it intends restoring the old form of separate voters' rolls. Neither is it clear what steps will be taken to prevent a repetition of the corruption of the coloured vote, the disturbance of the balance of parties, or the election of communists to parliament. The idea is however, to achieve some form of consultation at all levels. This party propagates white leadership and a race federation by means of separate representation. Federation has been under consideration from 1850 but its supporters have never been able to come forward with a federal solution of the racial problem. The existing provincial councils are the only result of that struggle. South Africa's great problem was and is to adapt the British parliamentary system to the conflicting political aspirations of a heterogeneous population. This problem even influenced the views of religious leaders.

From the foregoing it must be clear that apartheid cannot be explained in terms of the Afrikaner's theological ideology only. The Prime Minister of South Africa is therefore not bound merely by religious views but by all those events which shaped South African race policies.

Prof. D. J. P. Haasbroek.