

Posted 4.9.59.

Attention is drawn to the "Competition to foster Goodwill" which will be run by the Bloemfontein Newspaper "The Friend" as a contribution to the fostering of improved race relations in the Union. Readers are invited to send in any true stories of goodwill, for the accuracy of which they can vouch. They may concern incidents between Whites or Whites and non-Whites, and will be printed in the newspaper between now and May 1960.

The prizes will be £25, £10, and £5. This seems to the C.E. to be an opportunity that should not be missed by members.

The Memo on whether the U.P. land issue is a question of political morality or not, follows:

POINTS PRO: Why the land issue is a matter of political morality.

The promise made by Hertzog in the 1936 Land Act should be honoured, and no circumstances should alter this obligation to non-Whites, whatever party may be in power. Had it not been for the intervention of the war, the full extent of the land would doubtless already have been purchased for the Native Trust. Therefore, the future of the land in question is irrevocably bound up with the future of the existing reserves, and what this future may be is irrelevant to the obligation upon any government to complete the purchasing of the land. Therefore, it is politically immoral to allow a set of circumstances to interfere with the carrying out of the Hertzog promise as soon as possible.

POINTS CON: Points why this issue is not a question of political morality.

In this country where the White man's word to the non-White has often been broken, it is obviously undesirable that any promise given to non-Whites should be broken without the agreement of the non-Whites concerned; but in this instance the U.P. have never said that they will not honour this promise. They have, in fact, stated quite clearly that, should they be returned to power, they will continue to purchase the balance of the land promised in 1936. They maintain that their promise involved the purchase of land for Africans as South African citizens. They maintain that the purchase of the land for Bantustans will result in the eventual setting up of separate Bantu, and possibly hostile, states. They say they are not prepared to support the purchase of land for this purpose. It seems to us, therefore, that as long as the U.P. stand by their promise to purchase the land, if and when they are returned to power, there is no question of a broken promise.

It is suggested that the motive for the U.P. opposition to the purchase of land for Bantustans is that they hope to catch the votes of Whitesfarmers whose farms may be purchased by the Government for this purpose, or whose farms will adjoin "supposedly hostile" Bantustans. Yet logically this should hardly be a vote catcher, since, if these farmers - and others - vote in sufficient numbers to ensure that the U.P. are returned to power, the U.P. will immediately purchase the land under dispute.

In this country especially an appeal to racialism is undesirable - and clearly to warn people against "die swart gevaar", in reference to Bantustans, is an appeal to one's baser feelings. But we do not consider that the Sash should concern itself with public criticism of party political tactics or "manouvreings". If it was clearly a question of political morality, the Sash should without fear or favour make its attitude known. Failure to do so would result in our being justly accused of having a party political bias.

If members agree that it is not a question of political morality, there may be some value in issuing a statement to say that, as we do not consider it a clear cut question of political morality, we have not protested. This would allay the fears of those who feel we only refrain from criticising because the U.P. is involved.

Having produced these pros. and cons. the C.E. do not now intend doing anything further in this matter unless Regions indicate that they wish us to do so.