



**MR. WHITE  
MAN, WHAT  
NOW?**

**GM MES**

**G.M. MES**

**Mr. WHITE MAN**

**WHAT NOW ?**

With a foreword by the Hon. Mr. Justice J. F. Ludorf

1965

Afrikaanse Pers-Boekhandel, Johannesburg

## **Foreword**

*In his recent book "Now Men and To-morrow Men", Mr. Mes expounded a new theory, supported by arguments which would require strong counter arguments indeed, to cast doubt upon the correctness of the theory. He concluded that in the scale of evolution the transition from the ape-man to man occurred not when his skull took on a different shape but when his mind became conscious of the future and lifted him out of the paradise of the present, which is that of the animal world. This occurred not on the day that our ancestor made his first tool or weapon but on the day that he remembered to keep the stick or stone which had come fortuitously in his hands because of the nature of the terrain where he had just used it, in a contest. He henceforth would have a weapon at hand whatever the nature of the terrain and could of course gain a great advantage over his enemies by choosing the battleground. From then on the choosing, shaping and making of weapons and tools followed automatically together with all the advantages to be thus gained over an adversary who did not know of his future existence. This faculty of a future-sense developed sporadically and at a different pace in different parts of the world until man of today could be broadly classed into three categories, without clear boundaries but broadly typical of the extent of such development: The man of the east whose future-sense had reached eternity, making him in his thinking a fatalist - merely a link in the chain of eternity. The Bantu of Africa with a very short future-sense and the happier for it because of his ability to enjoy the present without much concern for the future, and the White man of Western Europe with a short to medium future-sense, the restless go-getter to whom is denied the restful resignation of his fatalistic long-futured or happy short-futured fellow man.*

*The present work is an endeavour by the author to apply his theory to the rise and fall of past civilisations and to seek an explanation for this manifestation, naturally with an eye on all manner of other factors to avoid over-simplification. Step by step and with logical sequence he brings us to the rise of our present "Western Civilisation." He pinpoints its advent with the development of the fire-arm and the ability of the medium-futured to use it because of his approach to life, based on the "survival of the fittest" in a world which to him had a sufficient future to justify such use. The short-futured have a "tempo-cognition" which may extend quite far into the future but it is not real to him - his "tempo realisation". He is satisfied to fight today without much thought of tomorrow. The very long-futured regard fighting as pointless in the scheme of things. The white man with his gun saw the advantages. He could shoot the taboos out of the Gods of the short-futured and subdue the long-futured ones who were not much interested in who governed, as such, because all they wanted was to be left alone, provided life was not made too unendurable while it lasted.*

*The white man, with a "tempo-realisation" of say four years and a "tempo-cognition" of about 30 years, with his gun in his hand saw the advantages of being the "master" and of course, taking the bounty. He put his gun to use, thus becoming the ruler of the world and wealth with ease and luxury in sight. Two devastating world wars, however, have made him tired of carrying the burdens of overlordship, which is a much more difficult self-taxing position than that of the slave, who must do his work, but may look to the master to house, feed and protect him and, most important, make all the decisions for him, involving all the future implications of such decisions.*

*In his flight from the responsibilities created by his past conduct the white man is withdrawing his white policemen all over the world, leaving his wards without the machinery by which they governed themselves before his advent, but in its stead a "Whitehall constitution" which is workable only where the population is medium-futured.*

*To salve his conscience the white man has created the platitudes of "human rights" and "all men are equal" and throws up his hands in horror when he sees his fledgling, newly independent democracy turning within a year or two into an autocracy or a dictatorship in which the new state has simply exchanged its white-man master for a black-man master or a tyrant.*

*The author asks whether white overlordship of black men deserves world denunciation and a black dictatorship over black men is something which needs no comment. The fact that white overlords looked after their wards and that the independent short-futured Bantu can only be ruled by fear has not been placed upon the agenda of the white-man policy-makers because, until the author expounded his theory so recently, it has not occurred to them, just as it never occurred to the first ape-man to take his stick home after the fray.*

*The day when the inhabitants of the White House and No. 10 Downing Street and their advisers realise what Mr. Mes has with a devastating blast of argument shown, that men are not "equal" but "different", only on that day will clouded thinking become clear. The author is at pains to show that "different" does not mean "superior" or "inferior", unintelligent or very intelligent, just "different". He is at pains once again to explain that short-futured persons may be more intelligent than medium or long-futured persons. We have white confidence-men of outstanding intelligence with a short future, and Bantu, by miscegenation, of a longer future who outstrip these whites, because of a coupling with their superior intelligence. This, however, does not detract from an essential "difference" which is not a "superiority" or an "inferiority" but something which is unlike an "equality" – a "difference". With all their intelligence they prefer the black man's Bantu beer to our wine of the grape. We prefer the wine. It does not follow logically that because a white man insists on his right to one man one vote and it works in Britain, America, South Africa, Australia, Canada and the like that that is the ideal and indeed, as we bluff ourselves, the only form of good government.*

*These medium-futured white men should pause. Read Credo Mutwa's illuminating book "Indaba, my children" on the aspirations of the Bantu in Africa. Then decide whether only the White Man's approach to life is the correct one.*

*Mr. Mes has analysed the conception of "human rights" with equally penetrating logic together with the blissful dallying of the white man in the flowerbed of the meaning of words.*

*In an appendix the author expresses some very interesting thoughts, criticisms and advice on the policy of separate development sought to be implemented in South Africa at present, under a veritable tornado of local and world criticisms.*

*Mr. Mes says in his introduction that he has set out in this work with the proclaimed object of provoking thought. In this he has succeeded beyond his wildest dreams. Whether he is right, I as a judge cannot say because I have not yet heard the other side, but the other side will have to produce convincing arguments.*

*I am no scientist like Prof. Raymond Dart, but I recommend this book to all thinkers, scientists and policy-makers all over the world and I exhort the author to continue writing before the short span allotted to man on earth might rob us of his further thinking.*

J. F. LUDORF

## Preface

*It has been said that the value of a book lies in the measure in which it provokes thought, either by convincing argument or by causing a well reasoned protest - and on that basis this work asks for the attention of the reader.*

*One is well aware that the huge mass of subject matter which had to be reviewed and organised into some sort of a logical arrangement, has resulted in an undesirable over-simplification; and that some of the facts given may in the light of expanding modern research, prove to be inaccurate and/or already outdated.*

*It is realised, for instance, that the structure of a 'Civilisation' is more like that of a tree than the simple linear development represented here. It has branches and those branches to a certain extent copy the parent body; in origin; in structure and in the way of their ending.*

*Within the limits of this book only the main outlines of the basic pattern can be filled in without becoming tedious and repetitive.*

*In the same way the 'periods' of history were also far less sharply defined than is here suggested. They flowed into each other and partially overlapped - or had long 'stagnant' intervals between them both in time and geographical location.*

*Nevertheless, just as the tracker does not include the position of each visible blade of grass in his reading of the spoor but allows his eye to catch only those that have been disturbed by the passage of his quarry, so he who would discover a pattern in the structure of the endless (yet monotonously self-reiterating) variety of human history has to select and to eliminate.*

*A basic pattern of Cause-and-effect is necessary for the understanding of human relationships and the logical development of history which is, by far, not a haphazard sequence of events. Such a pattern, valid or not, has been presented here.*

*Proof in these matters is and will remain impossible. Every man's guess is as good as that of the next. But it is suggested that the reader, having followed the argument, should test it out on what he knows or can find time to learn about our history and the ways of man with man.*

*Many striking insights will be his reward as they have been for the writer. Many hitherto senseless mazes will take the quality of recognisable designs and the almost universal recurrence of the pattern should be enough proof for its own validity.*

*There is one remark to make. The word 'not-European' has been used to denote all those who are not of the Western European stock. 'Non-European' has, in South Africa, acquired too narrow a meaning to be suitable in this context.*

*Finally, the sombre and apocalyptic implications which follow logically need not be too disturbing. They are amply taken care of by the quotation with which this book ends. We should realise that if the ancient Greek or Roman could have had a correct vision of the future, he too would have balked at the imminent disappearance of his particular way of life.*

*In the meantime the days into which we have been born are probably the most interesting the world has ever known - for those of us who have no children and have the eyes to see (with more understanding than sympathy), what is happening about us.*

*We should learn to smile, even at ourselves, for it is very necessary that we do so.*

*Above all, let us not be too much in love with ourselves.*

Krugersdorp,  
18 August, 1964.

## CHAPTER I

### *The Future is Black*

The White Man has had a good innings, for as long as it lasted and he should not complain if the wheel of history now gives another turn and pitches him off into nowhere.

We, the White men, the hated 'Palefaces', have held the world in thrall for fifteen to twenty generations and we have become so used to it, that we cannot see what the rest of the world has already known for some time, namely, that our days are numbered.

It is necessary that we open our eyes and look at what is happening around us.

We, the 'Tah Bize', the 'Big Noses' - the 'Yang Kuei', the 'Foreign Devils' - we have strutted our turn upon the stage. We have given an extremely good account of ourselves but - the sceneshifters are waxing impatient. The curtain is about to come down in preparation for the next show and it is getting late.

Many - if not most - of us, with a curious masochistic pleasure (which is in itself a symptom of degeneration), nod our heads at such apocalyptic thoughts and say that it 'will be a good thing' when the White Man falls off his pedestal at last. One cannot, however, help having the suspicion that those who say such things do not realise that that fall will be, and must be, total. There will be no such thing as sitting back in comfort, in order to enjoy the proceeds of the depredations of our forefathers. We are certainly not henceforward going to be 'brothers of one blood' with the rest of mankind, on the basis of the present status quo!

The possibility that such an unnatural condition could come into existence, if we are but 'friendly' and 'broadminded' enough in this sinful world of ours, is one of the pet escapist dreams to which a large number of us is prone when racialism comes on the carpet for armchair discussion - especially when that 'dirty thing' is to be found in another country.

There is no bigger fool than the fool who cheats himself.

True, one should also not deceive others, but when a man sits down and starts telling himself fairytales, there is no doubt that he is nearing the end of his tether.

Mr. White Man! My friend! - As a 'Master of the Universe' you are on your way out - but that is no reason why you should shame your ancestors by refusing to face that simple fact with open eyes and an open mind; or to use a term which is, alas, rapidly losing its validity: 'like a man'. You should at least not cringe and wag your tail and deny your own value which has been magnificent.

You have given the world many things. You have given it machines to do its work. You have given it the conception to the 'Law-by-itself', so that some sort of a predictable Justice could reign. You have, in several instances, been able to keep a real Democracy going for a few hundred years at a time, thereby demonstrating that it *can* be done. You have given the world a Science which now, in its death throes, is tentatively scratching at the portals of the Universe itself.

All this is undeniably true, and with becoming, yet almost pathetic modesty (which, strangely enough, does not contain a trace of hypocrisy) you say, *and think*, that 'Humanity' has done these things, when you know, or should know as well as or better than anybody else, that that is not so. You, you the

horrific 'White Man Boss', you the terrible merciless 'Paleface' - you have done all these things and many more

'Humanity' had nothing to do with them.

Humanity is still the same as it has ever been; just as you found it when you appeared upon the stage at the end of the 'dark' middle ages. Humanity is still the amorphous matrix from which civilisations like yours spring up, build themselves into glorious edifices and into which they finally tumble back again.

Look around you and you will find that despite your example and your constant propaganda, real Democracy is nowhere to be found except among yourselves. Look again and you will find that the 'Law' is nowhere considered to be more than a sort of general 'rule of thumb' to help in deciding what in any specific case, is, or should be, considered to be 'fair' and 'just' or even 'expedient' and to the advantage of those in authority.

Look again and you will find that where a perfectly organised democratic system equipped with a functioning legal system, complete with laws and all, has been given to the others, it has taken but a few years for that democracy to disappear and the 'law' to become a weapon and a tool used to back up and preserve a tyranny.

Note too - and this is most important - that, despite the fact that you have kept no secrets to yourself; despite the fact that for generation after generation, you have encouraged and even paid for the best, the cream, the preselected representatives of other races to come and study at your Universities - and despite the almost total absence of 'racial prejudice' with which you treated them there - there is still a practically complete absence of the ability to start industries (or even to keep them going, once they have been started for them), with the one remarkable exception of Japan.

It is simply not in them!

Have you never wondered why this is so?

If not, it is high time that you did, for in your not-understanding of this fact lies a large part of the reason for your imminent disappearance from the scene. 'The moment of truth,' as the Spaniards call the Estocade which tumbles the harried bull into the dust, is near at hand and before you die, you too should know and understand.

The rest of the world has seen it coming, ever since not long after the first world war, 'somewhere in China' a legation doctor was killed and the consul's wife raped by an unruly mob. Then, when everybody was waiting for the 'inevitable', 'deserved', and 'logical' shelling of the town by English gunboats, dawn suddenly touched the Asian sky with rosy fingers.

Very strong representations were made to the authorities concerned(!) and the whole of the not-European world squatted back on its heels with a contented smile upon its lips.

The White Man was becoming ethical!

It would not be long now, at most a generation or two, before the world would be rid of the White Scourge. Silently, even at that early hour, the jockeying for position began among them. The old skills of plot and counterplot were taken out of thousands of cupboards, dusted and studied carefully in preparation for the new times which were to come.



The average man (among whom one presumes that one can classify the reader) has a disdain for those who cry havoc, but we are not 'crying havoc'. We are only focussing the light of our torch upon the ground before our feet and, for one short moment, forgetting to look up to the stars.

If one had the sense to see it, things could not possibly have worked out differently and the wonder would have been if our final act had tarried much longer.

One can draw these pessimistic conclusions about the blackness of the White future with confidence from the fact that no civilisation has ever yet survived for more than a thousand years.

Combined with the symptoms of breakdown and decay which we see all about us (or about which we read every time that we open our newspaper over our breakfast egg) there is more than enough valid material from which to draw the obvious conclusion.

The breakdown in our morals (which we see as 'enlightenment'), the loss of belief in ourselves (which we see as high 'ethical standards'), the 'withdrawing to more strategic positions' which are happening all over the world under the beautiful motto of 'Freedom for All' - they all tell a tale which only the willingly deaf can fail to interpret correctly.

For those to whom such a simple, direct argument does not seem convincing enough, there is still available the conception of Oswald Spengler who sees the different Civilisations which have graced and shamed this world of ours, as being separate entities, each with an actual 'life' of its own. By timing them against the clock of History, he found that all of them have had remarkably similar lifecycles: Youth, Middle Age, Old Age and Death, in the form of 'Culture', 'Civilisation', 'Hellenism' ending in 'Fellahinism' and /or total destruction.

This similarity is so marked that he could often predict the appearance of a state-form or the emergence of a Despot or a 'Liberator' within the range of a few years and. if we borrow *that* idea from him, we of the Occident have but a mere century and a half to go, before we will finally make our last bow to history.

To the critical thinker neither of these arguments is really and entirely convincing. The simple reference to the general structure of history is too vague and too much tainted by pessimistic forebodings, while on the other hand, Spengler's quasi-scientific method fails to convince, in that, in accepting the mantle of Science, he does not accept the discipline of Science and fails to produce convincing proof of his contentions.

Both leave us with the feeling - illogical perhaps - that we, the great Western Civilisation, will be the exception which is going to prove the rule. *We* are going to survive where others fell by the wayside because, as far as we are concerned, we are manifestly what all history has been leading up to.

We are the beginning of the millennium!

More blatant wishful thinking than that has been accepted as 'truth' ere now.

Referring to examples in history neither proves nor convinces. What we want, is to understand the situation itself and to draw logical and understandable conclusions about our future and our place in history from known facts. Only if we can *understand* will we be really convinced. After all, formulae and stories may be interesting, but one can choose to apply them or not. They do not compel belief.

If, however, we really desire to understand history together with our place in it, we must look at it with impersonal, almost disillusioned eyes: taste and feel it without allowing our personal emotions to

become involved. We must see it for what it is and cease to read our own wishes and personal importance into its pages. *That* habit is the reason why, as Hegel said: "we learn from history only that we do not learn from it". We do not learn from History because we do not look at the real History at all. We see only our personal interpretations of the events and not the events themselves. We see only the grand tale of how a whole world was created, of how civilisations rose and fell, all with the seemingly sole and single purpose of leading up to the supreme moment when we would arrive on earth.

Obviously such a personal interpretation of history (even if we have overdrawn the idea a bit here) cannot teach us anything at all.

History with a capital 'H'; History as it really is, does not know about us.

There is, in its time-scale, no special mark against the few years during which we, you, the readers and I, the writer, exist on earth.

Nevertheless, although the idea is absurd to our intelligence, all our thinking about history and life in general seems to take exactly that for granted. All our valuations are those which are valid to us. All our judgements are based on the values *we* give to things and to social relationships.

We think of the possible end of our 'civilisation' and our 'way of life' as if it will be the end of the world although it can mean no more to History than the end of the sanguinary glory of Rome did in its time. The catastrophic imaginings of the Incas, when their Empire of the Sun came tumbling down about their ears, had validity only for themselves and for nobody else in the world. For the conquerors it meant a glorious victory achieved under the blessed guidance of their own Christian God.

History, real history, despite in whatever ways professional historians define it, is the addition-sum of millions upon millions of big and small simple and complicated 'causes and effects'.

We may see a pattern in it. We may follow up a certain coloured thread or a group of threads, but the carpet remains itself and the pattern is never more important or 'real' than the material into which it is woven. Neither is any part more important than any other.

If one part could be more important than another, there would have to be a universally accepted valuator somewhere, that is - a mind. a principle or an ideal according to which such importance could be adjudged or considered to be valid.

The man who claims that the personal principles and ideals which he happens to have are the only real and valid ones, suffers either from thoughtlessness or megalomania. After all, even his ideals and principles are hardly his own! They have been implanted in him by his heredity, nurtured by his education and the example set by his parents, developed in a reciprocal relationship with the type of environment in which he has happened to grow up.

The life and death of a 'dull' aborigine back in the jungle of Borneo is as important (or as unimportant) as that of the London bank-clerk, commuting to and from work or pottering about in his garden on summer afternoons, - as important or as unimportant as the more or less degenerated society specimen who drinks and womanises himself into oblivion under the constant supervision of press photographers and reporters.

Neither of these again is more or less important (except to his immediate surroundings) than the so-called 'great men' of this world; Raphael, Beethoven, Rembrandt, Napoleon, Hitler, Leonardo da Vinci, Churchill and Stalin.

It is true that our lives would have been different if these men had not been born but that does not mean that they were 'important' or that history was 'better' or 'worse' for their existing. One can (somewhat facetiously) bring this home when one remembers how our lives are influenced by those who have really not been born.

How much more beautiful and satisfying would life not have been if Rashamataru had been born! He would have given humanity the perfect religion, but unhappily his father-to-be missed the bus or the caravan and found his beloved Nada already happily married when he arrived home. Consequently humanity is still miserably feeling around in the dark looking for God without knowing where to go.

This chastening thought should be enough to show that it is absolutely impossible to adjudge importance or unimportance to anything, except in relation to a certain combination of circumstances whose own importance must again rest on something else if it is to have any validity.

A million unimportant persons are no more important than one of them and a hundred million men are not a hundred times as important as one million of them. A thousand million naughts, when all is said and done, add up to no more than a naught.

In real History, 'importance' never means more than 'importance to' and to whom is a civilisation, and all that it entails, important - except to itself ?

*To all others it is at best only important as an obstacle. The sooner it disappears, the better!*

If one likes to hide behind 'bin' words, as so many so-called thinkers do, one might object that 'Mankind' is important to us because we are all part of it.

That is true, but then the only thing about mankind which is important is that it shall continue to exist.

The ways and means of achieving this, the parts that must be saved and those that can be discarded and the spirit in which it should live its life, will be differently estimated by everybody concerned, and who shall say whose judgement is valid and whose not?

The trouble behind all this is obviously that although man has emerged far enough out of the simple animal reflex-consciousness of his origin to be aware of himself as existing in a world, he still lives in a world which, for him, is centred in himself.

Each human being is, as a matter of fact, the centre of his own private universe.

He does not realise this. He would probably scout the idea if it was put to him and yet, when one examines the contents of even one's own mind, the above conclusion is unavoidable. The 'reality' of things to us is, for instance, in a direct ratio to their proximity and to how they affect our lives or those who are dear to us.

Each of us looks into his own private world from behind the iris-curtains of his own eyes and yet - that private world does not really exist, except in us. It has been built up out of the impressions received from outside, but only after they have been sifted, selected, influenced and combined in the way peculiar to the self.

This personal world is, however, the only *real* one to us and in that sense it is true that creation and the convulsions of history had only one object: the preparation for the moment of our personal arrival on earth. It is, in that respect, also true that once we are dead history will have lost its immediate importance.

As a basis for understanding History, such a way of looking at things is obviously useless - although that is the way we do it.

Not from a whimsical sense of humour does the heathen Chinese call his country 'Chung Kuo', i.e., 'The Country of the Middle'. That is really how he sees it, and naturally we grin at his conceit.

We know (don't we?) that the world centres in Berlin, London, Paris or New York - or, possibly, if we are Catholics, in the Rome to which all roads are supposed to lead.

We also, all of us, indulge in the luxury of having a personal God who looks after us specially and who has the rest of the world for step-children. This becomes very apparent when during a war He casts the others off entirely and, becoming the 'God of our Fathers', leaves the poor enemy to the 'Gott unser Väter' or possibly to 'Lenin'.

Because in this way History cannot be understood, we can hardly expect to learn from it. Wherever valuations are made, where ideals are fought for, or principles adopted, it cannot be otherwise than that inconsistencies will develop because none of these are ever universal. When and where such inconsistencies are combined with differences in the power, enormous injustices and catastrophes must eventuate.

The one side tears its cloak and strews the ashes of misery and despair upon its head because the end of the world has arrived while the other side flocks to its churches or its temples to send paeans of thanksgiving across the countryside thanking God for deliverance and 'freedom'.

We should, at least privately, try to avoid this manner of thinking and attempt to look at History in the way that intelligent men should do it - without pride or prejudice. It will then probably not show us what we would like to see, but if that is what is aimed at, one can go to a cinema, or read an escapist novel.

## CHAPTER II

### *'Real' History*

It is true that the word History itself means: "The formal record of the past, especially of human affairs and actions." (Shorter Oxford English Dictionary), and not the events themselves.

If taken as such, 'History' has no living connotation. It is a mere dead record - a library. That with which we are here concerned is not the record but the actual events of human affairs and actions - and that is what we intend to indicate with the name "Real History."

This 'Real History' did not start with the fall of the Greek kings, nor with the first democratic stammerings by Solon. It started long before all that - long before the first Sumerian scribe put his pointed reed to the first clay tablet and left a record for modern men to read. Even when the 'Missing Link' arrived to make his first artefact and think his first independent thought, Real History had already been going for a million years or so.

Basically we are 'living beings' and, as such, we partake of all the characteristics of 'living beings'. One can therefore say that 'we' started when 'life' started on earth and (on this, the third planet, of Sol) life started in the form of what we know as a 'Plant'.

How and from where it came we do not know. It may have been no more than a chemical accident (the million-million to one chance) or a development from cosmic dust, blown in from the empty void, or again as a result of a creative act by a God - it does not really matter. The tale which followed is outlined with reasonable clarity and that is the part with which we are concerned in this discussion.

At first this plant was a simple chemical process which took in raw materials from its surroundings, combined them into 'living' matter and cast them out again as waste. As it grew and specialised, it developed separate organs for these functions; roots to drink, leaves to breathe and a stem to hold them all together. Essentially, however, it was still but a relatively simple physio-chemical reaction which differed from others only in that it was self-sustaining and self-reproducing.

Then - among those primitive plant ancestors a new principle appeared; one which one could nearly call a new 'idea'. Rather than generate and build up organic matter out of inorganic and inert material, it would obviously be much simpler and easier to let other plants do the work first and then to annex the results of their labours for oneself.

On this principle the 'Animal' developed (probably from more humble beginnings as a 'parasite') into a mobile 'Herbivore' - an 'eater of plants'.

This new development in the evolution of life, crushed the plants into a pulp in the special mashing-machine which it had developed, extracted what pre-formed, organic material it could use by means of chemicals, and rejected the rest.

In this way it gained freedom from the necessity for standing all day and all night in the same spot, doing nothing there but absorbing and building up 'living' substances.

Most significantly also, here, right at the beginning of evolution, the basic principle which was eventually to rule all life became abundantly clear.

The Herbivore obtained the first instalment of that most precious of all possessions, 'Freedom', at the expense of the life and on the result of the labours of others.

There were no laws in those days and the Herbivore had no idea that it could be considered 'bad' to live by 'robbery with violence'; and tearing a living being to pieces and chewing it certainly is 'violence'! The Herbivore lacked that essential quality of modern man, a 'conscience'. It saw, it needed, it took, and that was all there was to that.

Obviously this was only the first step and the second started almost at the same time. After all, it still represented quite an amount of labour and an irksome limitation of one's free time to have to eat and chew and digest large amounts of low quality foods in order to extract and build up the complicated proteins needed for an active, mobile life.

The 'Carnivores' saw the obvious solution to that problem very early in the scale of the development of life.

"Let the dumb Herbivore do the dirty work and produce the high-quality protein out of plant material. When he is ready one kills and eats him and the problem of Total Liberty is solved completely - they said - and so they did.

There was no S.P.C.A. in those days. There were no courts of Justice and Heaven remained uniformly blue and impassive when the dying eye of the buck turned up towards it. Nobody saw these things happen and all was well with Creation.

That at this stage pain and terror entered into the picture made no difference either. As we said before: the pattern of History does not know about us, neither about our joys nor about our sorrows; neither about our high hopes and aspirations nor about the depths of despair to which we can sink when our values turn out to be invalid in reality - when we are food instead of feeder.

At the moment when the claw of the Carnivore anchors itself into the flesh of the Herbivore, Nature writes the latter off. As far as she is concerned it does not exist as a 'living being' any more. It has already been turned into 'food'.

All Nature was - and is - concerned about is that a sufficient number of 'lives' should have been started off before this transmutation takes place; and the 'herd principle' among the Herbivores take care of that for her. As long as the race remains in existence and keeps the loom of life aweaving, everything is as it should be.

With the coming of the Carnivore "Liberty" had now really become a thing to be proud of!

All one had to do, if one had the sense to see it, was to select a suitable victim every few days, kill it and eat its flesh. For the rest of the time one was free to lie in the sun upon one's high rock, free to sleep and to gaze lazily down upon the world below.

If there could have been an observer in those days, he would certainly have thought that the maximum possibilities in the situation had been realised, but as we know now, he would have been very wrong.

Among the 'Animals' who inhabited the earth at that time, there was one, an 'Omnivore', an eater of everything, a swallower of fruit and seeds and insects and any other organic material that he could get his teeth into. Originally he had lived in trees, and there he had developed 'hands' with opposing thumbs which could grasp things and therefore handle instruments and weapons. He had acquired binocular vision which gave him the three-dimensional, visual image needed to judge distances among the

branches and the faculty of focussing his visual awareness sharply on one small area to be able to catch his insects.

Finally, besides all these gifts which nature or fate had already bestowed upon him, he also had the latent ability to develop thought, to invent speech as a sort of an Algebra of sound symbols which would enable him to organise the vague ideas in his brain into manipulatable entities.

In time this creature discovered two things, two facts which are so familiar to us now that it takes some effort to realise that they had to be 'discovered'.

The first of them was the remarkable fact that plants develop from seed and that it was therefore possible to determine beforehand where foodplants would grow by placing the seeds where one wanted them!

This made an end to the necessity for seeking food in the forests and the plains and started agriculture. Man (or rather, his wife,) made food grow at his own doorstep.

The second discovery was the fact that Herbivores really are very foolish. As long as they do not feel any immediate danger, they are content to remain where they are, and can therefore, in general, easily be tamed and herded together. In this way they could be transformed into mobile fresh meat stores, ready to be killed without the troubles, the rigours and the dangers of the hunt.

This then started the herdsmen and the nomads of the plains who live on their herds of cattle, goats and sheep.

"Now!" the observer would have said, "the fullness of Liberty certainly must have been attained!"

Work, worry and danger had all been reduced to an absolute minimum. The maximum possible result of the first law of life, namely that "Liberty (and hence Leisure) depends upon taking the life of others and appropriating the results of their labours", had been achieved. This new creature did not even have to fight any more. It just had to stretch out its hand and take what it wanted!

But here, unobserved, the second law of nature sneaked in and became effective.

This law (which has plagued us ever since, and which has snatched the cup of success from our lips time after time) is the very logical antithesis of the first. It states that: "Liberty and Leisure weaken the individual and the race."

As Liberty and Leisure, according to the first law, are the result of being strong and able, these two laws must cancel each other out in the endless seesaw which produces history - the real history of humanity. The effect of the second law did not tarry long in coming for the farmers and the herdsmen.

In the depths of the forests and in the caves of the mountains there were those who had been too improvident or too indolent to do more than what their hands found to do at any particular moment, and it was not long before these 'children of nature' discovered the treasure trove which the provident ones, had amassed in the clearings below.

These primitive ones acted according to the laws of nature and not according to those of the 'Hague Convention'. They came down and took what they found there to be taken. Being tougher, more inured to hardship, and still master of the weapons of the hunt, the result was never in doubt.

A crackling in the underwood, a few cries in the night, and another group of 'workers' had been deprived of both their lives and the accumulated results of their work and forethought. Tomorrow morning the corpses would be dragged out of sight and smelling distance, while the new owners took over.

There were no police to stop this and no laws for the police to implement if there had been.

All was as it had to be, logical and very, very simple.

There was no feeling of injustice here either, for even 'Justice' itself had not been heard of yet. If a man had stood up and said, "Hey! You can't do this! It is Mine. I have worked for it, I have produced it. You have no right to take it away from me!" he would have been considered to be no more than a raving fool whose mind had been unhinged by his 'bad luck'. Even his brother victims would have only shaken their heads over him.

By now the basic pattern that was to be the main motif of human history had already become fairly clear.

The marauders lived on the fat of the land till the larders were empty again, and when that happened they went on to the next settlement. As long as they did only this, they remained fairly fit and able to look after themselves. The understanding of the means by which they 'earned' their living must have kept them aware of the necessity of being able and willing to kill

The next step was, however, too obvious to miss for long. Just as the farmer and the herdsman had tamed the plants and the animals, so the new masters started to 'tame' the farmers and the herdsmen. After all, it was a mere waste to kill them off after the necessary fear and respect had been instilled into them. It was much more sensible to keep them, or at least some of them, alive, able to work and to serve one's needs and whims.

It certainly was more 'sensible'. But it was fatal too.

The ground was, by that change in tactics, prepared for the full and detailed unfolding of the action and the counteraction of the two rules formulated above.

Leisure and Liberty depend upon being able to make others do the basic work for one, while the result of achieving this Leisure and Liberty is again that one degenerates and becomes unable to enforce one's authority, and thereby ends by losing both.

It is one of the amusing paradoxes, of which reality has quite a collection to show us, that by serving well, the servant becomes the master, while the well-served master, in that he ends up by being unable to do without that service, becomes the slave.

The master only remains master as long as he keeps the sword well in evidence, and shows that he is not afraid (or not too squeamish) to use it if necessary. The servant only serves for fear of punishment, pain or death. He does not work for love of the master, although he may be able to delude himself into believing that he does because it gives a tinge of reflected 'nobility' to his servitude.

In the meantime there was 'nothing to do' for the master.

He was up against another paradox which says that an ideal is only an ideal if it is unattainable.

As long as he had to fight and struggle to attain and keep mastery, the master naturally kept himself fit, willing and able to fight, to kill and to break whatever was between him and his desires. Now that



there was nothing left to desire, he also had no direct incentive to keep himself fit. Even if he had the sense to realise that his continued existence and safety depended upon his keeping fit, he still had to force his brain and his commonsense to tell him to practise the use of his weapons. It needed an effort to keep it up, and every pampering slave made the resolve to do so more difficult to sustain. Willpower and intelligent appraisal of the situation are usually not enough to make a man forego the pleasures of the flesh.

Even in the first generation most of the masters already started failing in this duty to themselves - for what, after all, is the use of having servants if one still has to do the work oneself? Pride comes in too, and whispers in one's ear that a master debases himself by doing work. Work is for slaves or 'natives' - for 'inferiors'.

In the attempts to eradicate the Afrikaner idea that 'manual labour' is degrading to the 'white man', and in the insistence that the young people in boarding schools should do their own house work, thereby making them self-sufficient, the realisation of this factor in the evolution of a healthy state has recently come to the fore. It is here that those who jeer at these 'experiments' show their lack of understanding of what is happening.

To counteract this natural decline, the master groups always build up a tradition which entails the use of weapons. The teaching of the young 'noblemen' in all ages and civilisations, has always been towards proficiency in the use of weapons and a thorough training in the art of killing one's fellow men.

Sparta was an example of this. There the 'keep fit' motif was elevated to a religion; but even in our emasculated society, up to not so long ago, the elder sons of the 'noble' families always went into the army.

The symbol of 'nobility' again is the sword, which is the weapon of the man who fights face to face with an enemy and who is not afraid of personally killing another and risking death in the process.

The weapon of the serf is the bow and arrow which kills at a distance (and often from ambush); while on the villain's belt there hangs the dirk, the weapon of the assassin.

The basic and only characteristic of the master and of the 'noble', however much this is glossed over, is still the willingness and the ability to fight and, if necessary, to kill. It distinguishes him from the civilian and the bourgeoisie who had rather run away or swallow an insult than get hurt in a quarrel.

The willingness and even the readiness to fight does not germinate easily in the character of a youngster growing up among a horde of slaves who pamper him. As the memory of the bad and dangerous old days fades, the sword becomes no more than a symbol of rank, a 'dress-sword' as it is called. The ability to fight becomes a mere braggadocio, which finally deceives no one; and there is an end to a 'nobility' which, once again, has been 'pampered to death' by the slaves for the acquisition of whose services it was originally instituted.

The old masters disappear, degenerate beyond redemption or are overrun by a new, more virile generation of men who are still 'on the make' and who boisterously demand their turn at the fleshpots of life.

Ever since those far off days, in single instances, in small groups, on a national or even a 'racial' scale, this same little drama has been played out in thousands of variations, which are, like love, always the same and yet ever new. Through bloodshed and violence to mastership, through mastership to leisure and luxury, through leisure and luxury to degeneration and through degeneration to death, is the inevitable and unbreakable circle which no one has ever been able to escape for long.



## Chapter III

### *The Anatomy of a 'Civilisation'*

The greatest and most striking examples of these fatal 'circles' are the so-called 'Civilisations'. In them we find the whole process worked out in marvellous detail, and it is because of this basic similarity in structure and in the sequence of events in them, that Oswald Spengler with strange (but typically German) 'Materialistic Mysticism', was lured into seeing in civilisations, individual, living entities with more or less predetermined life histories.

Obviously that is not so.

A Civilisation is not something which is already esoterically there when it starts to manifest itself in the pages of history, just as the flight of a rocket is not something that is already there when it 'manifests itself in reality'. Both the flight of that rocket and the course of a Civilisation are the simple effects of the forces originally present, acting and reacting on each other and on their surroundings.

Like the private marauding lord or the robber baron, Civilisations also start with murder - murder on a large scale - wholesale, organised murder if one likes.

That this must be so becomes obvious the moment one takes the trouble to think about it.

When everyone in a community has to work all his waking time to earn the wherewithal to live, there will be very little chance and still less inclination to develop the arts and the sciences which are the backbone of any Civilisation worthy of the name. A man's food and drink, his wife and his bed, will be enough to fill any spare time that may still be available to him.

Only when he has nothing to do, when he has time to sit down and ponder, can a man develop his sense for the beautiful and create the Arts; think more deeply about things and develop Ethics and Philosophy; ponder about the why and the wherefore of being alive and develop Metaphysics and Religions; study the workings of nature for their own sake and develop the Sciences, which again, driven by self-interest, he can use to create Industry. Only when he himself has leisure to design them and when, under him, there is a plentitude of slave labour, can he build the palaces and the temples which have been the hallmark of all successful Civilisations up to now. (In our case the development of the 'machine as a slave' makes a difference, but this difference is not as deep as one would suppose, as we will see later.)

Also, only when the master has leisure and power, can he get round to organising the state so that it will have a certain measure of stability, and without stability no Civilisation could ever emerge or remain in existence. There must therefore be Politics and Social Sciences under whatever name one would like to hide them; a knowledge and a study of the 'Art of Ruling Men'.

Alas, all this does not come by itself. To become a powerful master, a man with enough free time to play with the unessential, a man with enough servants to be able to do 'big' things, (or rather, to have them done), one must first subdue one's underlings and put the fear of death into them, and this can obviously only be well and thoroughly done by a period of wholesale slaughter and 'inhuman' cruelty.

Here again we find another of the paradoxes of life, namely: the good of evil and the evil of good. Only by the evil of holocausts and arson can the 'great' achievements of humanity eventuate, while through the good of ethical conceptions, (which are developed in the peace of Civilisations at their height) the

masters, as we see happening once again, in our day, are given an excuse not to want to fight any more, not to want to be masters, and therefore to prepare the ground for an end to it all.

The slave does not come up to the level of the master; it is the master who crumbles and tumbles down to the level of the slave. There is an end not only to mastership, but to self-respect and peace and plenty for all.

Much of this is hidden from our eyes at the present peaceful stage of our Civilisation, but it is there nevertheless.

Thinly disguised, under the characteristics and qualities of our 'modern' life, which are so familiar to us that we never have thought it worth while to look at them for a second time, the age-old seesaw is still going up and down.

As killing each other lies at the root of Civilisations, we naturally find at the beginning of each of them, a new perfection of the ways man has of murdering man. For every Civilisation there was a new weapon or a new way of fighting, which put the neighbouring tribes at the mercy of the emergent one.

Even the man with no more than a general knowledge of such things will be able to remember the Persian Cavalry, the Greek Phalanx, the Roman short sword and finally our own supreme effort - Gunpowder; to mention but a few.

All of them are well known, but they are seen only as 'reasons' for the 'military' success of the Civilisations concerned. The fact that these Civilisations could not have come into being without these weapons and methods of fighting used in an aggressive way, is not always apparent to the average reader of history who is still steeped in the traditional 'glory' of military victories and 'world conquerors' and who, therefore cannot see that 'world conquering' is only wholesale 'robbery with violence' on a worldwide scale. (It can be nothing else, for one would have to be very foolish to believe that men will fight others and risk being killed by them for no other purpose than to do them good!)

It is naturally a moot point whether the new weapon is the result of the new spirit which inspires the budding Civilisation, or if the Civilisation is the result of the military successes produced by it.

Probably the truth lies between the two extremes. Neither can by itself completely explain the events we know of. One reads of the hordes of Huns who held the largest part of Europe in bondage for several generations and left no trace of a Civilisation behind them; while, in South Africa, there is the example of Chaka, who (obviously inspired by some misguided missionary's tales about the Roman short swords and well-disciplined cohorts) laid waste most of the northern part of present day South Africa with his Zulu Impis, armed with short stabbing assegais. He found his 'new weapon' and his 'new method of fighting' but, as it did not come out of the nature of his people, the whole thing petered out almost before it had begun, well before the white man arrived to put a final end to it.

There is, however, an undoubted significance in the way in which the new weapons fit in with the spirit of their inventors; the volatile Persians; the matter-of-fact Greeks; the hard, dour, aggressive Romans and finally the guns of the 'Machine-makers' of our era. In each case 'The Weapon' fits in snugly into the Civilisation it serves.

On the other hand again, one can find any number of tribes and communities with special characteristics out of which Civilisations could have been developed but which, for lack of military overlordship and the leisure consequent on being master, never developed beyond folklore and homecraft.

However that may be, we find that all the Civilisations we know of start with the subjugation of the neighbouring tribes over an area whose final limits are set by the methods of transport and communication available at the time.

The young bucks of the rising group swarm out and 'carve themselves a fortune' at relatively small danger to themselves in comparison to the prizes they win. There is a general sense of well being, of 'being master of one's fate', of having been 'called' and being specially favoured by the gods. Under its spell the still latent capabilities and talents of the group spring up and start to develop, unhampered by the worry about tomorrow.

All eyes shine with energy and the knowledge of being the bearers of the fate of the world which is their own. Almost overnight (that is, in a generation or two) the new Civilisation is there, complete in all its essentials, waiting only for the last touches to achieve its ultimate perfection.

The first sign that this stage has been reached is the appearance of a 'Lawmaker' and the 'Sanctification of Ownership'.

Every Civilisation has had to have these two, for without them the full mead of leisure could not become available.

The basis for the characteristics of the Civilisation that is to be, has at this stage been laid down. Arts, science, religion, philosophy and industry are there in embryo; but as long as the conquering hero has to keep his mind on his sword arm and to make sure that his back is well covered, their development is obviously much hampered.

When the new 'master' realises this, he sees that the time has come to consolidate his position in such a way that he can enjoy his booty, and, incidentally, develop whatever amuses him. He is tired of sleeping with his sword rather than with his wife or his slave girl and he therefore creates Social Sciences, Economics, Jurisprudence and Politics.

The first principle brought in is that of the personal ownership of things and its sanctification by law.

To many it may be strange to realise that 'ownership' is not a natural relationship between a 'possession' and its 'owner'. In the real world there is simply no such thing as ownership, as we understand it now.

'This is mine', in reality, means only: 'I can prevent others from taking this'. It has never meant anything else - and it never will.

At a certain moment in the development of his Civilisation, the conqueror says: "This is enough! We will now declare a moratorium!

"Everyone has what he has. The game has ended and, as from today, this 'having' is no longer by right of 'being able to defend it', but by a 'divine right' which I hereby institute, signed, sealed and ratified on such and such a day, by so and so, Emperor Rex, By the Grace of God (assisted by my trusty weapon and the fear of death)."

Yesterday it was 'each for himself and good luck to the strongest or the wiliest'. Today a man who takes something from another is a dirty thief. What yesterday was the basic characteristic of the 'noble' man is, as from today, the action of a despicable criminal.

The odd thing is that every time this happens the conqueror has got away with it, to be lauded by our History for what amounts to the 'buying of safety' by the inversion of values.

However that may be, with the arrival of the Law peace descended on the land. Leisure for the possessing classes was thereby redoubled, for the necessity of defending their spoils was taken away from those who possessed, by a Judicial system and some form of a police force, paid for by all (even by those who had nothing to lose). At the same time, however, the ex-victims could heave a sigh of relief, for even if they had lost everything, now at least they would be relatively safe. It was no use moaning. One could at least start building again.

It is obvious that this 'Law' with its sanctity of ownership is a piece of genius. The stability, and therefore the possibility for further development of the Civilisation depend upon the type of laws produced and the efficiency with which they are implemented.

"This is mine" from now on, means: "If you try to take this from me - I will call a policeman. He will see to it that you get punished."

It had to be, however, that under the effect of such a situation the weapons of the 'nobility' lost all rationality and degenerated into symbols, till finally they disappeared.

The original show of power was a nuisance and a possible stimulating irritant to those enthusiasts who like to die for Liberty! The advent of the Law made fools of these potential Heroes.

Fighting against the Law manifestly puts one in the wrong. The Law defends 'everybody' and fighting against it is trying to go back to the 'bad' old days before the Moratorium. Such a rebel is a self-declared 'out'-law - an outcast, who will soon find himself fleeing before the yapping curs of the market-place.

With the development of the Law comes the development of the State as a unit, and therefore Politics. The powers that have been distributed haphazardly have to be organised and welded into one whole and for this, the basic patriarchal pattern (found in all 'conquering' tribes, where the 'matriarchal' are more static) will not do. It therefore disappears except for a few minor aspects (such as 'votes for men' only). The new state now consists of a set of rich, proud 'owners', a nobility of barons and lords in their own right with more or less grandiose ideas about their personal power and freedom backed by the 'state'.

The first form of government (often mistaken by the sentimental historian as democratic) is therefore the rule by a group of aristocrats banded together under the leadership of a 'strong' man, a 'king' whom they have selected and lifted up on a throne or the shield, for all to see and obey. He is not a king because of his place in the structure of the community, but by the choice of the strong - the masters, which is the choice of God - 'Rex Dei Gratia'.

From here on the history of the government is one continuous battle for power.

The King attempts to make his position hereditary; the Nobles try to curb this tendency and to manoeuvre themselves into a position where they can slice off a larger piece of the communal cake than the others.

For generation after generation this struggle is waged to and fro with variable success.

In the meantime the second law of nature takes over and, not having been formulated by man, it takes very little notice of the varied guises and disguises under which power and influence appear.

The first law has done its best, or its worst, depending on which way one looks at it. It has produced luxury, leisure and liberty and allowed them to develop to the full, according to the latent possibilities in the conquerors, but automatically that gift itself weakens the drive.

A life of ease and lack of worry, softens the will to be up and doing. Tomorrow there will be another day, and here already we can note the first appearance of the downward pattern in that the old men start complaining about the 'slackness' of the younger generation, their lack of drive, conscientiousness and general worthwhileness, which is moderated by the consoling thought that, as their own fathers had the same complaints about them, it probably was all no more than an illusion to which crabbed old age is subject. The idea that each Civilisation, once it has passed its zenith, must necessarily be on the downgrade and that, even if not discernable from year to year, it could be sensed from generation to generation, has (because of its apocalyptical implications) never been accepted by anyone, just as it is not accepted by us at this very day.

There is, however, no doubt, even during the middle stages of every Civilisation, that fortunes are now not made at the frontiers any more. They are made on the markets and the stock exchanges of home, where most of the treasures of the conquered lands have by this time been transferred.

The wise boys at home are by now reaping a rich reward and only a fool would go and have himself killed in far-off lands to safeguard their possessions for them. The youth of the nation logically refuses to go out voluntarily. Conscription causes too much discontent, and mercenaries (like the Praetorian Guard) often end by terrorising and dominating their masters. Finally nothing helps but to practise 'astute statesmanship', to manipulate the relationship with friends and enemies in such a way that one comes off best without fighting, and/or, at the worst, with only a minor 'strategical' withdrawal.

At home there is a flattening-out, for, although it is true that those who have shall receive, and that from those who have not, even that which they have shall be taken away - this interesting paradox remains active and safeguards the possessions of the 'owners' only for a few generations.

The great fortunes of the original nobles crumble away in the fumbling hands of degenerating descendants who never have known the necessity to fight for their own and have no sense for the real value, in human effort, which their riches represent.

The 'Commoner' rises everywhere He obtains a seat in government. He amasses fortunes in his own right under the disdainful sneers of the old guard and he obtains power without being restrained by the traditions of using it.

As time passes by, the 'Arts' come to the end of the special possibilities present in the outlook on reality and in the innate talents for expression of that special group of people. They turn into the production of hollow imitations of 'classical' shapes and forms or swing over to the other extreme of 'anything goes'.

Science reaches the final limits of the way of thinking of the group and starts to stumble over thinking errors which are hidden from its own view because they are contained in the 'method' of thinking and not in the application of that method. (Like the Greeks, for instance, when they tried to apply their static thinking to the problems of dynamics.)

Religion, originally fired by the manifest and palpable blessings their gods showered upon their hallowed heads, finds, as twilight closes in that 'the gods are dead'. The need for individual religious succour is supplied by sects and superstitions.

Justice begins to play with words.

Government becomes more and more impotent as the incumbents of the positions of power and trust believe less and less in both the sanctity of their calling and the value of human rights and privileges which they administer.

Slowly but surely the whole system sinks back into 'Fellahinism', the flat, uninteresting monotony of spiritless, unambitious, cowardly nonentities - not even able to be really happy in the absence of actual trouble in their lives.

And there it stays, unless a more virile neighbouring group which has found its 'new weapon', starts on the way upwards.

The Civilisation has forgotten the basis of its own way of life. It has forgotten that it depends upon being Master and that being master depends upon the ability to keep the slaves and other workers with their noses to the grindstone. Those who do remember think, in this connection, only of the ability to 'punish' and to 'administer discipline' but there is much more to it even than that.

One can only remain Master when one is in all respects more able than the slaves and servants. Not only must one be able to fight better and, if necessary, kill more efficiently, one must also be able to do the work better, be able to think better, and in all respects be one jump ahead of one's underlings.

However peaceful and friendly the socio-economic situation looks that is still a rule which governs everything. And will always do so.

The moment the master becomes in any way dependent upon the slave, the slave has become the master.

To remain a Master one must remain independent and partake of the ministrations of servants 'as a luxury' only, and not as a part of one's way of life, and it is as well to remember that this applies as much to being served by a human servant as by a machine, but about that later.

All this is the simple, matter-of-fact, inevitable and logical, inescapable cause-and-effect structure of our human endeavours and Civilisations here on earth.

If one likes, one can experiment with taking this framework and filling it in with the known details of any of the so-called Civilisations of which we have sufficient records, and it will be found that all of them fit. The outer aspects may be as different as night and day. They may be in our estimation 'good' or 'bad', 'high' or 'low', but it will still be found that the basic structure is the same, be it the Civilisation of the Aztecs or the Incas, the Egyptians, the Babylonians or the Medes and the Persians, the Greeks, the Chinese, the Caliphate, the Moguls or the Kahns, or even the miniature Civilisation discovered by Thor Heyerdahl to have existed on Easter Island (which is, remarkably, the only one where the slaves really exterminated their own masters, a deed for which they usually lack the 'gumption').

In this book, as the title states, we are only concerned with the vagaries, past, present and future (especially future) of our own particular example of the process.

Our Civilisation is certainly the most interesting one of all, not only because it is our own, and because we are intimately concerned with it; but also because it has a few characteristics which the others lack and which throw up new problems and develop new possibilities.

In the first place we have here the astounding contradiction between the religious conceptions and the driving spirit of our civilisation. In the second place, in inventing the Machine, which is the ideal slave (almost omnipotent but without personal feelings, ambitions and possible animosities,) it may be considered possible that we have broken, or created the material for breaking, the charmed ring in which Civilisations have had to travel up to now.



## CHAPTER IV

### *Our Civilisation*

#### **(Introduction)**

It is to all intents and purposes a truism to say that all civilisations have been different' and that, although in general they all had the same structure or 'lifecycles', each of them has had a special combination of qualities which distinguished it from the others.

This combination of conformity to a basic pattern together with the presence of what one could nearly call 'personal' characteristics, lured Spengler into seeing real 'personalities' in civilisations and, in a certain way, he was undoubtedly right.

After all, even a living being like man himself, is not a something, but simply a 'relationship', or a shape, which is 'occupied' by matter that is continually in the process of being taken in and being cast out again. We are something like a wave which travels over the surface of the ocean but which does not really exist as a 'thing'. The wave, too, is but a 'shape' into and out of which the material water flows.

In the same way a civilisation is a structure in, or a form of, a combination of relationships among a set of people and, as such, it has the general characteristics of the actual human individuals who are born into it and who, after a few years, die out of it again.

Spengler, with his basic mysticism, sees this process as a 'spirit' emerging from the inside, and inspiring the individuals of a certain ethnological group to do great deeds. He sees in the individual members of that group no more than impersonal carriers of that spirit - the 'genius of the age' - and, for him, it lives itself out through them.

This idea is repugnant to our self-respect but that would not be an argument against it if, in any way, it was a necessary condition for a reasonable explanation of the whole problem.

This is definitely not so.

As a matter of fact this mystical conception causes more problems than it solves. It contradicts commonsense and is certainly not necessary.

If we accept the basic idea that Civilisations can only develop where there is Leisure and Liberty to do so; that such Leisure is dependent upon being Master and that being Master is the result of military supremacy; then there is no need for an 'inspiring genius' to explain the Phenomenon of Civilisations at all.

As Leisure will obviously bring out the good and the bad in the individuals concerned, this will explain their often completely different personal quality, which leaves the basic mechanism of 'rise followed by the inevitable decay' intact. It will explain the known examples of stillborn Civilisations and of those who never were able to 'complete' themselves.

In Man, the development of the consciousness from the pure, nearly memoryless, reflex-consciousness of the animal, up to the highly developed perceptiveness of the artist and the deep, abstract thinking of the philosopher and the scientist, did not happen in one gradual ascent.

It was a development in stages and each stage represented a step, an advance, a something new. Each such step meant not only an advance but also a definite advantage to those who achieved it, or in whom it happened to occur.

As such, each step gave the recipients a superiority over their competitors, which they were quick to exploit. In consequence each such advance meant a new Civilisation during which the new development was tried out to the final limits of its possibilities.

In this connection we must realise that these new developments were not developments of the 'soul' or the 'spirit' of man alone.

At the root of each such new characteristic there must lie a change in the physical brain. No soul obtains new viewpoints on reality all by itself. It can only do so if that quality is represented, in an active or latent form, in the relative material brain tissue. Such a novelty therefore, meant that a new quality had been developed or had occurred in the brain of a certain group of men, a new contact had been established, a new 'centre' had been created, and, as one cannot accept a general change happening all by itself all over humanity, one has to remember that this change must have happened originally in individual brains. Some definite reason, such as the mixing of two or more racial units, or the appearance of a single mutation among them with a 'dominant' characteristic in his or her genes, must lie at the root of it.

What is important here is to realise that whatever the cause, the new characteristic must have been definitely limited to the group among whom it developed, at least until such time as the Civilisation which was founded upon it broke up and scattered its members among the rest of humanity. Only then could and did they sow the new characteristic out into the matrix of humanity itself.

The backwaters of humanity isolated on islands like Australia, or in the depth of the Jungles, remained much as they were after their first steps above the animal level.

These others are not 'inferior' to the 'new' men, they are well and better able to survive in their own surroundings, as they have demonstrated in practice. They only have less combinations at their disposal.

Their minds are more simple; they cannot appreciate Shakespeare or Goethe, their ways of arriving at conclusions are still much nearer to the instinct-ruled ways of their ancestors. They are not the 'Noble Savages' of our romantic salad-days but neither are they the idiot half-brothers of modern man.

It would take several life-times of devoted study to analyse the different stages of the development of the mind of man and discover what exactly the different Civilisations eventually added to the common pool.

Doing so here would divert us too far from our main theme, but we can at least point to the curious traces of the attempts of man to creep back into the anonymity of animalhood after, with the help of the Word and his Tools, he had left that stage behind for ever. In the mysterious illogicalities of Totemic beliefs we find the same 'end of a civilisation' spirit which makes the White man of today vehemently deny his 'superiority' over the other races. Like us, the newly awakened man of those primitive days wanted to go back and be 'of one blood' with all his sweet animal 'friends' of yore.

Such a thing is obviously impossible. The new characteristic stains or influences all the thinking of the individual and he can never go back, even if he declares all crocodiles to be his blood-brothers or dedicates an annual thanksgiving plus the most ingenious explanations and excuses for the killing of the animals which he has done during the past year.

In those days, slowly, and step by step, man became conscious of existing. Where the animal was merely 'conscious of something', man started to place himself in the picture. He did not only realise 'there is something', he placed 'it' in relation to himself.

Helped by the 'algebra' of language, he succeeded in building in his mind a more or less complete replica of the image-of-reality which he had received from outside; and in which model he could do his thinking, that is, his 'pre-testing of the results of proposed actions'.

Most of the intermediate stages have disappeared. They had no traces to leave for us except in the mystical allusions in folklore and fairytale. We finally find historical man appear in Sumer, where as S. N. Kramer says: "It never occurred to them to raise any questions concerning the fundamental nature of reality and knowledge"; and later: "To take even so relatively simple a principle as 'Cause and effect', the Sumerian thinker, while fully aware of the innumerable examples of its operation, never came upon the idea of formulating it as a general, all-prevailing law." ("History Begins at Sumer", p. 127, Thames & Hudson, London.)

His mind was still living a more or less 'hand-to-mouth', existence with the outer world.

The subsequent civilisations around the hub of the three continents added to the stores of human awareness step by step, each his little piece, but nowhere did reality become really 'real-in-its-own-right' to them. When we look at the civilisations which are not a part of the Greek-Roman-Renaissance series, we find that they have much more in common with each other (even when miles and ages apart in different epochs and different continents) than they have with us.

All of them have the crude form of 'Master-slave degenerating into Slave-master' sequence, without any apparent attempts at adjusting it. All have a Master-race or a Clique with absolute control over slave populations, (who build often fantastic edifices in an attempt to immortalise the Masters, like the Pyramids of Egypt and the Aztecs, the Taj Mahal and the Mausoleums all over the middle East, where the Greek and Roman edifices were more in the nature of temples to the honour of their gods or individual 'heroes').

The graphic arts of these civilisations may have been beautiful but they strike us mostly as somewhat childish. The drawings miss depth. The background is telescoped into a sort of a 'wallpaper effect' containing a projection of all that is present in the consciousness of the observer. This is expressed, not as it is, in space and in reality, but as a background to that which is under mental observation.

Their literature consists of long tales of happenings without affording much insight into the inner drives and workings of the soul or the mind. In them, nature and its moods and manifestations are inextricably mixed up with the human element living among them. Few of them have a 'plot', a beginning or an end.

Their music has sequences of notes in melodies - and rhythm rather than the three dimensional effect created by harmony. Their Laws are rules of conduct rather than the expression of an Absolute Justice. Their Philosophies and Religions are often surprisingly deep and rich truths which are wrapped up in interminable inanities and florid, hypertrophied symbolism just as if some eternal wisdom had been caught in a material not yet able to do it justice.

When one examines these Culture-civilisations, one senses that the people of whom they consisted lived and still live in what we would consider to be a 'closed' world. Their drawings give a correct picture of how they see the world and are not due to either the inability to draw or because they want to make 'abstractions' or 'impressions' or whatever our art critics see in them.

The Philosophy and Magic of the East and the Voodoo of Africa, are built not upon reality, but upon the connections and associations things have in the mind; that is, in the only world which is real to them. There, and there only, is there an unbreakable 'oneness' between things which happen to have the same name. There 'knowing the name' gives power over the bearer of it, for the name can call up the image! There also the part and the whole are one, so that what happens to the spittle and the nailparings of a person will, in a way, also happen to him. There, there is a certain reality and validity in dreams; and there the mind of the man in a trance does travel round and sees the world, as Lobsang Rampa (in 'The Third Eye') claims that the Tibetans are able to do at will without explaining why he then needed to go, in his physical body, to study at foreign universities! To such a mind it is also possible to influence the fall of dice with the will, produce levitation and select lucky numbers with the self-evident acceptance with which the not-European does it.

All these things are the products of minds who have not yet arrived at the point where reality becomes 'real' to them, to whom it is not yet something which exists by itself outside us, despite the images we have of it, despite the wishes with which we try to influence it and the tantrums we throw when fate does not smile at us.

For some unknown reason the Greeks suddenly saw things differently. For some unknown reason they suddenly became aware of the 'autonomous reality' of things.

One needs but to take one look at a typical Greek statue to realise that here there is an expression of the idea, the vivid awareness of existence. This reality is so strongly felt that these statues have no surroundings. They stand alone, even when in a hall or on the same pedestal (and possibly even combined into one group) with each other, like the Laocoon.

Each is an 'existence by itself'.

This is brought home still more when one compares Greek sculpture with that of the rest of its contemporary world. The statues of the East do not belong in the open air, they are a part of their surroundings, so much so, that one could nearly call them 'three-dimensional bas-reliefs'.

It is that which seems so strange about the Diabutsu Buddha in Japan. When one stands before that great figure, the absence of the temple round it is somehow unnatural and distressing. It feels naked and unprotected as if the temple had been broken down in preparation for the building of a new one. One instinctively looks round for signs of building activities and they are not there!

Greek painting also suffers from the nearly painful accentuation of the fact that the figures exist, and this is so strong that the artists never even seem to have felt the need of inserting an indication of a background at all.

Spengler noticed all this, but he saw in it only the specific characteristic of the Greek civilisation which he thought to be caused by the sharp sunlight on the deep blue sea and the white-cliffed islands of its Aegaeon motherland. He did not notice that this 'sense of reality' was something new and not just something different in the development of man.

Life had become conscious in the 'higher animals. In Man it had become conscious of being conscious and now, in the Greeks, but only in the Greeks, it had become conscious of the fact that 'something existed' outside. For the first time this consciousness realised that it was not just a 'consciousness by itself' but a 'consciousness of something'. The reality had shifted from the inner image to that of which it was the image. All Greek culture and civilisation and its difference from what went before it, can be deduced from and understood by this fact which is, to us, so self-evident that it takes some thought to

realise and accept that it was not obvious to the non-Greeks and is, even now, not a tenth as self-evident to the not-European as it is to us.

All the culture and civilisation of the Greek, his art, his philosophy and his science was an attempt to accommodate this new factor into his life and to live with it.

The far-reaching effects of such a realisation can hardly be overestimated.

With the realisation of the existence of 'things by themselves' outside, and the fact that they were not ruled by our awareness, came the need for the existence of autonomous laws to explain the predictability of happenings in the real world. Up to then things just happened because they happened like that in our awareness, and we never asked why it should happen just like that, because in a way, we were ourselves the cause. When the unusual or the unexpected eventuated, some 'abnormal' influence was at work. Even now most aboriginal people still do not accept death from disease or old age as normal. They insist that malign influences must be at work.

With the coming of a self-sustained existence outside and immutable laws for their relationships, an entirely new way of thinking had to arrive also.

It is strange that it has never yet been realised that the idea of a 'law of nature' is entirely confined to the Greek civilisation and its direct descendants, and it is here already that we can see the first glimmer of the reason why our education of the not-European has met with such little success.

This new conception brought the Greek to the analysis of the relations between facts which is 'Logic'. Where laws remained constant for all things, he learned to work with abstractions which stood for 'all things that had a certain property or group of properties in common'. He learned to see things not as individuals but as possessors of certain properties which made them part of certain groups to which again certain laws applied. His thinking changed from considering a certain object and feeling what factors applied to it, to one of analysing to what group or category a certain object belonged so that he could know what laws were applicable. This was the origin of the concept of 'definitions', a concept that is still confined only to 'Western' thinking. Then, when the laws had been defined, the Greek applied them and considered the effect on the particular instance of the case which he had in hand.

There was, however, one defect as compared to our modern conception of reality, which put a limit to the Greek possibilities. He simply had no idea of Space and Time. This meant that all his thinking had to be Static.

Naturally he knew that Space and Time existed (as the rest of the world knew that 'things' existed) but Space and Time were somehow not really real' to him.

This became glaringly obvious when the Greek tried to attack problems which contain these factors.

His strange conclusions about the inability of Ajax to overtake the Tortoise, and his 'Nothing Moves' because there can be no empty space for things to move aside into, are but a pair of examples known to everyone. Students of the history of Mathematics can supply many more. (Greek mathematics could for instance not accommodate the 'empty zero' and was therefore doomed to stagnation.) For him there were only existing 'things'.

To this new development the Romans added a sense for the practical, the basic matter-of-fact attitude which brought them to mastership of nearly all the world as far as it was at all accessible and worth subduing. This practical sense was partially or wholly the result of seeing existence-in-its-surroundings, which is demonstrated and confirmed again in Roman art, in that although the statues still remain

monuments to existing, their paintings and mosaics do not only contain backgrounds but even show the first indications of perspective, that is, they are drawings in which the picture represents a space with something or somebody in it.

When finally the Greco-Roman civilisation dies out, all this disappears and we find once again the old telescoping of background and foreground plus the symbolical rather than representative painting of the Italian primitives, which distinguishes itself from that of the East only in total lack of movement and the awkward stances of its subject matter.

This, more or less, was the condition of humanity and the material Present when the curtain rose for the world premiere of the Occidental civilisation which was to culminate in 'Uncle Tom's Cabin, and is now finally ending in 'All men are Brothers'. (In which the sentimentalists seem to forget that the worst hatreds the world has ever known have always been between brothers or near relations)

## CHAPTER V

### *Our Civilisation*

#### (Upsurge)

What was missing in the Greco-Roman image of reality, as far as we are concerned, was Time - the sense of Time passing on by itself a Time not solely geared to our own mind and awareness.

The Semitic people of the Middle East, the Egyptians, the Arabs and the Jews had achieved that very much earlier (hence their preoccupation with Astronomy, the determination of time and the almost immediate reality which Eternity must have had for the Egyptians in order to stimulate them into building their pyramids and spending so much ingenuity on embalming their dead).

Now, during the mixed up years after the fall of Rome and its Empire, there was a flattening out and a breaking down of barriers between the Semitic blood which the Phoenicians had left around the shores of the Mediterranean, and the Greco-Roman stock along its northern shores, not forgetting an admixture of 'Teutonic' genes, coming down from the North in the loins of the Franks and the Longobards. With the Crusades again, new Semitic blood came in from the East and for a few hundred years this anthropological stew simmered merrily away, long before the fall of Constantinople which, (in our history books) gave the opening signal for the appearance of the 'Renaissance'.

This latter idea is one of the typical and quaint deductions one finds all over official history. If the material which was stored in the monasteries was really so potent that a distribution of it caused the giant reaction of our civilisation to eventuate all by itself, it should have burnt the monks and the librarians who had been holding it in trust for humanity!

It may be that this 'little extra' served to light the match which set the world aflame, but the fuel had to be there first and the fuel was the fact *that the mind of the people to the north of the Mediterranean had acquired a new way of seeing, a new way of being aware.*

For them the 'reality' of 'things' existed, outside them in a 'space' and during a period of 'time' which both were as real and as self-existent, as the things themselves.

It is here that Spengler derails completely, and for two reasons. In the first place his mystic conception of Civilisations as Entities, as Persons in their own right, did not need any explanation other than the distinguishing of a basic characteristic which would make it into such a personality. In the second place, being an intensely chauvinistic German, he had to make his beloved race the race which was destined to play the major role in the twilight of the Occident. These two requisites were neatly solved by Spengler seeing in the Occidental civilisation only the 'Leitmotif' of 'Space', and by finding its origin in the 'sense of space and depth' created by the slightly misty forests of the cradle of his own personal people.

What he does not seem to notice (and which oversight is in itself highly significant in that it is the particular facet which has not emerged from his race) is that Time is just as important, if not very much more important in the Occidental Image of Existence, because it fully admits movement into the basic image.

During the Renaissance (which only in the dictionaries of the Pedants is a 're-birth') a group of men (not 'Mankind' or 'Man') saw the world outside for the first time as a fully integrated system. A Space in which Things moved, acted, and reacted, influenced each other, pushed and pulled and pressed upon each other during a series of simultaneities, separated by what was felt to be 'intervals of Time'.

Where originally the realisation of 'existence' had a deep and far-reaching effect on the thinking of the Greeks - the realisation of 'real' things moving according to 'real' laws in Space and Time caused a revolution in the whole lives of those in whom it occurred - but again not to the whole world as we are apt to think.

It was as if everything, even existence itself, had opened up. Nothing was impossible any more. Nothing was inexplicable. Everything had a simple, material explanation. Everything suddenly became alive, as we can see in the paintings of those days. The gestures are instants stolen out of the moving tapestry of time. They are arrested a fraction of a second before they have achieved their object or their moment of equilibrium. The draperies sway out in the cool wind which blows through everything. Space fills the pictures with crystal clear transparent air. The backgrounds become more and more perfect till they are an object of artistic expression by itself, ending in the production of pure landscape art.

The connection of the moment with the past, and with the as yet non-existent future, which is entirely lacking in the Greeks and the Romans, is palpable everywhere.

Where Greek and Roman philosophy concentrated on the nature of things, here we find examination of the relationship between things and their surroundings or with the matrix of time in which they exist.

With the fearless intrepidity of youth, western man investigated this new world and walked blithely where angels feared to tread. At every mental step new vistas opened and heedlessly he rushed in and onward.

The world did not consist only of things and static relationships any more. Now there were forces and relative movements in an evanescent time which was still measurable and Absolute. Western man felt that at last he had to deal with Absolute truths into which he could anchor himself, truths more real and more eternally valid than any he had known in the past. There the only truths had been religious and magical formulae which only too often let one down, and which had to be patched up by unsatisfactory syllogisms and apologies.

In this new world of 'things-which-existed' (and which would always remain in existence) in an understandable space composed of fixed distances, and moved by definite forces originated by definite causes (which could therefore be calculated and repeated and directed) there was such a haven of security that it is no wonder that he leaped into it with all he had. It is no wonder that Materialism, naive as it was, ousted Religion out of the minds and souls of the intelligent.

Although many of the laws of nature were as yet only to be actually formulated into words very much later on, their spirit already permeated everything. The laws on the indestructibility of matter, the conservation of energy, the constancy of gravity, the inevitableness of inertia, the necessity of a cause for each effect, and above all, the laws on the survival of the fittest, the feeling that a man must stand or fall by what he is and what he can do, - all of them were there and they created a world on which one could get a grip, a dependable world in which one could go to sleep and be sure that it would still all be there, just like that, tomorrow. All this seems so obvious to us that it is hard to realise that it is only our way of seeing things - and not that of the 'others'. These things are only true for us.

It is a practicable impossibility for us to think ourselves into a Universe where they do not obtain, as impossible as it is to think ourselves into the world of the congenitally blind, or to imagine what the colour of Infra-red is to the animal who can see it. It is as impossible as it is for a man to think himself into the world of a woman or for a woman to do the same to a man. It is, finally, as impossible as it is for the not-European to think himself into the world in which we live or vice versa.



On the conception of this immutable, definable and comprehensible world, we have built our mathematics, with infinitely variable ratios, unreal numbers and abstract numbers ending in Calculus and Integrals. Music, which after all, is the very expression of Time and Space, became our supreme artistic expression just as sculpture, the art of material solidity, was that of the Greeks. Behind all this, Science started stirring in its sleep, Science which is the effect of the realisation of the existence of a world where everything is as it is and in no way different. In this world it would only be a matter of understanding how it worked or how it was integrated if one wished to become a master of one's environment and attain the final victory of the living-being over fate.

The material expression of all this is the Machine, which is as much the symbol characterising our Civilisation as the long pillared-in road was that of the Egyptians and as the meandering garden path was that of the Chinese Civilisation, as Spengler so aptly defined it for them.

Since our appearance on the stage, we have produced many machines. We are very near to producing some which will even do our thinking for us, but the most important one still remains the first one which we made -namely the gun.

Very early on, in the business of unravelling the secrets of this reality-suddenly-become-palpable, a monk blew himself through a roof somewhere in Germany, and immediately we saw the possibilities in that. If the gunpowder could blow the monk through the roof, it could blow the roof through the monk, or through any other person whose existence was disadvantageous to us.

A simple metal pipe to direct the energy was all that was necessary to produce the 'New Weapon' which would set us on the way to obtaining the leisure we needed to work all the possibilities, present in us, into existence and out of our systems.

History moves very slowly and we kept this new weapon to ourselves for close on three centuries before we really made the predestined use of it. During that time we familiarised ourselves thoroughly with it. We made it a part of our life and equipment. We discarded most of our now useless armour and modified the structure of our state and our society (and not only our castles and our fortresses) to fit its implications.

Even at this stage the later, colloquial sobriquet of the 'gun' as equaliser' was already potentially present. The sword and personal face-to-face combat faded into the background. Almost ab initio they assumed more symbolical than real values. Soldiers became more 'men who shot and were shot at' from a distance, than 'fighters'. Bravery became a matter of learning how to stand up straight as a ramrod, without wincing when shot at, both in war and in a duel.

Here, even in this matter of life and death and personal honour, it was the machine-slave which took over the actual fighting and it was left to the master to do any dying which might be necessary with as good a grace as he could manage.

No great change occurred in the configuration of the nations. This 'killing machine' was easy enough to duplicate and the human 'master material', although not absolutely similar, had during the dark middle ages been adequately amalgamated to ensure that there were no major differences in the ability to make use of such a basically simple weapon which was only one step removed from its forerunner, the crossbow.

For a long time we did not see its real possibilities. We were still too busy. We had not had time to work it all out. We simply simmered on for a few centuries and only then did we erupt into a helpless world which was unable to defend itself, unable to stand up to something that it could neither understand nor counteract (and here we do not only mean the guns with which we mowed the others down!).

This eruption of ours was probably one of the strangest the world has ever seen, for apart from its global magnitude, it contained such an improbable, inherent self-contradiction, that for as long as we shall be remembered, mankind will shake its head over us in silent and amazed lack of understanding.

It is but another example of the impossibility of seeing oneself as one is, that if here a thousand readers were asked what that inherent inconsistency is, only a handful would be able to give the obvious answer.

It lay in the religion under whose banners we went out to 'inherit' the world.

We had not 'grown' this religion out of our own nature. Having had our origin so near the end of the civilisation before us, we had adopted its religion. As we were basically too practical and too much aware of the material reality of our surroundings, it is understandable how it was impossible for us to develop our own religion as other civilisations had done before us. (This too is a facet of our civilisation which fits into the idea that we are trying to pinpoint here. We are the only civilisation which did not 'grow' its own religion. Because religion had, to us, to be something mysterious and far away, something 'beyond reality', we had to find it beyond the horizon and among a people strange and entirely foreign in their way of thinking.)

Although through Rome we inherited one of the most perfect religions the East has been able to produce, it still was a religion of slaves, of sufferers and forgivers. It was the religion of a 'dying civilisation' and, as such, entirely unsuitable for a civilisation which was on the way up, which had to 'take' and to be aggressive.

Officially we believed in a God who loved the meek, who instructed us to turn the other cheek, to walk the other mile with the man who asked us to walk one, to sell everything and give all we owned to the poor. Our God pronounced anathema on him who called his brother 'Raka'. Our heaven was only attainable by the 'poor' and the 'simple in mind' and we knew that 'there was no profit in gathering riches where rust and the moth could get at them'.

Naturally, under these circumstances it was rather difficult to make full use of the present we had received from the pagan gods in the form of gunpowder and it is rather interesting to see how we did solve the problem in the end.

In the first place we soft-pedalled the Sermon on the Mount as much as we could, leaving that for the musings of a quiet Sunday afternoon.

This left us with what was essentially the old pagan religion for our ritual and the theological theory of the (essentially also pagan), 'atonement'. To this basic tenet we joined most of the old testamentary and intolerant rules which Jesus had said that He had come to fulfil, so that they could be forgotten, and in this manner we ended up with a military church (the Church militant!) believing in 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth' as the rule of life for practised purposes. With this background it was now at last possible to take a leaf out of the 'holy wars' of the Mohammedans and declare a bloody war on all 'unbelievers'.

Full of the love of our gentle God we therefore loaded His cross with gunpowder and grapeshot and set out to conquer the world for Him -Onward Christian Soldiers!

On *us* rested the religious duty to save the world from its own unbelief and from its 'bad' and 'heathen' way of life. Then - when under the threat of death, the symbolical gesture of baptism had been accepted by the victims - we sought, not for souls, but for the gold and silver, gems and spices which the benighted ex-idolators would now not need any more.

With glowing satisfaction at the knowledge of a deed well done, we confiscated all we could find, and, like ants, we carried bits of metal and vegetable matter back to our nests in Europe.

In Africa, in America, in India and China and the far-flung islands of the Malayan Archipelago, things happened which made the heavens blush and the sun hide its face in sorrow.

Although the idea had not in those days been put into so many words, we lived according to the dictum of the 'survival of the fittest' and to hell with the rest. There was no doubt about the fact that with our new weapon we were the fittest to survive, although possibly not by a long stretch the fittest to go to our own heaven. That being so, the dumb adorers of wood and stone had to be taught the proper respect for the White man and, by God, they learned it! Blood flowed in every country where we put our foot and there was no-one to stop us.

Not that the others were cowards - far from that. Millions of them died doing deeds the valour of which can simply not be described. The thousands of Aztecs who ran into what must have seemed to them to be supernatural, deathdealing thunderbolts, in defence of their way of living and their Gods; the Zulus who under similar conditions stormed the Boer laagers and died in swathes upon the banks of the Bloed Rivier, the Indians at Plassey and the Malays over in Java, all faced the wrath of foreign gods with fear in their hearts - but they died like men worthy of the name.

Not that the Whites were cowards either. They also took their life into their hands, and often against formidable odds, to gamble it against their shoddy dreams of untold riches. They, however, at least knew what it was all about. The fight, for them, contained no supernatural terrors. They could weigh the chances, choose the battleground and knew that the dice were very much loaded in their favour - both by gunpowder and by their God.

What the poor benighted savage actually thought of all this when he learned to understand what exactly the religion was which was being forced so violently down his throat by holocausts, arson and robbery and worse - it is impossible to say.

He probably did not think about it at all, lumping it all together with the whole mystery of what makes the White Man tick - his apparent love of fighting for its own sake (even fighting to the death), combined with a cool calculation which made him appear unruffled even in moments of the most fearful stress; his crude and unmannerly behaviour, with not the slightest idea of how a 'civilised' person should act, yet gifted with a magic beyond even the most fantastic wishing dreams of native medicine men - backed by a God so powerful that the age-old Taboos and incantations were as a few drops of water before the blazing midday sun; yet again, gullible like a child when it came to collecting such baubles as golden or silver utensils - ready to lie and to cheat and even to play traitor to his own kind for a shiny pebble or a handful of pearls.

The White Scourge which had erupted over the world was simply not something that could be understood. It had to be borne for however long it pleased the angry gods to let it have its will. Some day, if not in this generation, then in a few more, there would be an end to him. Primeval wisdom knew that much, and bowed its head in patience.

In this way we conquered the whole world for our God and proceeded to cultivate it for ourselves to His glory.

While the Pope, representative of God on earth, divided it between the Portuguese and the Spaniards in two exactly equal halves so that there should be no unseemly fraternal squabble over the spoils, the Dutch sneaked in and pocketed the Malayan Archipelago. Efficiently they made it unsafe for

unco-operative rebels who considered that the islands belonged to them and usually ended up at the end of a rope for their troubles.

The English and the French slid into America and India and snarled at each other over the remains of the great banquet.

By now the time for consolidation and the sanctification of ownership had arrived, the coming of the law and the policeman.

England, appearing on the scene a bit tardily, missed the great treasure troves but being (as Napoleon sneeringly called them) a nation of shopkeepers, they soon settled down to make more than the best of their bargain. Gold and silver transported home did not do much more than to cheapen that commodity a bit there, and to present the nation with the problem of a set of over-rich people planted on an economically still rather tottery population. It was much better to start a system of trade, that is, to buy raw materials cheaply and sell the ready-made articles back at a good or better than a good profit. Such an arrangement benefited the whole nation, the industries and the trades. Inevitably the result of this was that the maps of the world broke out into a rash of pink spots, until literally, the sun never set on the British Empire.

In this framework it was that the Law finally arrived. There was little worthwhile left to take, so the usual moratorium was declared, this time on a worldwide scale. International law was promulgated on the basis of the status quo. From that moment on, everyone had what he had by the right of 'ownership' and not by the right of being able to defend it. England was its chief protagonist, because trade only really flourishes in times of peace. She more or less declared herself both judge, arbiter and policeman. Her navy established the Pax Britannica, her statesmen consolidated her Empire and started to make arrangements for the general acceptance of World peace.

As usual this was much better than continued outlawry and humanity took a breath of relief.

The oceans were swept clean of pirates, travel became safe as it had never been before in the whole period of human history. On the land, wherever necessary, the sons of England shouldered the 'white man's burden' and helped the poor heathen to live in comparative safety, both as to his life and as to his possessions.

The world knew a period of peace, alas, very shortlived, but - for that a price had to be paid. In this life of ours one never gets anything for nothing. although that seems to be the ideal of all mankind. Peace, like all peace, meant the loss of a certain amount of Liberty, of the ability to do what one wanted to do 'regardless'; and on the other hand the Policeman had obviously to be paid. This gentleman had his hand in every transaction which was going and helped himself to what he thought was his just due. That also was as it should be, especially as England, brought up in a spirit of 'fair play' generally managed to be fairly reasonable about it. (It also knew that those who want the last drop out of the tankard get the lid on the nose.)

All this had brought wealth in many different forms to Europe. Its citizens and Burghers waxed fat and prosperous. There was plenty of leisure and free time to develop ideas and possibilities. There were numbers of sponsors for art and economic or industrial projects, or for the assistance of scientific research and the dissemination of knowledge.

Painting drove the search after realism to such extremes that the reproduction of a fly on a masterpiece, which was so lifelike that a spectator would try to chase it away, was considered 'art'. The effect of light and darkness, (in giving a sense of space) the various possibilities of accentuating perspective in order to do the same thing, showed the tendency to see reality as something which was really there.

One has but to remember the fantastically detailed Dutch still-lives and the Vermeers to realise this. David, Messonier, Landseer and Constable are a few others who come to mind.

Music was finally finding its greatest masters who brought it to the ultimate perfection which exhausted its own possibilities (in this form). Science found in Newton, Linnaeus, Faraday, Darwin, Mendel and a thousand others, the men who laid down the occidental sense of reality and fixed the immutable laws of nature in verbal definitions, stating in unequivocal terms, exactly how things acted and reacted, how things were just so and not in any way otherwise. The Encyclopaedists compiled a 'complete' materialistic knowledge of everything. There were no secrets left in Nature and there was no place left for God or the Devil in which to hide himself. Man was complete master of all existence and he had no really valid doubts about anything. What was not known was only 'not yet' known. Once man came round to it, it would all fit exactly into place like a beautiful mosaic.

Most typical and important of all, however, was a development which, strangely enough, seems to have been mainly confined in its original form to the special mixture of human qualities present in the population of England; the mixture of Celts, Teutons, Scandinavians, Franks and Romans, leavened with some Phoenician blood and Spanish from the days of the Armada. Somehow this mixture seems to have stewed to ripeness with a gift for making machines, that is, for 'realising' in material, and with impersonal energies, the process of 'work'.

There, in England, within the space of less than fifty years, the foundations were laid for modern industry and the final accumulation of leisure which today affords even the unskilled labourer a living on a forty-hour week and threatens now and then to oust him from his work altogether, giving him endless leisure on the dole.

Great and interesting and alive though our Civilisation was, it was not a very nice one somehow. It had no really 'noble' men at the helm. Right from the beginning it was plebeian, small-minded in little things, a civilisation of tradesmen, small entrepreneurs, guilds and shopkeepers. It did not consist of men with self-respect but rather of those with respect for their positions.

England produced the ideal of the 'Gentleman' which was one of its most valuable gifts to us as a civilisation; but still, this Gentleman was but the plebeian's idea of a 'noble' man, who was originally the man who carried the fate of mankind in his hand as a precious gift from the gods, a gift he gave his life to be worthy of. (It is well to remember that only by the existence of the strong and 'noble' master was security possible for the lesser men, the vassals of the feudal systems.)

This civilisation of ours was also full of hypocrisies such as the strange twist we gave to our 'Christian' religion. We prate of God's goodness to man, but for generations we could see nothing wrong, or anything 'unchristian' in the keeping of slaves, and very much worse still, the conditions in the primitive factories of England had to cry to high heaven before, reluctantly, anything was done about them. There we certainly showed that our cruel treatment of the 'lesser' people of this world is an inborn trait in us, because there we did to our own children what we would (even in those days) not have allowed our representatives to do to the subject nations, unless it brought money into the till.

It is nonsense to think that we have changed inside and that all this was but something which belonged to the 'bad old days'. Our actions during the last two wars have shown that the savage is still as near to the surface as it has always been and we must realise that when it comes to the question of survival, the basic laws of nature are as valid for us today as they are for any other herd of animals.

The same hard and relentless core which is willingly blind to all it does not want to see, while professing magnificent ideals, made us for a time masters of a world which, most understandably, feared us like the plague.

Notwithstanding this, it must also not be forgotten that this plague gave the world a period of peace and prosperity such as it had never yet had in all of history and as it possibly never will have again.

People will only be 'good' for fear of punishment. And fear of punishment was what the White Plague instilled in the hearts of all wrongdoers so that, for a few generations at least, most of them went into hibernation until such time as the white winter would have thawed away.

## CHAPTER VI

### *Our Civilisation*

#### **(Downwards)**

It is difficult to remember that the qualities which characterise a Civilisation do not exist by themselves, but that they are qualities of the people who are members of that Civilisation.

However simple and obvious the fact may be, we are always tending to forget it.

We find, for instance, those who complain about the lack of devotion of the nurses in a hospital but who would not think of allowing their daughters to become nurses. To them the fact that a 'civilisation like ours should produce ideal and devoted nurses' is so obvious that they never stop to think where the actual human beings who are to offer themselves on the altar of service are supposed to come from.

In a similar way our Civilisation seems so solid, so well founded, so self-evident in all its details, that we forget that all it stands for depends upon the existence of people who have these qualities developed in the highest degree in themselves.

Education cannot be efficient if there are not found those who are willing to spend all their lives and energies in moulding the minds of other people's brats into some semblance of human thinking. Industry cannot survive if there is not a supply of men who are not only able to *do* the work, but who are conscientious enough to do it well without constant supervision. Only if these are available can major breakdowns be avoided in a system whose strength is no more than that of the weakest link in the chain of its different components.

In the same way also, the peace and safety of the world, that formed a solid basis to the conceptions of our generation (which grew up in the final stages of the 'Pax Britannica'), depended on the willingness of the sons of England to go out into the world and play the policeman!

The whole thing really hinged on the spirit which existed in the homes and cottages on England's, Scotland's and Ireland's rolling hills and downs. As long as there lived there the tradition that 'military service' was an honourable, sensible and worthwhile way of life, all was relatively well with the world and, incidentally, with England herself.

The futile massacres of the First World War made an end of that, although the real spirit had already been lagging for some time.

The 'Sons of England' lost the urge to go out to the 'farflung outposts of the Empire', there to shoulder the 'White Man's Burden' or to be shot to death for no earthly advantage to anybody, while on patrol in the Khyber Pass - and there was an end to the world that we had known.

This in itself, however, was no more than the beginning of the final collapse - the rot itself had set in more than a century ago, somewhere about the time of the French Revolution - for it was then that the 'Little Man' had at last thrown off his shackles and his respect for all that was 'great' and 'noble' in the old traditions. It was our version of the insurrection of the Helot slaves of Sparta and, as such, a normal and to be expected development in the historic pattern of our civilisation.

In his Liberté, Egalité and Fraternité, the 'Little Man' replaced 'Nobility' by sentimental balderdash. He would not have been able, he still is not able and he never will be able to define what he really means by any of these three magic words, but nevertheless they are sacred to him.

They served to make him feel the equal of those whom he had been looking up to all his life with a somewhat mean and sneaking awe although all that happened was that the great ones who survived the practical application of these ideals came down to the Little Man's level.

In his 'Equality' with what he had always held to be great, the Little Man felt himself to be great, but in prohibiting any one from being greater or more important than he was, he ironically, (but very logically) prohibited anyone, including himself from ever achieving greatness. Instead of putting up a prize for the achievement of greatness, he put a price upon its head.

This debacle, was however, still not the source of, but only one incident in, the general rout which was taking place all over our civilisation in those days - and is still going on around us now.

We had, in the Eighteen-hundreds, arrived at the virtual end of the possibilities contained in our specific gifts, in our 'new' way of seeing reality. We had had time to look around and to realise how much we had lost in security and how little we had really gained above what our ancestors had had.

We had not only lost God and His protecting arm, we had also lost the comforting ability to influence the fall of the dice of life in our favour. Instead we found ourselves in a heartless world where impersonal laws worked like soulless machines to produce inevitable effects from cold, uninfluenceable primary data and facts. We were in a world where a man was really treated according to his deserts and where, together with the possibility of achieving greatness, there was the hundred times larger chance of failure, of being crushed under the wheels of the Juggernaut of life.

We found ourselves in a system where nothing stood still, where one had either to keep on striving to achieve success or be swallowed up in ruin or oblivion. There was no rest and no peace in this world and worst of all - we were alone, for although we still went to our churches, only those with a childlike mind and heart could find God. We had killed Him long ago when we found that material reality was more convincing than His word and when, like St. Thomas, we learned only to believe in the evidence of our senses.

The Little Man, following blindly on the heels of the great ones, took one look around and ran back in terror at what he had seen there. He ran back to find safety in the middle of the pack and therefore we see how (logically again) the State takes the place of God and 'Loyalty to the State' usurps the place of Religion and the Love of God.

Everywhere we look we see this scrambling back from reality. In Art for example, this is very apparent.

In Painting where Realism had reached its ultimate possibilities and (as was to be expected from the texture of our civilisation) was in the process of being taken over by 'machines' in the form of cameras, we find Impressionism developing. The accent at first changes from a reproduction of the reality of the subject (how the subject is) to a reproduction of the image we have of that object (how the subject looks to us). This trend becomes vocal in the term 'Art for Art's sake', which indicated that Art was not trying to reproduce reality any more, but attempting to establish itself as something on its own, an Absolute Valuator of almost esoteric values which were not in any way connected with 'things as they are'.

After a comparatively slow start this trend away from Realism gains speed in Expressionism, where the artists tried to reproduce the effect which these images had on them; which again is one stage further away from realism. This was soon followed by others where the state of the soul itself, apart from any



definite material from outside, was depicted. Alongside this process there occurred the more blatant denial of reality (or the running away from it) as typified by 'Cubism', 'Fauvism', and 'Surrealism'; and the whole gamut of 'Inane-isms' which are exemplified in Modern Art to end in such fantastic things as 'Tachism', the adoration of the designs formed by a pot of mixed paints upset on a garage floor and the smears which a chimpanzee has made on a piece of canvas with his dirty hands.

A third, general route of escape was also tried out in attempting to get back into the good old days in such experiments as that of 'Classicism' which (because the Occidental could not rid himself of his 'new' awareness of space and time) missed all the closed, selfcontained dignity of that which it tried to represent. Inevitably it only succeeded in being merely artificial and palpably insincere.

Even Sculpture, although it is the most 'material' medium of expression (and hence that of the Greeks above all others) came under the same panic spell - although here the reaction admittedly was somewhat delayed.

Rodin had still to set the final seal on European Sculpture in that he, as Spengler points out, was able to portray 'existence in space' (as contrasted with the Greek 'existence by itself') - but after him, everything having been said, even sculpture becomes unreal so that one now often cannot realise that the twisted shapes are those of 'something', let alone of 'human beings' - unless one has had the foresight to buy a catalogue, of course.

In contrast to this, but still on the same road, Music fought itself free from the clear law-controlled, nearly mathematical structures of harmony and the different musical forms, into a bedlam of cacophonic dissonances which have only the fact that they are played on 'musical' instruments in common with what our civilisation, when it was still hale and hearty, considered to be 'Music'

This, too, only appeals to the 'emotions' and it makes the non-artistic person ask himself (in the safety of his own room, where no one can hear him) who is supposed to be bamboozleing whom?

As in painting, we find the whole process very extensively worked out in Literature.

Here, where the original authors of our civilisation aimed, in clear prose, to give the reader as 'real' a picture of the happenings in the story as could be achieved (often by endless, meticulous description of each little detail, admittedly not always by gifted choice of word and phrase), we see how at first the reaction of the heroes and the villains to the situations in the story, takes the centre of the stage. After that the 'psychological novel' appears, whose spotlight is turned away from the reality outside and focusses itself on the mind of man (usually 'tortured' by some aspect of life in which reality refuses to agree with his inner wishes!). This we could compare to the 'expressionism' stage of painting, and logically, it is followed by Sartre and Kafke and the Existentialists to whom the emotions themselves are all important and only for convenience's sake attached to any actual happenings.

It is sometimes remarkable how the atmosphere of a surrealist painting is created in these works, showing (if not proving) that they both emerge from the same urge or the same type of awareness.

Poetry too had a similar development. Where once, like music, it attempted to obtain its effects within the well-defined laws of metre and rhyme, it now discarded either one or the other or both till it was no more than a kind of sing-song prose written in irregular sentences. The contents also underwent the same subtle change of standpoint and outlook as prose had done in its more 'reasonable' examples.

Finally, for both prose and poetry, we find those writers who throw all pretence away and frankly discard reality to dabble in sounds for their own sake, in dadaism and 'the rose is a rose is a rose' kind of

art which reminds one of nothing so much as of the meanderings of the schizophrenic before he has started to degenerate into incomprehensible mutterings.

To understand what moves men, it is best to set the soul listening to and tasting of what the artists of the period try to express. It is their duty after all to interpret the deepest roilings of the ego of their age.

The same symptoms are, however, available on the surface everywhere, and everywhere we see evidence that, since the beginning of the last century, 'The West' has been in panic-stricken retreat from the reality which it had not so long ago, in its youth, faced so blithely.

Even in such an unlikely subject as Mathematics it is glaringly obvious. Our mathematicians had, under the influence of their sense for time and space, built up out of the addition and subtraction sums of the Greeks and the Romans a Mathematical structure of magnificent proportions. They had dropped the 'unit' structure, (the 'fragmented' conception of quantities as collections of 'ones' in round numbers and fractions) and learnt to see it as a network of reciprocally connected and infinitely variable relationships of quantities which were only in exceptional cases expressible in respect to units common to both factors.

All these relationships, although many of them were represented by unreal' and 'irrational' numbers, still, had their roots, their basis, in reality, and these numbers were 'notations' for relationships which were not expressible in any other way. Its results could be translated back into numbers correct up to as many decimals as one could possibly need and therefore correct 'for practical purposes'.

About the time of which we speak the mathematicians took the bit between their teeth. Once they found that their unreal numbers could express 'everything' they realised that they did not need this troublesome reality at all, and they promptly discarded it. Everything was a formulatable quantity in their four-dimensional 'Continuum', and reality had efficiently been liquidated.

In this connection it is a remarkable and significant fact that the men who were most concerned with this development of 'relativistic' mathematics (that is, mathematics in which the 'unreal', but in themselves certainly 'valid', relationships are given a sort of an existence of their own) are of Semitic origin, members of the race which represents primarily the 'time' facet of our conception of reality and to whom our material reality and space are not as immediately valid as they are to us. Again, we may note that the Western mathematicians often admit that they 'cannot really follow Einstein all the way', but that, as they can find no flaw in his arguments, he must be right!

It is amusing to reflect that the 'flaw' in this case lies in the acceptance of the 'Eastern' factor 'Time' as a 'fourth dimension' on an absolutely equal footing with the combination of the other three dimensions represented by the 'Space' of the West! This is an artificial marriage which does not stand close scrutiny.

If Mathematics is an unlikely area to look for the de-realisation in our thinking, Nuclear Physics, which has set itself the task of unravelling the secrets of material existence, must be still more so, yet here also we find the same forces at work.

Practical Science, which has as its object the gathering of data on which to build practical results, naturally still has kept its nose to the grindstone, but what one could call 'Speculative Science', the Science which draws Universal truths and generalisations out of the tracks left by 'electrons' on photographic plates - the science of neutrons, photons and positrons, which has given us the most gigantic Damoclean sword the world has ever known, has, as it itself admits (and as it is even proud of) - left the region of hard facts far behind.

To it, our old familiar words have lost most of their original meaning and are only symbols for those scientific concepts which had their origin in the ideas for which those words used to stand.

'Waves' are not 'Waves' any more but something which could probably better be expressed by the word 'Throb' or 'Pulse'. 'Matter' is not 'Matter' either, not even in the substance of the electrons and the neutrons of which crude matter is supposed to consist. The 'Time' they use is not the time we measure with our clocks and their 'Speed' is not the thing that tries to make our trains run somewhere near to schedule. Space has become a mere mathematical concept and nearly everything, except the thought of the 'thinker', has become a part of a huge mathematical pattern in the mind of a Supreme Mathematician who has taken the place of our old God, in that He too can explain everything that is inexplicable.

The most typical and significant symptom of all, however, is that the 'Laws of Nature' which our civilisation in its youth extracted with so much labour and painstaking care from out of the welter of seemingly haphazard happenings, now again became: "Expressions of the aggregate results of the laws of Chance".

The deep significance of this lies in the fact that the universal applicability of the 'laws of nature' (which were the aggregate results of predetermined cause and effect) had to imply that the future is irrevocably predetermined. This has always been a sore point against Science, because it seems to rule out the 'free will' which is such a precious possession of so many of us.

When it was found that the electrons seemed to know better where they were going than the scientist who observed them, the scientist laid aside his omniscience with a smile, admitted 'chance' in at the ground floor level, and so the 'real' world governed by immutable laws which his predecessors had thought inevitable and bravely accepted, was disowned.

In understanding the laws of nature to be no more than the aggregate results of the laws of chance, lay man's only escape from the treadmill of predestination and the scientist grasped it with both hands, for after all, he also was human and a part of his age.

As has been shown, the modern Occidental (not the 'modern man') is beating a retreat all along the line. Instructive and somewhat sadly amusing is his attitude to the two factors of Evolution: 'Heredity' and the principle of the 'Survival of the Fittest'.

It is difficult to deny the validity of the laws of heredity and we have not yet descended to denying known facts. That will come soon enough. The degeneration to which we are subject is at present only apparent in the way in which we interpret these facts. The results of Mendel's experiments with his sweetpeas and the practical application of those results to the breeding of special plants and animals are so unequivocal that we can only draw one conclusion.

The laws of heredity, however, are an integral part of the reality of the real world and of a fate which we do *not* like. It ties us down to the having certain characteristics, to being 'better' and 'worse', and to being fate-bound to these conditions.

We do not mind so much being bound to more or less gifted, healthy or diseased, able or crippled bodies, but we most certainly object to the idea that we ourselves, that our egos which inhabit these different bodies, are in any essential way different, 'better' or 'worse', more or less gifted, crippled or diseased than those of others.

In the beginning, when we had abundant and daily evidence that we, as a group, were more gifted, more able and healthy than the others, we did not mind boosting our egos with conceptions like 'blood will tell'. Now that we have woken up to the fact that 'high trees catch much wind' and must therefore be

able to stand the buffeting if they wish to survive, this originally so flattering and comforting idea has much less charm for us.

The only way out is to deny the applicability of the laws of heredity to the soul, and that is in effect what we are doing.

Most people will get hot under the collar nowadays when it is suggested that a Negro child, taken away from its parents at birth and brought up in a White family on an equal footing with its own children, will not grow up to be exactly like them except in physical appearance.

A slight aura of doubt as to the honesty of that objection is caused when we note the reaction to an inversion of the statement and say that a White child, if brought up under similar circumstances in a Negro home will grow up to be a Negro in all but colour. Few of us will be able to suppress the instinctive knowledge *that in that case* 'blood will tell', although the first variation has such bad 'racialistic' taste that it does not even arise, or is immediately suppressed if it does.

This is certainly a strange thing in us and its implications are much more far-reaching than we realise.

In the first place, we know that one can breed animals for certain psychological characteristics, just as well as we can do that for physical ones. One can breed dogs to be fierce fighters, lazy and good natured, sentimental, watchful, alert trackers, pointers at game, able to seek out criminals and the secret burial places of truffles, or to like being fussed over by frustrated females. We know that, even in identical environment, and with identical education, each of them will retain those basic characteristics, and no two of them will turn out even nearly alike.

Yet we do not admit this to be valid for man.

We are all 'human' and therefore basically equal. It is only a matter of education and environment which makes us *appear* different from the outside. We all have the same soul when we start off, but in Neanderthal days our environment made us into cavemen, while the environment in Paris causes the same souls to become those of gigolos!

What does not seem to have been noticed in the forming of this conception, is that it implies that the evolution of man took place in a rather peculiar way, for first a vehicle, a body, had to be evolved by 'natural selection' (which would have to be very strange where the latent capabilities *for which it was being prepared* were not active in aiding that selection) – and then, when it was ready, the human soul was placed in it, ready-made.

Any other idea would involve the possibility of a 'Quarter human', 'Half human' and 'Three quarter human' soul, and that is, to us, a repugnant conception, because there would in that case be no reason why, even today, there should not exist on earth whole tribes of such 'fractional' humans. It certainly would throw a grave doubt upon the idea that 'humanity' is a quality by itself.

Worse still, it would throw a still graver doubt on the justification for the summary dismissal of racialism as disgusting! Anti-racialism would itself even become irrational in that case.

After all, *only if men were basically equal, if all their souls were potentially 'white' (horrible thought to the selfrespecting not-European!), could racialism be condemned out of hand.*

If men, however, are not equal, it would be necessary to examine in each case to what degree he was fit to live in a 'civilised community', and how far not.

There is still more to it than that, for the possibility that men are *not* equal raises the possibility that it could be that one was not the 'equal' of one's neighbour, which would take the soothing syrup out of the saying: 'He is only a man - just like I am'. It would open the possibility of someone really being that bugbear of the Little Man: the 'Better Man', with all the heartache and frustration his existence would entail.

It is because of all these implications that the modern Occidental has virtually denied that Heredity has anything to do with the soul. He may not believe that the body was created as his Bible tells him, but there is no doubt that that was how the soul came into existence as far as he is concerned.

To twist a colloquialism: "Heredity is strictly for the birds".

The whole question of heredity is so important and complex that one could devote a chapter to it but that would take us too far out of the way. At present we have to move on to the other half of the pair which add up to the idea of Evolution, and which at the same time was the main precept which justified our forefathers in their predatory morality, namely: 'The survival of the fittest'. There was no doubt in the minds of the confiscators of the world that they were the fittest, and reality seemed (in those days), to agree wholeheartedly with them.

Most suitably it is the little phrase of 'survival of the fittest' which makes the hair stand up on the neck of the modern Occidental. It hurts him from every direction.

In the first place, he will not admit that there is a fittest. In the second place, even if he existed, it could not be admitted that he has any more right to survive than the weakest. Everything the Little Man does is in some way an attempt to overcome, circumvent, outsmart, outwit and generally checkmate this simple, obvious and untouchable little law of nature.

In his Liberté Egalité and Fraternité the Little Man conceived for himself a beautiful ideal - but it was certainly not based on Realité! It was vague and could be interpreted to accommodate all the petty prejudices of his little soul and yet give the appearance of real and concrete, constructive thinking.

But - where he prated of Liberty he had still to delimit it from 'Licence'. Equality was obviously an empty word where men were certainly not equal and Fraternity, as an ideal in itself, is also nonsense. There is only unity among brothers when they fight a common enemy. If all humanity became one brotherhood they would fight more among themselves and more viciously than they do now. That has always been the nature of brothers. That 'familiarity breeds contempt' is not an empty phrase.

The original 'Nobles' did not believe in Brotherhood; they believed in Mutual respect and (one is ashamed to admit it) in Selfrespect! These qualities are conspicuous by their absence in 'brotherhoods', whose members 'Love' each other. Love itself is an emotion which is famous for its habit of metamorphosing itself into Hatred at the smallest excuse. It means very little.

The Little Man does not believe in Respect, either for others or for himself. Respect for others is, to him, a humbling experience, because he cannot feel it unless the other is a 'better' man.

On the other hand, he cannot distinguish 'selfrespect' from 'selfglorification'. He knows that pride comes before a fall, and he is so pathetically afraid of falling that he would rather stay on level ground and keep his eyes cast down to the ground.

For this reason, although the theory of the 'survival of the fittest' remained a convenient explanation for the superiority of Man over the Animals, it was soft-pedalled to near extinction where it concerned the development of man himself.

It had to be eradicated wherever possible, for if only the fittest did survive, the Little Man knew very well that he was *not* the one who would do so.

To defend himself against that hated law, he therefore banded together in mobs, in Trade Unions and Employee Associations - thereby finding the strength to survive not in fitness, nor in worthiness, but in sheer numbers combined with the passive resistance of the mule. He invented, among other things, Democracy and Political Parties.

These combinations were originally designed only to eliminate the necessity to compete against the fittest but - with the simple logic which we find everywhere in reality - by eliminating the need to be the fittest, there was suddenly no reason to be fit at all, and willy nilly, the socio-economic system of the West geared itself to the weakest, the 'lowest', the unfittest, and it forced industry to accept the situation like that.

Everything was arranged so that the 'poor lame duck' should not suffer. That that 'poor lame duck' usually was a lazy good-for-nothing, playing the parasite on a society gone soft in the heart if not in the head, did not matter - it was impossible for the Little Man not to get tears in his eyes at the thought of his unavailing struggles for survival in a hard and inimical world. It did not matter what happened to the economy of the state or industry itself. As long as there was no 'suffering' and 'frustration' all was well, and, to prevent suffering, the law of the survival of the fittest had to be inactivated.

Benefit societies and Social Security schemes were instituted to guard against and to buffer the effect of losing in the battle for survival. The state was forced to institute the Dole and in this way, by taking away the punishment for losing, together with the prize for winning, the battle itself was eliminated too.

Everyone now automatically survived and no one could win, so that the contest, which had at first been to see how much the employers could get done for how little, now changed into one where the employees tried to see how little they could do for how much.

Essentially there was, admittedly, no difference between the two; but the first contained a 'survival factor' tending to improvement while the latter was exactly the inverse.

Everything that smacked of contest was eliminated. Piece-work, which could give the good worker a chance to earn what he deserved, was killed under the motto that it gave the employers a chance to whittle down on people's incomes when, had that been so, a strike would have had at least some honour in it. Now the strike looks to the spectator no more than an ever-repeated refrain of 'more for less' and 'less for more'.

In commerce, competition was counteracted as much as possible (short of abolishing private enterprise) by price-control, standardisation, permit systems; and in general by eliminating all so-called 'unfair' competition, which in practice meant eliminating all competition which endangered the racket of anyone who could put up a convincing enough cry of being threatened by undeserved 'ruination'.

The Little Man is a sob-sister.

Wherever he meets suffering and frustration, he does not ask whether it was deserved or not - he simply dissolves into tears. The only thing that rouses him into irate, tooth-gnashing fury, is the man who dares to say 'I am better than you', in any of the forms in which this disgusting thing can be done. He will yap at such a man's heels, scratch up mud, yell the most impossible lies and imprecations, labour heroically behind the scenes to pull the props from under him and will not let go until the hateful excrescence has been levelled out.

This has to be done, for the big fellow's pride points an accusing finger at the small man's pusillanimity and weakness. The Little Man finds his own pride in not being better than anybody - but this can only give him satisfaction if nobody is better than he!

The Little Man cannot stand any suffering or frustration except that of the man who rages himself into an apoplexy because of the bad workmanship, the bad faith and the total lack of pride in one's work, which he sees about him.

The Little Man is a sob-sister.

The one thing that touches him 'where he lives' is the man who can put up a convincing scene about his 'never having had a chance'. It has long ago been forgotten that almost all the great men of this world have grown up among those who 'never had a chance'.

It is only in fighting against the hardness of life that one steels the muscles and sharpens the wits.

Suffering and frustration are an integral part of our 'real' world as we have already seen in the analysis of primeval history; and since then there is not anything changed in the basic urges and structure of existence despite our aeroplanes and rockets. Only by meeting it and beating it on its own ground can man progress.

All this appears most clearly in the change which has come over our Education.

Basically, Education is there to teach the child the secrets of surviving in life. It has to make him ready to meet its demands, give him the necessary skills to play his part on an equal footing with the others. Above all, however, it has to teach him to stand up to the hard facts of life and bear his burden like a man. Modern education shudders at the idea of doing anything like that. It does not admit that life is real and life is earnest; and if it is that, it is so because people have had the 'wrong' education, a fault it will not itself repeat for the next generation.

Modern education sees life from the point of view of the child, and does everything to make the 'beautiful time of youth' as beautiful and as carefree as it can.

Man, however, cannot go through life without self-control and self-discipline, and these things he cannot acquire without discipline initially administered from outside!

The Little Man as Educator, cannot see suffering and frustration. He cannot punish (which characteristic is brought to its final absurd climax in the theories of Neill) he forestalls the effect of doing wrong, he lightens the work, he finds short-cuts and skips the 'non-essential'.

More and more there is a tendency to eliminate competition for fear of 'frustrating' the weaker brothers; the better ones are kept back by the mediocre instead of being used as an example for the others to emulate; examinations are skimmed because failing 'frustrates' the child, and the whole effect is rather that of making the child used to the kind of society the Little Man thinks that should exist on earth. In the schools it is kept in existence by the grown-up world from outside, though it never could do so by its inner forces and tendencies; but the Little Man does not see that.

The result of this can easily be worked out and agrees exactly with the real result which we observe all around us. The child, once he enters the world of the grown-ups, most naturally expects that it will be the one for which he has been made ready.

He finds nothing of the sort.

Here no one is interested in his finely strung and sensitive nature. As a matter of fact, it seems to be frowned upon to be so extremely sensitive! This grown-up world expects him to produce work as if it had a right to do so and does not even pat him on the back when he does it. It seems to think that he should be glad to be allowed to earn his living, just as if it did not owe him one!

The result is that the young man feels that he is not appreciated, that the world is against him, and he takes that personally and somewhat as an insult.

In a way he is entirely right in changing into a juvenile delinquent and a 'ducktail'. Life has not given him what he has been educated to expect, and therefore he definitely has been cheated (only not when he sees it, but long ago, when he was still in school and he was allowed to terrorise the teachers with his near criminal 'childish' pranks).



## CHAPTER VII

### *Our Civilisation*

#### **The Beginning of the Rot.**

Above and behind all this hangs the debt which our fathers have run up for us, and which is as large as, if not larger than, the financial debt which we have run up for the next ten generations to pay if they can, in our fantastic national debts.

Heavily it hangs there like a black thundercloud trailing a dark curtain of rain across the landscape. With death and destruction our forefathers conquered the earth, with death and destruction they consolidated their position, and this generation (which is no longer a virile 'animal trainer' at heart) has a tiger by the tail.

We do not want to fight any more. We want to live in peace with our neighbours and to enjoy the prosperity we have inherited from those selfsame forefathers whom we now wish to disown. We want to hold on to what we have but do not wish to pay the price there is to pay. A master can only remain a master when he is willing and able to fight and to defend what he has taken (or what his ancestors have taken). That is the price of being and remaining a master.

We say that we have become 'ethical', that we think that killing is 'bad', that no earthly possessions can justify the taking of the life of a fellow human-being, be he white, or brown or black.

We are like the poker player who has collected most of the chips and now wants to go home. The rules, which he endorsed earlier on, do not allow him to leave the game till the others give him permission to do so, and they are now, after their long spell of losing, just starting to enjoy the game.

He is tired, he begins to make mistakes, his opponents alternate and sit in for each other, but he has to stay awake and be alert and able to meet all comers. His opponents learn his way of playing, learn the formulas according to which he bluffs and stalls. They adapt his tricks to their own special gifts, forestall his moves - and he is tired.

He really must go home now, but there is no rest.

Life and his grinning opponents are heartlessly frustrating him and nobody cares!

He offers the others a part of his winnings "without strings attached" and they accept, but they still demand that he play on.

They do not only want part of their money back, they want it all and his own on top of that, as compensation for the long and painful dance he has been leading them.

The White Man is getting scared, especially in his inner heart where he imagines that nobody is looking. He still hopes that he will be able to manage to end up as an 'equal'; and therefore he preaches 'Brotherly Love' and 'Equality' with such exaggerated zeal that it makes the intelligent not-European grin at his naiveté.

All over the world the White Man is distributing Freedom for which he claims that he has now made his erstwhile dependencies 'ready' as if they had not had this freedom before he came and had not been well able to look after it!

Hardly one of these new states lasts more than a few years in the Western form in which we leave them. They revert suddenly, or slowly, or 'de facto', back to the old style, or one as near to it as can be achieved after the residual material has been adjusted to what they have been able to adopt and adapt from us.

In vain do we expect thankfulness from them for this 'gift'. One does not thank a thief for giving back what he has stolen.

In vain do we expect thankfulness from them for the 'good' masters we have been.

A slave may love his master, he may even love him so much that he is willing to die for him; but that is only because such a slave sees (or has been taught to see) in that master his own 'reason for living' - something like the way the religious among us see in God the reason, the valuator for our lives.

When the slave has been liberated, however, he automatically learns to realise that there was nothing inevitable about his servitude, and that, as a matter of fact, an 'injustice' has been perpetrated upon him. His very freedom is evidence that he need not have been a slave and he resents what has happened to him. No slave will therefore love a former master, no matter how 'good' that master was. If a man has been bitten by a non-poisonous snake he may be thankful that the snake that bit him was not poisonous, but one cannot expect him to be thankful to the snake for biting him.

"But!" say the disgusted ex-colonialists, "look what we gave them! Dams and roads and motorcars and cinemas, frigidaires and radio, Democracy and a place among the nations of the world! Base ingratitude! That is what it is!"

One is reminded of the lion tamer who said to his charges, "Look, I have made you the most famous troupe of lions in existence, I have taught you a way to earn yourself a standard of living miles and miles above that of the jungle from which I 'rescued' you. I have fed you all these years at my own expense. Come, let us be friends and do this act together, from now on, on a voluntary basis. I am getting on a bit and I am tired of 'having forever to keep an eye on all of you. Let me put away this chair, this whip and this pistol -" and at this point the chief lion chewed his head off.

We should realise that these people did not ask to be 'rescued' from their 'predicament'; they did not want our Democracy and our care-and-responsibility-ridden way of life which is more concerned with what may come tomorrow than with what can be enjoyed today.

We have taught them to desire and need many things which they could originally do very well without. We have complicated their lives without bringing them more joy and pleasure. Should they be thankful to us for that?

We have taken much grief away from them and lengthened their lives; but who will say if a short life without worry is not better than a long one spent in tension or frustration like ours?

Lastly, let us look into *ourselves*. Do we really deserve any thanks? Have we done these things for the love of our fellow men? Have we given up anything for *their* sakes? Are we not really a set of hypocrites in claiming that they owe us anything?

Let us at least not cheat ourselves.

If all we have given them was weighed up against all we obtained from them in various ways, direct and indirect, the balance would drop on our side like a dead weight.

The only thing one can say is that we could have been worse masters, and if we had been worse, we would have had to be content with obtaining less and having worse servants.

Finally, it is as obvious as the hands on the face of a clock that there can be no equality - no 'all being brothers' together - either at the status quo or at the status quo ante.

Man is basically too ambitious an animal - too irritable and prideful an animal - and he will not be content with static, uninteresting equality. Equality is a thing that is only desired by those who are tired and in whom the fires of life burn low.

We ourselves have made the rules of this game. While the heat of our energy was upon us we allowed nobody to sit out. Willy nilly, we made them play. Now the thing boomerangs, and it is we who are not allowed to sit out.

Nobody wants equality. There is no fun in equality. There are no pickings in equality, nor unearned riches, and therefore we will have to fight on until we stumble in our tracks.

However much we try to make them invalid, the laws of nature still go on - they do not care one iota about how we formulate them and which ones we think valid, which unimportant or which 'outmoded'.

This is a fight to the finish for us - although not for 'humanity', because among the members of 'humanity' this fight will go on long after we have sunk under the table. The contestants will change, but the game will go on and still remain essentially the same.

For us, however, it is necessary to understand the nature of the present contestants and what is really at stake in the present hand.

One of the most important aspects of the case is the basic, nearly primeval difference between those we call Europeans or Indo-Europeans and the 'Others' - the general original mass of humanity.

This difference is the more important because our civilisation represents the final development of a series which has emerged from the ashes of a previous debacle. All direct historic traces of its origin are lost, but it can be deduced from the general structure of the human race so that its logical development attains such a plausibility that it becomes entirely convincing to all but the hypercritical.

(The latter are not entirely sure if 'black is really black' and we can therefore leave them to the doubts in which they find their pride and their self-respect.)

It is obvious that the earlier maelstroms in the process of human development from near animal to man, from mere reflex-awareness to human soul, could have left no direct traces for us to find before artefacts of sufficient durability and with sufficient information in them had been made. That we cannot 'prove' does not mean, however, that one should not indulge in legitimate speculations on the material which is available - in the languages man speaks - in the basic characteristics of his body and his soul -and in the ways these are combined and associated.

It is true that we must tread carefully here, for we are approaching an area marked 'Thin Ice'. With the rise of Nazidom, much of this type of speculation acquired such a vile reputation (because of the evil

perpetrated in its name), that nearly all of humanity is afraid of looking in that direction for fear of being contaminated.

It is amusing and sobering too, to see how that monumental work of erudition, The Encyclopaedia Britannica, makes itself slightly ludicrous by the way it does a careful egg dance around its material under the subject-heading 'ARYANS'.

It does not really matter what these people called themselves when they made their particular step 'forward' in human development; but what we see dimly through the mists of prehistory (as if through some rainswept window) is a rather larger than average type of man, tending to be fairer or lighter in colour than the others, and speaking a presanskrit type of language.

The principle quoted by the Encyclopaedia Britannica in order to administer a fatherly and well-controlled admonition to those who "draw unjustified conclusions" namely: "That a people may remain constant in type and language and change in culture; that it may remain constant in type but change in language, or that it may remain constant in language and change in type and culture is a two-edged argument, because where it denies the possibility of proof, it opens the doors wide to any legitimate speculation.

What one can on this basis accept with some measure of surety is that if one finds the language, the type, and the basic culture to be the same over a large area, one can take it that there is a common source. Besides that we also have open to us the possibility of thinking that those who 'have only two characteristics of the three, are the descendants of some group who were either swallowed up in another culture or who took in another race which grafted some of their characteristics on the basic stock.

There is no doubt, however, that this prehistoric group, whom for fear of offending or rousing unjustified associations we will call the 'Sanskrits', left behind them those who are now called the 'IndoEuropean' peoples, who inhabit most of Europe and the southern part of Asia, below the Himalayas and west of Mandalay.

What is also true is that these people, who speak a language with a Sanskrit base, differ in many essentials from those who speak languages derived from other sources.

These differences again are not so much contained in the lighter colour and the size of the body. Many of them by admixture with other races have become smaller and darker than the Orientals to the East and North of them.

What really characterises them is a certain naiveté, an almost childlike direct approach to existence.

They do not all have the full realisation of the existence of real things outside and apart from them, but they are saddled with the obsession that things are generally what they look like; where the Oriental has long ago learnt to read the meaning of things in his own heart. This 'potential sense of reality' has coloured the subsequent civilisations built upon it, so that even the Bengali is more different from his neighbours, the Burmese, than he is from the English who are at least as many historic years as miles away from him.

One of the secondary characteristics of this group, admittedly not so widely distributed but still strongly present in the central, most typical races (and to a lesser degree present in the others), is a very important one in our discussion here.

It is a strange love of 'fighting for its own sake' - not as an expression of hatred, not as a part of a predatory foray, not as a 'living-out of animal passions'; but the cold and calculated pleasure of measuring personal prowess and risking one's life for the supreme thrill of physical victory.

Behind this the sensitive, seeking mind can feel a hatred for the reality which is already troubling this type of man. He gains satisfaction in personally vanquishing this 'thing' which is nagging at him through the 'arras of appearances' - nudging him through the veil of Maya.

Here is the possible (?) basic origin of our Berserkers, our love of duels-to-the-death and, nowadays, our boxing and wrestling matches. Possibly too, we can find here the reason for the unexplained and, to the sentimentalists unexplainable, destructive instincts which often break out among us in the 'vandalism' of our young.

Deep down in us there is this hatred of having to exist, which erupts in fits of unreasoned violence, in senseless despair and 'unmotivated' suicides (as compared with the always motivated Hara Kiri and the typical 'protest suicides' of the East) - the 'will to death' of our psychologists.

This love of fighting and violence, which was so characteristic of us in our hey-day, seems such an ordinary, normal thing to us that we do not realise that it is a personal quality of ours which other races do not necessarily share and which, to them is a sign of our madness - a sort of periodic form of lycanthropy.

If we look around with unprejudiced eyes, we will see how true this is.

No other race fights simply for the pleasure of it. True, they also had and have their 'wars', but these are always more in the nature of skirmishing and manoeuvres, forays and infiltrating night attacks. Few are the battles of the East and Africa of which any record has remained, where the history of Europe and India is the story of our previous existence, with battles for punctuation marks.

There have been in those 'other lands' also, the overrunning of whole countries, and the extermination of whole nations. There have been profound changes in power and styles of government - but very few, if any, 'battles'. Where, among us, the soldier is an honourable man despite his calling as a killer, where in India he belonged to the second highest caste - in China he was, and still is, rather frowned upon as a ruffian and at best a 'necessary evil'.

Among the Bantu of Africa, also, there is much folklore but no remembrance of battles except in the South where Chaka listened to some deluded missionary. Even there, there were no real battles; only raids and massacres, till Chaka, like Montezuma, came to stand face to face with the 'real' thing.

His men acquitted themselves like heroes, even in our perverted sense, showing that their lack of the 'wish to fight' was not due to cowardice.

The 'lower races', like the head hunters and the aborigines in the jungles, also kill, but they do this as a part of the ritual of their way of life - as a part of their system of magic. When we investigate these killings we find that there is no 'fight' involved, no 'victory for the strongest'. It is ambushing or a killing from the undergrowth, of an unsuspecting victim.

The 'ritual' nature of this killing is further demonstrated by the fact that the killer 'has to undergo a long rite of 'purification' after, and often before his deed, before he is allowed back into the community. The same mystic implications apply to most primitive 'tribal' wars.

The Sanskrit, the Indo-European, has no such scruples. He enjoys the fight and an unholy glee fills him at the sight of the bloody remains of his enemy which have fallen at his feet.

It is true that most of this has been leached out of us by the last two world wars (which have given us a surfeit of blood and death), combined with the normal and natural trend inherent in all civilisations -but one does not have to study history to realise how deeply it is still ingrained in us.

One has but to visit an All-in wrestling show, and hear the pack howling for blood, to realise that we have not changed a whit and that we are not half a pace ahead of those who in the glorious days of Rome held down their thumbs, so that they could taste the climactic joy of seeing a human being killed.

We are only a bit more squeamish - not 'more civilised'. Our stomachs are not as strong as they used to be, that is all.

It is instructive, and even necessary for a full understanding, to go somewhat more deeply into this.

We are the only people who have personal, physical, man-to-man fights in public and who enjoy seeing them unashamedly.

This point is brought home when one compares our version of the 'Art of Self Defence' with that of a pair of Chinese 'boxers'. Their posing and strutting, leaping, stamping and slapping of their shins seem senseless theatricals to us, but that is because we do not understand what they are acting.

Each 'pose', entails a threat which, if fully executed, would mean the end of the opponent if he did not take timely countermeasures in the form of another stance. This new stance in itself contains a counterthreat which, once again, needs countermeasures from the first contestant; and in this way, a continuous, flowing pattern of incipient downfall and recovery is created by what are 'artists' rather than 'fighters'.

The audience understand and are therefore able to visualise and enjoy something which has been lifted entirely out of the world where people are so foolish as to hurt and to get hurt. In Chinese boxing, the accent is on the smoothness of the action and not on 'who wins'.

All our sports are centred on winning. They are all personal contests between individuals or 'sides', for the evanescent 'honour' of 'having won', and all one can do with that is to go and tell others about it, probably boring them to tears. What the competitors are really after is the thrill which the moment of victory gives them.

Here, once again, we meet the exception in Japan, and as that may someday prove a vitally important exception, we must take one moment off to snatch a closer look at it.

Not only do the Japanese have personal contests in public in the form of Judo and especially in its elephantine wrestlers, it is also the only not-Sanskrit nation whose members came to our universities, learnt what we had to teach them, went home and put it into practice and - remained themselves.

Not one of the other nations and races have been able to do this. Their students have come to us and gone home, contaminated by our way of life so that they were no more than cheap imitations of Europeans; or the comparison of the two ways of life made them go to the other extreme and changed them into rabid anti-Westerns whose life was embittered by a useless and senseless hatred of everything that had anything to do with the White Man.

Only the Japanese were able to extract what they could use out of our treasure-house and discard the rest.

Only the Japanese were able to build up and maintain industries and factories in the best tradition. Only Japan has a really efficient civil administration and disciplined servants of the state. Only Japan has Trade Unions and civil organisations which are not more than to an average degree contaminated by the personal interests of those in positions of power. In short, one can say that Japan adapted most of what is positive in our way of life and yet - they are not like us.

Because of this, one is tempted to assume that somewhere in the dawn of human existence an admixture took place in which the genes for the 'sensing of the real' were transmitted, although the Sanskrit racial type and language were obliterated.

This idea gains credibility when we are reminded of two interesting facts.

The first is that 'Eurasians' generally look much more like Orientals and are often difficult to distinguish from them (more difficult than the European from a dark, southern European for instance).

The second and even more significant fact is that in the north of Japan, there is an enclave of rapidly disappearing but nonetheless undoubtedly 'Indo-European', 'Sanskrit' people; the Aniu. As if to underline the time era when the split-off from the rest of their tribe happened, they are still on the edge of the totemic era and of one family with the bears that live in the mountains behind them.

The point may be legitimately raised here that the Bantu, as we know them, are also always fighting among themselves. This 'fighting', however, is not in any way like what fighting meant to the typical 'European' of the days of our youth as a Civilisation.

In the Bantu and the Negro it is more a part of the pattern of the 'survival of the fittest' aspect of life in nature. His fighting is something he works himself up into by arousing his own passions, by magic incantations and potions, and by war dances, designed to inflame the spirit of aggressiveness in him and dull his fear of death and pain. The wish to fight is brought in from outside.

The modern version of this can be seen on Sunday afternoons all over the Rand, where within a wide ring of spectators the young bucks blow off steam because they have been too long away from their womenfolk. They do not do this at home in their kraals.

Beating their chests they prance around, showing their muscles and yelling defiance at all corners. Half blinded by sweat and excitement, they barge into others and stagger apart till two grab hold of each other and go at it hammer and tongs, with no holds barred, legs and arms and teeth and butting with the head - all is allowed.

Compared to these displays of pure animal ferocity, our All-in wrestling bouts are kindergarten brawls.

These fights, besides having no rules, also have no real beginning or end. The chap who gets the worst of it slinks away, and after the first yell of victory both seem to have forgotten what it was all about, resuming their yelling and strutting. There is no real winner in the show nor a loser, unless someone really gets hurt. The spectators, in their excitement, may join in, and when he has had enough, a fighter may join the spectators.

Anything further from the man who fights for the love of it, from the man who respects the fight and the fighter as 'something noble', and who has the man who can fight 'without losing his rag' as his ideal, can hardly be imagined.

In a way it is as if one compared the sexual relationships of the practised libertine who extracts his pleasure from the perfection of his act, to those of the hormone-driven male who simply cannot help himself.

The best way of all, however, to judge the mentality of a nation or a race, is to study the motivation, the structure and the aim of the games they play. Games cannot and will not survive if they do not interest the players; and therefore in the games they play, their type and the things they seek to achieve, one must find an accurate selection of all the most important things that make those people tick.

Now, our games are, for the most part combinations of the competitive spirit, aiming at the thrill of victory, and the 'keep fit' idea.

The not-European has no such ideals. The 'Fit body' as an aim for spending energy on, is to him a rather low and 'animal' conception.

His ideal is the fit mind which is able to enjoy, and the body which is comfortably fat from eating well and working little, or not at all.

And who would say that he is wrong?

The not-European does not like to 'compete' either, he 'outwits'. He does not try to 'out-fight', he 'out-generals'. Any dog can fight - he thinks - and the Chinese proverb says, not for nothing, that: 'One does not make nails out of good iron, nor soldiers out of good men'.

Among nearly all of them, the man who compels respect and admiration is not the upright, or the honest man, but the man who succeeds, by hook or by crook. The ideal of a large part of the Bantu peoples is definitely the 'successful liar', the 'cheat who gets away with it'.

The most marked indication of our basic differences is to be found in the games of the intelligent, on both sides of the dividing line.

Here our game is chess, which seems to have its source in our cradle, near Persia.

Its essence is the taking (killing) of a piece and confiscating its square. The pieces are all different and have their own values, qualities and abilities. It is a 'real' game in that it symbolically represents our way of life with a King or a Head Person at the top, without whom the whole herd ceases to exist.

It is finally remarkable for being fully controlled by laws and conventions and in general it is obvious that it is an expression of our basic nature, as any game must be.

The Oriental equivalent of this is one which, by some fantastic accident of sound apportioning, is called 'Go Bang'. Even in our language it could not have been called by a better name.

It, too, is played on a squared board, but here the lines between the squares represent 'roads' connecting 'fourway crossings'.

Each player has a store of counters - all alike, all of the same value, the one's white, the other's black, and they place them, one by one, alternatively on crossways of their choice. There are no laws controlling this, or any other part of the game, and the value of the counters lies, not in what they are, but the position they occupy.



The aim of this game is to 'encircle' the enemy. The moment when a group of men belonging to one player have been so enclosed by the men of the other that they have no way out of the encirclement, the other player confiscates all these men and replaces them with his own.

As in the meantime the first player has been busy preparing a potential fence around his opponent (who, intent upon encircling the group of men placed there as 'bait' may not have seen it) he will soon be able to 'close the gate' and confiscate both the enemy's ground and the area that he has just 'liberated', as we would call it.

As can be imagined, the whole is a most fascinating play of plot-counter-plot. On the surface it looks too simple for serious consideration as a game for the intelligent, but the strange part about it is that the European is not able to really play it well - neither on the board nor in the realms of international politics, as has only too blatantly been demonstrated to us for the last decade during which we have been trying to learn how to do it without realising the change-over.

The Oriental does not 'fight', he outmanoeuvres his opponent into a tree and then, after having seated himself and having sipped a cup of aromatic tea, he takes up his gun, and, using a rest, shoots him down out of the branches. Truly! That is the way in which a civilised and sensible man should take care of such things! He is not squeamish about killing. Something that troubles one should be removed, but there is no need to descend to animal brawling, is there?

There is a wealth of instruction in comparing Chess and Go Bang seeing that, in essence, the game of international politics is played on the same board and with the same pieces.

We came into power by playing Chess. We came and we took, killing whatever was in the way and possibly a little more, just for luck.

We held on to our power by keeping on playing Chess, moving in here, covering such and such areas by our firepower (our famous 'zones of influence') and, where natives' proved restive (which we called 'being treacherous'), we moved in again and did some more killing.

We played for the 'Kings' too. We took Montezuma and 'The Inca' himself, with the use of a small band of devoted fighters - a lonely, isolated Bishop and Knight combination.

It was the 'Shepherd's mate', which is usually successful against beginners who sit back astounded at having lost before they began to play.

Oh yes! We are very good at playing Chess, and, if we could have gone on playing it, we would still have been at the top of the heap.

We have the practical mind that distinguishes what is essential from a practical point of view from the inessential. We had discipline, the devotion to an external idea and the lack of sense which tells 'normal' people to stay away from danger. Above all, our soldiers had the tradition of the 'great warrior' who keeps cool, keeps his head and keeps his powder dry.

However, as we have already indicated, Chess needs the ability and the willingness to kill and that is a characteristic of a beginning civilisation. It is not found in any reasonable quantity at the end of it.

At the end of a civilisation, as with us, the laws which were originally instituted to legalise the position of the robbers of the previous generations by a moratorium have penetrated so far and become so ingrained that everybody really believes them. Ethics (the belief in 'higher' values - in the goodness of

goodness for its own sake) backs up the growing dislike for the cruder forms of self-aggrandisement, together with an almost prudish shrinking away from the real physical sensations and pain of the flesh.

As we cannot bring ourselves to kill any more, even when it is necessary for our own preservation; and as we, by our living together in peace and harmony, have become so much aware of the other man's point of view that it has become a practical impossibility to find an excuse strong enough to convince us that we should take what belongs to others - it has also become impossible to play Chess. When one comes to the point where one has to ask the opponent if he will be kind enough to let our little pawn share a square with his rook, it is obviously time to pick up what one can of the pieces and go home.

It is time now to go home - if one could, but that, alas, is manifestly impossible. The game must go on, and, if we cannot play Chess, we must play the other fellow's game - we must sit in and play Go Bang.

To realise that here we are as much out of our depth as the others were in playing our game, one has but to look to the Middle East and the East where a full-scale demonstration game has been on for some time.

One can try to analyse the moves, work out the different gambits and write a treatise on how Go Bang is played in international politics, but the full realisation of the devilish ingenuity and efficacy of this game only comes when one draws up a balance sheet for the last decade and adds up the fantastic total of what has been wangled out of the West (which here includes Russia, for that big fellow is as much a dupe of this game as we are. As a matter of fact, it is a part of the game that we should not know that the Bear is also led by the nose).

Compared with what it has cost the Arabs and Mao Tse-tung, their total gains are simply unbelievable in terms of the average expense of Chess players.

A few false or half-true rumours about gun-running, an expendable 'king' shot dead by a few hooligans, some hundred or so of foamflecked speeches, a spate of propaganda over radios (which are mostly run with 'foreign' capital at that), astute lobbying behind the scenes designed to play out the 'teutonic' against the 'slav' halves of our basic Sanskrit group, and Nasser had the Suez Canal. In a year and a half of Sundays he and his people would never have been able to construct it by themselves; they have only the accidental 'right' of happening to have settled ages ago in a place where such a canal could be dug. They were able to give the bronx cheer to Whitehall, and have proud England rapped over the knuckles by Uncle Sam who still had ideas about being able to 'win the goodwill' of the peoples he was helping to 'liberate', and whose 'Legitimate National Aspirations' as Dulles put it, 'he supported wholeheartedly'.

All this, if one looks at it impartially, has cost nothing. Not a shot has been fired in real anger and hardly anyone has been killed, except when England and France with the help of poor 'lost' Israel tried in exasperation to resort to Chess, to the disgust and horror of all the 'civilised' world and the holding of breath from the others.

For a moment they must have had their doubts. Had they possibly been putting on the screws too much and too soon? Could this old and tired beast still be irritated into some kind of a resurrection?

Happily not! The pieces were withdrawn and the game could go on. We cannot keep it up and bluff has never worked with the not-European. He himself is a master of that.

Every day millions of Western money (representing work which in this way has been made unproductive), are poured into this game which we are now trying to learn. Armies and navies are moved from one faked-up crisis-point to another and when the Russians and ourselves show signs of

slackening or stopping to mistrust each other, Mao sends for Krushchev or Kosygin, whispers something in his ear, and the trouble starts in Quemoy or Vietnam.

Lately we have a repeat performance by Sukarno who, for the price of a few public speeches and the lives of a few deluded expendables, is making England and Australia spend millions of pounds.

The West is like a lumbering, harried bull, storming in short spurts at a pack of dogs yapping at it from all directions; or at a bunch of Banderilleros, Picadores and Matadores.

It spends a thousand footpounds of energy to be, time after time, frustrated by the wave of a mantilla or a swing of the hips.

Suddenly the enemy has disappeared.

As if by magic he is somewhere else!

The audience - and possibly even the Bull in the deepest recesses of his heart - knows that this simply cannot go on. Something will have to give and it will not be the bullfighters - of that one can be sure - not *all* of them.

They are really only playing, they are not fighting for their lives. When they get bored or tired, they can leave the arena for a time to go and drink in the refreshment room. Others will keep the bull (and the audience) occupied.

Not so the bull. He has to keep on taking notice of every wave of a red rag, of every movement on the wide field around him. Any of them may mean the final moment if he does not turn to face it.

The not-Europeans all over the world are learning this marvellous pastime, even the Bantu to whom this is a new game which they have never played before, but for which they have ample aptitude.

One by one they are all sitting in and claiming their share. By playing one White against another, they already have the poor fellows where they are begging to be allowed to give whatever is demanded.

One wonders what our forefathers would say if they could see what their offspring have come to.

Not that we are no good! We are too good - too good to live and to survive, and one fears too good to be true. Committing suicide for a high ideal would be a wonderful way of quitting the stage, but that ideal would then have to be one in which we really believed and not a false front, hiding sloth and pusillanimity.

When we look at the individual who in the aggregate as a race, has such wonderful ideals that he would rather die than be unjust; and would rather lose everything than take from another race what is due to that race, we get a shock.

These individuals - you and I, dear reader - only have those immaculate ideas for the relationships between nations and races when they do not touch or interfere with our personal lives. In ourselves we are still the same utter egoists we have always been. We are still on the lookout for a windfall, even if that windfall may mean the ruination of another. We still jockey and scheme and lie and cheat as much as we can to get the advantage of others, either in our own person, or as a group in Trade Unions and Cartels and Trusts. We still charge as high a price as we think we can get rather than what we know the product is worth. Our honesty is limited by the law and not by truth.

What can still be called 'good business' would make even a sophisticated angel weep.

We look down upon those around us if they do not conform to the standards we have set ourselves. We try to keep up with the Joneses at all costs. We bow our heads in awe to the possessors of money rather than to civilisation and those who live civilised lives.

We would think a man mad if he said that it was our moral duty fully to educate and train the cheap help (who has been hired to take our place) in the skills of our craft before tendering our 'voluntary' resignation - but this is, in effect, what the anti-racialists expect White South Africa to do for the lost cause of the survival of the White Race.

It is sad but true that most of our beautiful ideas about Human Rights, Equality and even Democracy are only for outside consumption. We demand that our race as a whole must stand sponsor for these ideals so that we can be proud of belonging to it, but we never expect them to ricochet and hit us personally in the middle of the herd.

Later on we will look at these 'western ideals' again and see what they really mean.

In the meantime we have come to the end of our consideration of the extremely interesting historic background of this, the White Man's situation in the pattern of history at the middle of the twentieth century A.D.

It is to be hoped that in seeing it in the manner in which Burns asked to be allowed to see it, we have at least learnt something.

## CHAPTER VIII

### *Men are not Equal*

There is, in our day, probably nothing that gives rise to so much woolly and even schizophrenic thinking (shot through with completely irrational, almost compulsive emotionalism) than the statement - or the thesis - "All men are equal".

The bewildered inquirer from the previous generation, in which nobody had yet heard of it, asks: "But - in the name of all that is sensible - how can you make a statement like that? How can you calmly contradict the evidence of your own eyes? How can you deny all the evidence of your experience (and that of everybody else)? Has it not shown you that no two human beings are ever equally gifted? Is there then no truth in school records and competitive examinations? Have you forgotten how different even you yourself are from your brothers and sisters? Do you honestly believe that there is, or was, no difference between Savonarola, Buffalo Bill, Beethoven and a Baluba cannibal? Were Monopotapa, G. B. Shaw, Jack the Ripper, an Eskimo and George Washington identical?"

If the person to whom these questions are put is reasonably intelligent and willing to discuss what to many would, a priori, seem to be an almost blasphemous attitude to a semi-religious verity, one receives an answer which will essentially be: "Of course they are not the same, you fool! But they are equal nevertheless!"

If one then shifts the examination to the meaning of the word "equal" which here seems to have acquired another dimension, one loses still another percentage of those who are willing to proceed with the discussion, mostly because they have never thought that the word 'equal' could need a closer inspection. They know what it means - and that is good enough for them.

Discussion with the others however leads to the preliminary discovery that, behind the general statement of this basic Credo, there is either one, or the other, (or even both) of two 'equalities'.

One can paraphrase them as meaning: "All men are equal before God," and "All men have equal rights".

The first 'equality' is essentially religious, even when 'God' is seen as 'The Universe' or, still more abstractly and impersonally, as 'Existence'.

In its openly religious form man is seen as having a 'soul' and it is accepted as almost a truism that all these 'souls' have an equal value and importance before God. (This is the idea at least, even if it is usually no more than a theoretical truth which few believers apply in their private lives.)

Even for the true believer it is, however, difficult to think that God has as much interest in the soul of an idiot as he has in the soul of a saint (or in that of the true Believer himself, for that matter). And, once the possibility of a difference is admitted, the gradation of values for those in between is already there.

As a basis for the tenet that all men are, or should be, equal in this material world of ours, the religious equality, which nobody can disprove, is, however, without value - either logically or as a derivation from what the Bible teaches us.

There is no legitimate reason for transposing 'eternal' values into 'temporal' ones. The souls of men may be of equal value in the eternal scheme of things but that does not imply that the man, whose soul it is, should have an equal value in all mundane situations and relationships. In these material circumstances

it is the thinking and feeling qualities of the man himself, his ability to adjust, to see the other man's point of view, to be honest and conscientious, and numerous other qualities, that determine his social and political and economic value. These are not determined by the fact that he, like all other human beings, has a soul of average value.

The Bible itself teaches us the inequality of man.

Nowhere in it do we find a diatribe against, or even a mild criticism of, the iniquity of the slavery which was rife when it was written. Much less do we find the demand, or even the hint, that a one-man-one-vote system of government might possibly be desirable.

On the contrary.

We find that Jesus says that we must give to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar. Jesus does not question the right of tyrants to rule as they think fit. In the parable of the talents, He describes God Himself as dealing out different mundane values and gifts to His children, despite the equality of their souls.

Both the idea of the equal soul and the teachings of the Bible therefore give little support to the Equality of Man. It is merely 'read into' them by the natural tendency of every true believer to transfer to his own, personal valuations, the religious aura and the sanction of his God.

One of the most amusing instances of this habit is surely the oft repeated insistence by some churches that God Himself abhors anything that smacks of the Undemocratic! God, according to them, seems to be the 'Supreme Democrat'

Such statements are, at best, no more valid than the parallel argument that God demands apartheid and abhors miscegenation. Jesus here again certainly was not shocked or even perturbed at the fantastic racial melting pot in which He lived. One also understands that he frowned at the apartheid which the Jews practised against the Gentiles.

As neither the concept of the 'equal soul' nor the teachings of our Bible seem to justify the near religious belief which is accorded to "All men are equal", we must dig deeper still to try and find its roots and the origin of the strength of its compulsion.

Here we come up against the concept of 'Man' as being a unique and worthwhile creature, placed on this world and in this Universe by God or Fate. He is supposed to be worthy of respect for no other reason than that he is a 'man'. He is seen as something apart from, and essentially above, all the rest of creation. In a way Man is God's masterpiece and he is the god of all else - just as Jehova is the god of men.

This way of seeing things is manifestly the tail end of the original, primitive and entirely 'anthropocentric' concept of creation which placed Man in the centre of it all. It saw everything created for his special benefit while even the gods needed their prayers and their sacrifices. (An echo of this 'heathen' attitude can still be read everyday in the newspapers where an advertisement tells us that "Jesus needs prayers.")

Few intelligent and educated people will admit that they still believe in this but the spirit is there and the argument that Man is worthy, simply because he is 'Man' - and not because of any intrinsic and defined personal worthiness - can hardly be seen in any other way.

It is still essentially and completely anthropocentric - and disturbingly primitive. It shows by its popularity how far mankind still has to go.

There is another variation of this idea which is not really 'anthropocentric' but which is even more foolish. This is the feeling that all that 'Mankind' has achieved makes 'Man' worthy, and that every man (being a 'Man') must therefore partake of that worthiness. This is manifestly as inane as the goose who swaggers about in the muck of the farmyard because a flock of geese saved Rome by their cackling.

The more one speaks and argues with people, the more one comes to the conclusion that, in reality, the problem is nowhere as 'deep' as all that. These defences and explanations are no more than justifications and rationalisations of an answer that is already there before the argument and the explanations. The root of the modern idea of the Equality of Man lies again in the innate (albeit subconscious) sense of incompetence and insufficiency of the little man who has assumed the power in our 'modern' times.

The arguments are an attempt by the little man to justify his ideas by referring them to one or another of the few 'eternal' values which he is still willing to recognise. In fact it turns out that his credo of "All men are equal" is no more than a generalisation and a deification of the feeling: "I'm any time as good as the next man, whoever he may be."

Behind his defence, is the thought: "The other chap may be able to do more than I can do, he may know more or he may have better manners and clothes and what have you - but that does not mean that he is better than I am.

"He is only a man, just like me."

It is amusing to note that therefore it is in our frailties and our failings that we are actually equal - but that never comes near the surface.

What the little man hates is not 'greater ability' but 'superiority' and not even so much the 'superiority' as the expression of superiority! He will not admit that he is 'inferior' although he may readily admit that he is not as 'able'. Such an admission may even make him feel good because it demonstrates his 'modesty' which, to the little man again, is a primary laudable quality.

As the 'equality' has now become the absence of 'superiority' and 'inferiority', it means that the primary slogan has acquired the meaning of "All men have an equal value".

Here, however, it is forgotten that for the word 'value' to have any sense at all, it must imply a valuator to whom or to which the individual has a value; and we have gone all round the mulberry bush to arrive where we began. The original arguments turn out to have been attempts to define this Valuator either as a 'God', or the 'Universe' or 'Humanity', who are taken to be valutors to whom all men are equally valuable.

This is the day of the little man, and what *he* hates more than anything else is the 'superior man' because that man makes him feel small and inadequate. The superior man brings home the little man's littleness to him. In our day the little man has got rid of most of the 'superior men' in his own environment and is slowly but doggedly throttling those that have survived, into death and conformity - but this picture has an obverse side. It is that which fills the little man with the almost hysterical fear of being himself superior to somebody else.

He knows what has happened to the superior men and he fears the same fate for himself. The thought gives him a sense of insecurity when all he asks of life is, please God, to be secure and not to be held responsible for his own failings.

In the days when there were masters they carried the burden and, as long as the little man stayed within the prescribed limits, he was reasonably safe. Now he has become a 'master' himself, and as the Master no longer stands between him and the results of his incompetency, the little man wants nothing to do with the impersonal laws of nature and fate, and the inexorable effect of the impersonal laws of cause and effect which were once the domain and the responsibility of the Master.

The only safety he can see is in the mass where no decisions will have to be made and no responsibilities to be taken. He wishes for a vast rabble of nondescript, almost identical, individuals in the very anonymity of which he can hide himself.

As long as there is inequality there will be strife. As long as any part of him sticks out anywhere he can be hurt in it.

If, therefore, one could transform the world into one great welfare state where there would be nothing to achieve but also nothing to lose, one would be safe - for ever; and anyone who does not try to play the game that way, anyone who stands up and objects, is seen as a maniac and a blasphemer.

Here then is one of the main sources of the almost pathological disgust at 'Apartheid' and at the superiority of the group of self-styled 'supermen' that, to his mind, 'Apartheid' must imply.

The 'normal' reaction he shows in the case of the influx of (God forbid, not inferior) 'foreign' people into England, or the rise of Black Nationalism in America (where it threatens the little man's personal security) indicates only too clearly what the background of all this make-believe really is.

Actually it is no more than fighting windmills.

It is not really a question of 'superiority' or 'inferiority' at all. That is merely the interpretation which the little mind of the little man gives to it. In reality it is a question of the fitness or the ability of men to live according to the moral, economical and political codes and laws of the community in which they find themselves, and by overlooking this, the train of the argument finally derails completely.

Once having declared all men to be 'equal', the word (as is the habit of all words), reverts back to its original meaning of 'the same'. All men, being essentially the same, should therefore have the gifts and the ability to live and thrive and to be absorbed into the social, moral and political environment in which the little man lives. It is when it is demonstrated to him that this is not so - at least in the specimens of the other races with whom he comes into personal contact (or competition) that he loses his spurious, fear-imposed 'idealism'.

He fights back, as well as he can, because the law of the survival of the fittest has, despite his vehement denial of its validity (in regard to modern man), caught up with him again once more - and he is 'only human' after all!



## CHAPTER IX

### *Human Rights*

What do we really mean by these wonderful words? What are these 'Human Rights' we prate about as being 'equal'?

Whole political campaigns are built upon them. Most of the U.N.O. (which we have spawned for its sake) rests upon them, and yet when one corners even the most intelligent inhabitant of that somewhat saddening cloud-cuckoo land, he cannot answer the simplest basic questions on the subject, although he can give us chapter and verse on the policy.

What then, in this context, is the meaning of the word 'Human'. for instance? It can hardly have the meaning that it has in the sentence: "To err is human". That is not what we mean, but then, what is it?

The simplest and most popular definition is that of 'belonging to the Genus Homo'. It is popular because it shifts the responsibility on to the shoulders of Science.

Science, however, has an uncomfortable habit of forgetting that its discoveries sometimes have devastating effects on both human lives and their pet theories.

It was simple to define a Genus as the group of those who can cross-breed with each other. This made all men 'Human' and members of the Genus Homo. They have never tried to cross-breed with their cousins across the line and it could therefore be accepted that this cross-breeding was impossible.

Lately, however, with the study of the composition of the chromosomes and the genes, the lifting of the veil from the micro-biochemical events in the cells of living tissue, the D.N.A. template and other irrefutable, but to the layman, mysterious facts, it has become more and more apparent that the 'genetic border line' may have to be drawn between the Gorillas and the Chimpanzees on the one side and the Orang Outang and the Gibbons on the other, rather than between the most primitive men and the Gorillas and the Chimpanzees.

This therefore would place the latter in the Genus Homo with the resultant collapse of the whole 'Human Rights' theory if it is to be based on 'Scientific' principles.

It is becoming more and more likely that, where the Tigon and the Liger prove the genetic association between lions and tigers, the birth of a Gorilman or a Manzee may very soon prove that the Gorilla or the Chimpanzee should, scientifically speaking, be admitted to the group that have Human Rights, and thus should have their one-man-one-vote privileges, and at least their fair share of the handouts from America and Europe to the Congo whose 'citizens' they are.

Obviously the genetic definition is not valid here. Because we had a preconceived idea, we have again to scramble back and to define a Human as being a living creature who to us looks like 'a Man'. This reminds one of the famed document of the Declaration of Independence. There, too, when it declared 'All men to be born free and equal', it did not consider the Negro to be one of those 'men' - they did not look like 'men'.

The term Human now acquires for us the rather vague meaning of "All those whom others, who are undoubtedly human, are willing to admit as brothers under the skin". This again, for practical purposes,

leads to the possibility that a plebiscite should be taken in doubtful cases to decide who is Human and who is not.

But if that was all, there would not be much trouble. We could easily hide the little difficulties from ourselves.

What is important is that, despite the 'All men are equal' background to all modern thinking, in practice not even the most fanatical believer in Human Rights applies these Rights equally to all those whom he must under any definition admit to be 'Human'. When it comes to the apportioning of Rights there are evidently Human beings that are more or less human than others - and in our immediate surroundings.

Unknown probably even to himself, the theoretician is again keeping something up his sleeve: - a criterion, or a set of criteria - which he does not openly acknowledge but which nevertheless determine how much of these 'equal' rights a specific human being should have.

As the wag said, "All men are equal, only some are more equal than others."

Let us ask ourselves some questions.

Do we really mean that, in this context, every creature born of woman is Human and that, as such, he comes in for his full share of Rights - or is there after all discrimination? Are all Idiots, Madmen, Schizophrenics and Maniacs Human to us?

And if they are not, where exactly is the line, the criterion which divides the Human from the non- or only partially Human? Must we take the word of the Psychiatrist (who changes his theories on the nature of insanity at least once in every decade) to determine this for us? At what level in the evolution of mankind and at exactly what Intelligence Quotient did man become Human? And why exactly there and not at a lower or at much higher level?

If, again, the Humanity of Man in this context depends upon his intelligence, why is there no intelligence test devised that will show if a certain man, a certain nation or a certain race is fit to be given Human rights? Why prattle sentimental nonsense about the Rights of Man?

But there is more. Are babes in arms human in this sense? Obviously not, for they have not the necessary I.Q. either, at whatever level it may be pegged - but the development of the I.Q. stops rising for the over-large part of Humanity (even for that of the White Race) at about the age of twelve. A large percentage never reach that level at all. What possible excuse can there then be if the twelve- or thirteen-year-old has reached the level of the maximum intelligence for the average citizen, to withhold the deserved Human Rights from him at that age?

The answer is of course that this child has not yet reached the stage in its development where it can be expected to be able to make a mature and balanced judgement. It may know enough but it does not yet fully understand. It lacks the experience to weigh the deeper values, one against the other.

This is true and valid and even necessary - but where is it found in the term Human Rights? That only specifies that the person must be 'human' to qualify.

It now appears that when claiming Human Rights the maturity, the understanding and the ability to evaluate correctly must first be demonstrated. Why do the anti-racialists not argue and bring proof of these things when they pontificate about the Human rights of the 'suppressed' races of this world?

And there is still more. Besides the necessity of a definition for the intelligence and the maturity and understanding necessary to qualify, there is also the fact that criminals are nowhere accorded all their Human Rights. This brings up the questions of at what place in the scale of criminality the criminal should forfeit his Human Rights, and secondly what criminal code must be accepted for all Humanity? One can hardly accord rights to one person on a different basis from that used for another. To use the codes applicable to each person in his daily life would entail that the man who lives in a harshly governed state will have to be much more worthy of it than the fellow brought up in a happy-go-lucky community which does not worry much about what he does as long as he does not kill too many people.

It is apparent that here our problem takes a most amusing turn.

It is criminal in Russia to diverge too much from the opinions of the current rulers. Are anti-communist ideas and radical tendencies therefore going to be a bar to receiving Human rights all over the world?

On the other hand it is criminal to be a Communist in America. Is 'being a communist', therefore also going to exclude one from the company of what, by now, are the elite?

It is not criminal in Cannibal countries to eat each other; rather the inverse. Does a Cannibal still have full Human Rights in our world or is he, despite ourselves, somewhat of an outcast - somewhat 'in-human'? What right have we to condemn the age-old practice of anthropophagy? Is it because this particular item in the menu demands that men be killed, and that therefore the rights of another human being to live must have been interfered with?

If that is so, all peoples have lost the rights to human privileges. We have all, as nations, killed others and have remained unshriven by either ceremony or inner remorse. We are even proud of our Victories

In this respect some of the loudest, most vociferous claimants for our human rights, are still killing each other in regular 'illegitimate(!)' border raids all over the world. The only difference is that they waste their victims on the worms instead of giving them, with due reverence to the culinary experts of the tribe. If the reader will analyse his reactions to this seemingly facetious way of putting it, he will find to his surprise that, after all, it is not so much the killing as the eating to which he objects! Man is a strange creature, even a civilised man!

Coming up the scale of human frailties, does the practice of Polygamy, or worse still, Polyandry, make people inhuman in the eyes of our idealists? What possible reason can there be for excluding them except for the silly reason that we have been brought up in a world where Monogamy is the rule? Can we honestly claim that there was, or is, less happiness among them than there is among us; and what, after all, but the happiness of men can be a criterion for the judgement of a people, unless we wish to go to the fantastic extreme of claiming that our system of morals, ethics and religion is the only 'right' one?

When one examines the loss of civic rights of criminals, one realises that here another criterion has been introduced, without defining it. The criminal has shown that he has no sense of responsibility and the rest of the community feels that it cannot trust a say in its destiny to the man who feels no responsibility for the general good.

Beyond this the problem becomes still more involved and at the same time more remote from reality when one tries to enquire what exactly is meant by those 'rights' a Human is supposed to have.

'The Right to live', is in itself nonsense, for the right to live without the wherewithal to do so, is valueless.

'The Right to earn a living', is also an empty phrase if there is not the ability or the willingness to work.

'The Right to work', which at intervals has been so popular as a slogan in the 'class wars' of our century, pre-supposes that there must be such work available. If it is, it will be asking for workers, so it is nonsense to demand the 'right' to fill the job. If there is not enough work available, it is again a futile thing to demand the 'Right to work'. Everybody cannot have a *right* to something of which there is not enough to go round.

Here, despite everything, the survival of the most able comes in, and the only Right man can be said to have is the 'Right to compete', which is certainly not what the term 'Human Rights' pretends to promise. And, anyhow, nobody is going to stop people from competing unless the workers themselves do it.

In the end, the problem is who must provide this work, and one suspects that it is not only work to which the Human fellow thinks he has a Right, but suitable work and work for a living wage at that. with the worker deciding what work is 'suitable' and what is a 'living wage'.

One would expect again that the right to receive wages for work would be counterbalanced by the right to receive work for the wages paid out; but that is not to be found in modern thinking, adjusted as it is to the little man.

He thinks that the world owes him a living and not that he owes the world a reasonable amount of exertion and honest endeavour. That is not the way he sees the distribution of 'Rights'!

The 'Right to resign' should in any system of justice obviously be counterbalanced by the 'Right to discharge'; but that, too, is a thing the employers are only allowed to dream about - if they do not talk in their sleep.

One can finally indicate that if Polygamy is a right for some Human beings, it should be a 'Right' for every man to have more than one troublemaker in his house if he so wishes; and if cannibals can be Human too, it must be the 'Right' of every man to eat, if not his neighbour, then at least his fellow Human from across the border, if he thinks it will do him any good.

'Rights' which are not defined by an elaborate and detailed code of Laws are so many empty words, fit only to use in rabble-rousing speeches and not fit to serve as material for serious thought.

When finally one comes down to brass tacks, one finds that the only 'Rights' the ranters and the demagogues are really talking about when they rave about Human Rights, are their political rights - which (possibly significantly) are also the only ones which really interest those selfsame demagogues because it is on them that they build their power, their influence and their importance.

Every man, according to them, must have his political rights. Without them he is a nothing, a nonentity, a helpless slave. You can take everything away from him, but you must leave him his political rights, for with those he can put the speechifier into power and keep him there. This political power the politician can buy with empty promises and it is probably one of the most amazing facets of the human mind that they can get away with it, election after election, and will seemingly be able to do so for ever.

## CHAPTER X

### *Liberty and Liberation*

Where the phrase “Human Rights” suffers both from a lack of definable meaning and from the uses to which it is put by politicians, the word 'Liberty' runs it a close second.

It must be emphasised that it is not contended here that the ideas themselves are meaningless or without value. Later on we will try to distil out the gold that is still there. But here we see them in the way they are presented as political slogans, essentially empty of any definable meaning, while their mob-rousing, potentially power-conferring ability is of the highest order.

As said earlier on, some three or four hundred years ago our White race spread out over the world like a blight. By gunpowder and a complete lack of personal integrity in our dealings with the 'lower races' (whom we in those days did not really consider to be 'human') we subjugated most of the world. Few indeed were the nations or tribes that retained their freedom.

In fact we had the whole world in thrall, for even those who had remained free had to take careful notice of our wishes for fear of provoking yet another 'grab'.

This is the picture which (without the 'amorality' implication) our history books give us of our past. It is also the picture on which the present-day hysterical rout of haphazard, conscience-stricken 'liberations' is based.

But is it true?

Every time the modern "White man" sees a poor native, his conscience gives him a sharp jab at the thought of the scarlet register of the sins of his ancestors and he feels that he must do something about it, even if it is only to expectorate in the direction of South Africa.

But is that 'historic' image correct?

One cannot help but feel that cool-headed examination must show it up for what it is - a completely false image presented to us on the basis of more or less empty words.

Whom exactly did we overpower? From whom did we take the liberty that was their so-called “Divine Birthright”? Whose Liberty finally is it, in this situation that really counts?

One thinks that it must be admitted that the freedom of a country, the 'LIBERTY OF THE NATION', is, or should be, preciously little to boast about if inside that country or that nation there is no liberty for the people themselves. It is easy to forget that the Russia of Ivan the Terrible and Hitler's Germany were 'free' nations, and that had they not been 'free' the deeds that made them infamous would possibly not have been done. They too had 'Freedom' like the realms of Ghengis Kahn and, in our own country, the Zulus under Chaka.

The liberty of a nation should only have value - or even justification - when it results in the liberty of its citizens. If this is not so, one must come to the conclusion that it is not so much 'oppression' itself as 'oppression by an alien' that is objectionable. One finds in this way that it is not the 'oppression' but the 'alien-ness of the ruler' that is hated. The question of the liberty of the people themselves and the degree to which the state interferes in their private lives does not, for many, seem to come into the picture at all.

When this is realised, it becomes apparent that we, the White men, did not really 'enslave' the world, although we made ourselves its masters.

We only kicked out the old 'masters' and took over from them. In the days when we erupted from Europe, there were no democracies to destroy. With a few exceptions there were no people who governed themselves or who had anything to say in the way in which they were governed. There were 'Free peoples' it is true - but there were very few 'Free men'.

The great empires that we destroyed, like those of the Incas and the Aztecs and the Sultans of the East were mostly tyrannies in the worst sense of the word.

When we look at the effect our taking over had on the lives of the people themselves, on the lives of the living individuals who comprised the nations we 'enslaved', it can truly be said that (but for the two horrible exceptions of the extermination of the Congolese by the servants of King Leopold of the Belgians and the no less horrible extermination of the Red Indians by the Americans) we actually 'liberated' the human beings who had been enslaved by the power systems under which they lived.

In a way, even if they did not want to be saved, we saved them from themselves! We did not do this for their sakes or out of any Christian or other love for our fellow men. We did it for our own advantage and we saw to it that we profited by it - but they profited too. For most of them our taking over meant the first taste of anything like liberty that any of them had ever had since the beginning of time.

This is a very important fact which, in the hullabaloo of present-day idealism and faultfinding with one's neighbour, tends to be overlooked.

Paradoxically, in enslaving the world we brought it Liberty for we were better rulers than those that the world had had. Within certain limits we gave it the liberties that we permitted ourselves to have. Our rule, even if it was 'tyrannical' in that it allowed no political Power to be in the hands of the subjugated, was at least benevolent and, within the context of the colonies, relatively just. Our trade brought a certain measure of economic welfare above that which had been possible to the individual before. Our supervision of the internal ruling of the countries brought a measure of 'justice' which they had never known. Rules and laws instead of whims and personal power took over. Finally our health services fought the diseases and the endemic scourges that had meant an early death to millions of them. The people themselves never had "had it so good" although they by no means "had it so good" as we did.

All this is overlooked. One can for instance point to but one glaring example of this lack of insight. In the boiling pot of present-day America, in "The Marshall plan for Negroes" (as voiced by the National Urban League) the demand is not only for total equality but also for 'indemnification'. "The White man has kept my ancestors down in slavery for hundreds of years," the 'new' Negro says, "and he must pay. for their suffering. He must pay through the nose!"

The modern Negro does not seem to realise that if the White man had not taken his ancestors away to be slaves on the plantations of America, he - and his people - would, at best, still be living in the jungles of Africa without any civilisation, subject to rulers under whom not one of them would be able to survive for long.

It is even more likely that they would have been sold to the Arab slavers and have disappeared into the Middle East. They were already 'slaves' when they were sold to the White man boss.

The White men did not institute or invent slave trading. They rarely caught their slaves themselves. Slaves had already been a remunerative export product of Africa since time immemorial and the White

men, having use for them, bought as many as they could. They only provided a 'sellers' market' and caused a stepping up of the rate of production of the commodity.

Again, once his conscience had been touched and his Christian ethics had caught up with him, it was the White man who forcibly suppressed the trade as much as he could and that against the wish of the black rulers of Africa.

One cannot help but think that those who chatter about 'indemnification' should go back to Africa to see and experience from what the so much maligned (and admittedly heartless) White slave traders actually saved their Negro's ancestors.

Admittedly the wholesale slaughter of the Red Indians in America and the nearly total extermination of the Congolese are a blot on our history; but they are no worse than the constantly recurring holocausts in Africa, the hundreds of thousands who had their hearts torn from their living bodies in the Aztec rites, and the virtual 'genocide' that Chaka practised on the surrounding tribes. It is only in relation to our White man's moral code that these things were wrong. They have always been present in the world and the 'new' Africa is rapidly returning to them, as we can see from what is happening to the Watutsi in Rwanda today.

However, when the first bloodbaths had subsided, when the necessary security for ourselves had been established - we settled down and we, especially the English among us, shouldered the 'White Man's Burden' to save the 'natives' from themselves. We almost stamped out intertribal wars and even the headhunter became a 'murderer' who was punished according to our laws. The same thing is true of the ritual or medicine murders of the Basuto in South Africa.

"But what is all this if the nation is not free?" asks the reader, still influenced by a political slogan that has been drummed into him all the days of his life.

The (partial) answer to this lies in the answer to the question: "Whom did we really subjugate?" for the ordinary man obtained more freedom than he had ever had. It was the rulers whom we subjugated, the rulers whom we oppressed and often completely suppressed. It is from them that we took over, and the ordinary man, the individual human being who asks of life no more than to be left alone, to have enough to eat and to be reasonably comfortable, gained immeasurably. Our rules and laws might be strange to him and often incomprehensible but at least they were not arbitrary and ruthless. Within those rules the black man was safe.

He could not become a ruler. He could not obtain power over his fellow men but he did have a reasonable chance of surviving for a life span which was much longer than anything he could have expected before. He had more to eat; famines were rare, and, if they occurred, adjusted for. He was, above all, no longer subject to the whims of those in whose power he happened to be. He was no longer a piece of goods, a chattel, an animal. He was, within the political framework of the colony a "Man". Only the restless, only those who felt the wish for power over others were frustrated.

And then the White man became tired of it all, tired and essentially incapable of ruling, incapable of insisting on discipline and the manipulating of power. Insensate, idiotic wars had decimated him at home and the very thought of killing, which is a potential necessity where power has to be maintained, had become abhorrent to him. The inhuman deeds in the extermination camps of Germany had become a disgusting demonstration of what may eventuate when man assumes power over others and it had become impossible to recruit the necessary manpower to keep the world in thrall. The White man "had it too good" at home, what with the dole and all. He had become ethical, or rather, he had learnt to hide his inner collapse under the cloak of ethics so that he still could admire himself in his own weakness.

The day of general 'Liberation' had arrived.

Ostensibly he began giving freedom back to his former subjects, though in fact he began to shift the White Man's Burden off his shoulders - and that with an only half-suppressed sigh of relief. He did not really 'liberate' the blacks and the coloureds, he liberated himself; he freed himself from what had become an onerous duty instead of something which he could delude himself into believing was a virtue.

He showed that he had not been carrying that burden out of the goodness of his heart by the fact that he did not much care what happened to his erstwhile charges. There was a lot of talk about "making them ready for self-government", but that soon died down. Anyhow it was a silly idea. They had been able to govern themselves before we came and there was no reason why they should still not be able to do it.

Naturally there was the idea in the background that this 'self-government' should be 'democratic', but both sides became impatient and the White Man contented himself by closing himself up in his study and concocting Constitutions so complicated that even his own people would not have been able to govern themselves according to them.

These Constitutions will one day be the comic relief in the pages in which our present day history will be recorded, but it was not a joke. It was dreadful, life-and-death reality with which they tried to deal.

Despite the White man's self-laudatory humanity he has made himself guilty of a much greater and disgusting cruelty than anything he did in the heyday of his colonising period. This cruelty is 'disgusting' because essentially it is the breaking of a trust - a refusal to meet an obligation - a dereliction of duty.

The White Man after having taken over from the former masters had accepted not only the privileges but also the duties and responsibilities of a 'master'. He began well. He raised the standard of living of his subjects. He gave them relative safety and security

Now his actions are essentially the same as that of the dear old lady who, stricken by her conscience, influenced by S.P.C.A. propaganda (and the rising price of bird seed and the eternal trouble of keeping the cage clean) opened up the door of their cage and let her canaries fly away, free as the winds of heaven; free to find food and safety for themselves if they could.

It is possible and even quite normal for men to live fully content in primitive conditions when they have never known anything better. But to be unable to keep up the standard of living to which one has been accustomed is a continual purgatory - as any typical pensioner can tell us.

Besides this, with the disappearance of the White Policeman there was the to-be-expected revival of tribal hatreds (that, theoretically, the 'noble savage' should not have) with the resultant outbreak of wholesale murder, not only among the more primitive Africans but even between the Hindus and the Mohammedans in India where thousands lost their lives when the British Raj went home to Bournemouth and Blackpool, apparently satisfied with a task well done.

Once again a man had to be able to defend his life and his possessions where already, for several generations, such savage relationships had been a thing of the past.

Last, but by no means least, the White Man's rule had, by its care, by seeing that food was always available if not always plentiful, by health services and the elimination of endemic and epidemic diseases, allowed his flock to multiply to a point where their own country would often not be able to feed them.



Permeating all this was the difficulty that, mysterious and often onerous as our laws had been, they were at least predetermined and fixed. The replacement of these laws by the whim of the strong and the powerful and influential made it necessary to acquire all over again the art of keeping in the good books of those who ruled and of knowing how and where to deposit 'presents' and bribes. Where all this, in the new circumstances of sharpened competition, might mean the difference between survival and ruin, between life and death, the suffering (although not appearing in our newspapers) is none the less too horrible to think about.

Truly this endless trail of suffering for individual men, rests or should rest as much on the conscience of the 'liberators' as the original 'enslavement' of the peoples of the world should have rested on the consciences of the colonisers.

We have reneged on our obligations by refusing to accept that the master is responsible for the well-being of his slaves. The White man would only have been absolved morally if he had made sure that those he liberated were able to carry the burden of being free, as was the case with ourselves when we in South Africa were 'liberated' (some think that we liberated ourselves!) from the English yoke.

The only ones who have really been liberated in this sorry spectacle are the potential rulers of the 'new' nations. They have been liberated not in response 'to a chimerical 'wind of change' (which is supposed to have blown through Africa, but which had its origin and even most of its existence in the stuffy rooms of Whitehall) but in reaction to the vacuum which suddenly appeared at the top.

Like the bubbles in an opened bottle of beer, they floated upwards in search of power.

The people of Africa have not asked for and demanded freedom and nationhood - but the politicians have. And they have not asked for the freedom of 'their people' although that is what their words seemed to say. They asked for the freedom to take over and to exploit their people as only they knew how. They were of the same material, came from the same nest and knew how much the traffic would bear and how to keep the ordinary man where he belonged.

The ordinary people did not ask for freedom, never in all the history and pre-history of the world have they known what freedom is.

All they wanted was a chance to live in reasonable personal security, but the politicians among the White men knew better. They were so sure that for their own people they, as politicians, were a 'good thing' that they insisted that the liberated people should also be ruled by politicians and not by the traditional chiefs through which the colonisers had once been able to rule them and who used to rule them before we came.

But the new politicians were of an entirely new breed. They were not really politicians at all but men who saw 'democracy' as a convenient tool to get to the top.

While Europe concocted Constitutions they were only really interested in two things. There had to be a one-man-one-vote system and Uhuru had to come soon, next month, possibly tomorrow. The choice of these two items speaks for itself.

The one-man-one-vote system produces a mob composed of the illiterate and the easily influenceable. Such people will believe anything - but what is more important, they are ideally subject to being influenced by the new electioneering gadget invented especially in Africa - the method of overt intimidation. The common man may listen to idealistic speeches but his age-old concept of a ruler is that he is the 'strong man' and that he inevitably rules by fear.

The logical result of this is that the common man flocks in behind the man whom he fears the most because that is the man whom he feels to be the one who will eventually become the ruler.

We in South Africa have seen the functioning of this all too clearly when, in the days before Sharpeville, Luthuli was trying to bring 'peace' to our country and earned himself the Nobel Prize. It would be instructive to know how many more lost their lives in cold-blooded stabbings and assaults in the townships, than by the gunfire of a group of policemen made trigger-happy by the events at Cato Manor not so long before.

It is not the intention to justify Sharpeville here, but the howling mob must have looked pretty dangerous to men who remembered how, a few weeks earlier, five of their comrades in arms had been killed by a similar mob. It's all very well to say that, being Whites, they should have known better - should have had more self control.

However that may be, it is typical of all African politicians that they insist on the one-man-one-vote system with no qualifications because that gives them material they know how to handle.

Uhuru must also come as soon as possible for otherwise there may be too many candidates in the field of battle once it is joined.

About the Constitutions they care very little. Once they are in the saddle all that 'foreign' and 'enforced' legislation can be amended or simply ignored.

What we have seen in Africa up to now and what we will see from now on, all has the same pattern. One-man-one-vote 'elections', the one party system, semi-deification of the leader, total elimination of all opposition and finally absolute power.

That at least is their ideal and it should work, but it is not all as simple as all that.

The new rulers have forgotten, or possibly never realised, that power needs those who are willing to make that power stick, policemen and soldiers.

However, to the primitive, the man who has the weapon has the power. One actually does not need all this rigmarole of the initial 'elections', and every man with a gun is a potential 'leader'.

Though the official 'leaders of their peoples' are on the way to becoming replicas of the old half-god rulers of Africa before the white man came, they have now come up against the fact that in the old days the system had grown out of the people. There were certain rules, there were family members in key positions, there was a basic awe that was already present and an established hierarchy that was acknowledged as valid by all. Now, in this new age, the pyramid of power has to be built up on the personal fear of 'superiors' and even a common soldier can put an end to a general if he has a gun and knows how to use it.

And every man is a potential 'chief'.

It will therefore take a long time before all this has settled down into something like a smoothly functioning system, and before the survivors of the battle for the top positions will have consolidated their hold sufficiently not to need, like Nkrumah, to hide in a castle, surrounded, even then, by an army of underlings among whom even the lowest private soldier may try to take a step towards power and fortune by means of a single pistol shot.

The 'mutinies' in Tanganyika and Nairobi - and even the 'revolution' in Zanzibar, needed no 'foreign' influence for their explanation. They were inherent in the situation and the nature of the people themselves.

It was only necessary for someone to realise that those who had the weapons had the power and therefore the way open to the throne.

More than at any time in history, the African soldier has the royal sceptre in his pack.

The first step would have been to get rid of the White officers who believed in military discipline and would have frowned at such ambitions. Besides that they insisted on doing senseless exercises and parades instead of using the weapons available for the purpose for which they were made.

The reappearance of a few White soldiers with guns at the ready must have made the ambitious realise that the time was not yet ripe for such things.

But it will come. Of that there can be little doubt.

The interesting point here is the new idea of 'exchanging soldiers'. One wonders where that came from, for it is the principle by which the Dutch were able to rule their Indonesian Empire with a comparatively small garrison of White soldiers. They made the men of Atjeh police the Javanese, the men of Java police those of Sumatra etc. and, far from their homelands and their own people, they were willy nilly loyal to (and even stricter than) their Dutch masters.

What we see happening in Africa to the north of us is however not Nationalism but the fight for power between individuals. It is a fight for the power that the White man has relinquished and which has now become available to those Black men who have the hardihood to gamble, double or quits, for fortunes that, some ten years ago would have been beyond their wildest dreams.

It is not Democracy that is developing there nor the will of the people to rule themselves. Such an idea would have been far beyond the conceptions of any of them.

The appearance of democracy is given because the White Man demands it and because it is the most convenient - and actually the only possible - way to power. Once that power has been obtained, even the appearance of democracy will disappear and not only 'for a time', as some of us whisper consolingly to ourselves, but for ever.

Dictatorships are not a 'transient' stage in Africa. There is no reason why they should be. Africa has known no other way of ruling. Even our own rule was actually a dictatorship in regard to its inhabitants. It is the natural form of Bantu and Negro government. We too had to tell them what to do - or else!

This is, one fears, the true picture of the great LIBERATION which the world has been witnessing in the last few years. It has been no more than the liberation, the 'letting loose' of the Black Man Boss on his own people.

## CHAPTER XI

### *Just 'Different.'*

The question now almost automatically crops up as to whether what has been said about the not-Whites in general and the Africans in particular, means that they are 'inferior' to us.

That is the way our minds run.

The question of 'Superior-inferior' has since the beginning of time played havoc with our thinking and even with our behaviour. It trips up logical thought by means of the emotional strings it pulls in us. It involves our 'self-respect' and is powered by the same illogical force that makes us accept a 'dare' although there may be positive danger involved and no possible advantage to be gained.

This force is rather important and merits a further examination before we go on. It is closely related to, if not fully identical with, the effect of being laughed at - which as Bergson has shown us in 'Le Rire' is a corrective influence which the community applies to its aberrant members. As such then, the emotion aroused by being called 'inferior' is normal and healthy. It is a power for the good in us and in the community. It stimulates -or ought to stimulate - its members to competition, to 'doing as much as one can', and it has a positive survival-value in a community.

In fact, it is the instinctive expression of the spirit that should inspire a herd; namely, that every member of it must do his share, and if possible somewhat more, if the herd is to survive and flourish.

This, too, is the spirit that finally sorts out the leaders, the 'better' ones, the more able and those that are willing to demonstrate and apply their superior ability for the good of all.

Inversely, when the will and finally the wish to be 'superior' dies among its members, the herd shows signs of old age. It is a symptom of the final downward way into decrepitude when demonstrated 'superiority' no longer elicits 'admiration' or even 'envy' - but simply 'hatred'.

When 'superiority' no longer produces the wish to emulate or to do better - when it only causes hatred and the impulse to destroy and to break down, then the herd is beginning to commit suicide.

That 'superiority' has almost become a term of abuse in our day is, by itself, a justification for the apocalyptic mood of our opening chapter.

We can pass this by, however.

It could just theoretically be possible that a herd like ours could become so perfectly organised and achieve such a mastery over the wherewithal of living and its environment that it does not need the wish to go forward into greater perfection if it wishes to survive. In that case the urge to be superior, to do better might have no more than a nuisance value. It would be a whip on the back of a horse that is pulling sufficiently well.

With our machines taking the place of the slave labour that supported all former Civilisations, this might even be true of us - if we had been alone, if we had been a completely isolated herd and in no danger from the outside world.

It is here again that our thinking and our emotions tend to de-rail for, whatever we would like it to be, all of humanity is certainly not one single herd.

The urge to superiority acts for the good within a herd; but between different herds it leads to war and destruction because neither of the competitors admits the existence of a still greater common denominator, a 'herd of herds' so to speak.

Only if we could make this humanity, about which we are so fond of theorising, real to ourselves, would it be possible for our 'herds' to compete without the thought of killing uppermost in our minds. A chastening thought.

Nevertheless that 'Humanity' has become an integral part of our world image for no other reason than that, in another aspect, it helps us to avoid the exposure of the high trees to the buffeting of the winds of heaven - the fight for, superiority.

We have produced the legend that 'Man' has achieved what we have achieved.

'Man' has attained the civilisation, the culture, and the standard of living that we have attained. 'Man' has conquered distances; 'Man' has perfected his communications into almost instantaneous contact; 'Man' has made the machines that now do the work for us; 'Man' is exploring the regions of empty space around us and 'Man' has found the secret of governing himself democratically (although that latter achievement is lately being soft-pedalled after the recent developments in Africa).

Not we Westerners have done all these things. It is not the slightly disgusting and 'superior' White man - but 'MAN'. It is Humanity as a whole who has done it and there now only remains the task of educating those who (through force of circumstances, geographical situation, and, in general, 'not having had the chance') have remained on the outskirts of this overall development. When that has been done Utopia will have been attained.

The alternative is a worldwide Nirvana that would come with a Third, and this time fully Atomic, World War. The gibbering fear of this other possibility has led to a state of mind among us which is simply appalling to an outside observer who has some respect left for human intelligence.

We discover that an apparently fully organised brainwashing is taking place the equal of which has never been seen before, not even in Nazi Germany.

No article (or even story) is complete and acceptable if it does not contain at least an allusion to the 'equality of man'. No illustrated article on social events or economical developments can pass without at least one picture of White and not-White working or playing together (supposedly as equals!) and no political pronouncement is kosher unless it is introduced by a public denunciation of the disgusting evil inherent in 'Apartheid'. Even if it has to be followed by a somewhat hypocritical "but...".

More disturbing still is the invasion of the scientific world by this fear-inspired chimera.

A beautiful and typical example of this is to be found in the criticism by Professor Theodosius Dobzhansky (himself one of the foremost authorities on evolution), of Carleton S. Coon's book on "The Origin of Races". (Scientific American, Feb. 1963.) To quote its final sentences: "Race prejudice is a psychological and social disease and is not based on reason, yet those who suffer from it have repeatedly sought the support of bogus 'science'. There are absolutely no findings in Coon's book that even suggest that some races are superior or inferior to others in their capacity for culture or civilisation. There are, however, some unfortunate misstatements that are susceptible to such misinterpretation."

The first sentence already expresses the completely unscientific approach of the critic. Race prejudice, although it may be 'unethical' and 'disgusting' is certainly not a 'disease'. The emotions and not the intellect are speaking here.

Race prejudice has been a characteristic of mankind ever since the beginning. As we have seen, even when the Declaration of Independence was being formulated Race Prejudice was such a self-evident quality of men that nobody felt it to be strange that Negroes were not considered to be 'Men'. As a matter of fact, 'Race Prejudice' was only discovered as undesirable some twenty five years ago when Hitler went altogether too far for a civilised person. Professor Dobzhansky's name is a possible indicator as to the reason for his 'scientific blind spot' and one can forgive him for this emotional outburst but the rest of his statement does not bear the light of logical investigation either.

It is immediately clear that the words 'superior' and 'inferior' are unscientific in that they do not name the yardstick, the criterion in relation to which they are used. What one reads between the lines, however, is that it is the 'White' culture and civilisation that he has in mind, seen once again as the summum bonum of the development of 'Mankind'. How any anthropological findings could give any information on the possibility of developing such an evanescent thing as a specific kind of culture or civilisation is beyond conjecture. Many of the 'races' have already developed their own cultures and civilisations. As a matter of fact, similarly inspired 'scientists' have been busy for some time proving that there have been civilisations and cultures worthy of the name in Africa itself! In the end one can only come to the conclusion that the statement was intended as a sop to those who might feel that Coon's book did not quite agree with the 'equality of man' because Coon maintains that there are at least five kinds of men - and that since the very beginning.

What one would like to see is a criticism by the Professor of Nathaniel Weyl's book on "The Negro in American Civilisation" which, having been published by the 'Public Affairs Press' in Washington, is unlikely to be 'bogus science'.

Reading the latter, together with Vance Packard's book, 'The Naked Society', one cannot help but get the impression that there must be the same kind of suppression of inconvenient 'scientific' facts that once characterised Nazi Germany.

To avoid the possible accusation of quoting out of context, the full text of its chapter on "The African Heritage" is reprinted in the Appendix, together with the full list of its authorities, by kind permission of the Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C.

But the strengthening of the delusion goes on.

Even where the voice of the Negro has begun to say - and finally to yell – “We are *not* the same, we are different!” and where there is the appearance of 'Apartheid in reverse' in the newly liberated Africa, the tide of compulsive wishful thinking is not stemmed.

The White man of today simply cannot see the issue clearly because what he feels to lie beyond the next horizon is too horrible to contemplate. Therefore, like the fabled ostrich, or like a child, he says, "It is not there!" and hopes that by that means he can make it go away.

We in South Africa, possibly because we have not yet reached the beginning of the herd-senility which is rife in America and Europe (in that we still do not yet 'hate' the superior men among ourselves, for instance); possibly because we are a dash of milk in the coffee instead of a milk that has only a dash of coffee in it, possibly too because we have to do with a much more 'raw' form of the not-White material, can still see more clearly. And we do this despite the undoubted, if still somewhat muted, brainwashing

indulged in by our English press about which it is difficult to say if it is brainwashing us or is itself already brainwashed to perfection.

Let us therefore try to discern what the real problem is before it is too late, before we too succumb to the eternal repetition of 'All men are equal'.

The 'superiority' or otherwise of the individual within the social pattern in which he lives is obviously decided by his ability to survive or to flourish in that pattern and nowhere else.

Einstein, if he found himself to be a Baluba would very definitely be an inferior Baluba and (being still superior meat to that usually available to the tribe) would soon end up in the cooking pot. One can imagine that Nehru would not be a superior type among the Ghurkas and that the late Sir Winston Churchill would have been unlikely to be superior among the lotus eaters on some Paradise Island.

All superior men are only superior in their own frame of reference. Shifting to another framework, or being judged by another set of criteria makes them immediately lose that superiority.

Hence the question is whether any framework, any way of living, can be superior or inferior to another.

To this the reader who has not yet taken time off to think about such things is likely to reply with an unequivocal "Yes!" It seems obvious that our Western way of life, our wealth, our knowledge and our democracy is far superior to that of the stone age native in a Papuan Jungle or to that of the miserable, dirty Somali who barely manages to survive on his desert.

But is this true?

What makes a way of living, a community or a state, superior to another?

If one sees them as essentially 'different' the question is no more intelligent than the question of whether the Lion is superior to the Tiger, or the Honey bee to his Bumbling counterpart. If we are different there is again no common frame of reference in which our superiority or otherwise can be measured - unless, as we subconsciously do, we take it for granted that we have attained the highest step up to now. It is amusing to think that in this we take it, a priori, for granted that we are, at present at least, superior and, for goodness sake, that is a thing we must never do! It is disgusting, as everyone tells us.

Coming down to earth, what is it in which the superiority should lie? Is it in its complication of life? Then some tabu-ridden communities are far superior to us. Is it in bodily cleanliness (A 'bathroom to every bedroom' civilisation)? Then the Japanese have us beaten before we start. Is it in variety? In security? In health services? In 'from the cradle to the grave' care for everybody? Is it in having aeroplanes, radio-communication and shots to the moon?

Again, is a vegetarian society superior to one that is omnivorous and an omnivorous society superior to one that permits cannibalism?

Is a monogamous society superior to one that permits polygamy - and heterosexual relationships?

While asking these questions it should have become apparent that the answer does not lie in the Societies concerned but in the set of values, the prides and prejudices to be found in the mind of him who pronounces judgment.

It is quite likely that a real Christian will feel that a fully Christian state, however backward and full of suffering, is still far superior to one where everyone revels in luxury but does not even know the name of God. The easygoing peon of a South American State is also likely (and with ample justification) to say that the dolce-far-niente existence of his people is superior to the restless merry - and not so merry - go-round of London and New York. Only a fool of a Gringo would run around in circles, getting nowhere, where it is obviously much better to stay where one is and enjoy the breath that God has given one.

In the end it should be manifest that one can only arrive at some conclusion by referring to what is a common denominator of them all, namely human joy and human suffering. This then leads us to the 'hedonistic' definition that the superiority or not of a state, a community or a way of living, is determined by the happiness and contentment of its members.

After all, that is what the state is for. It is not an entity in itself, it is a pattern of living together which should be designed, or rather organised, in such a way that the life of its members is as pleasant and bearable as possible. When it forgets that function and becomes a system of allotting power over others for its own sake, or when, as in the Soviet System it becomes something that has an existence of its own, it is apt to change into a kind of Frankenstein - like an ogre that eats its own children.

This possibly too simple definition of the value of states, however, brings up the problem of whose happiness and contentment and security should be safeguarded and we debouch into a sea of what is generally vociferous and more than slightly emotionally heated, theoretical argument. The question whether happiness should be apportioned to the chosen few or on the basis of one-vote-one-happiness unit - or again on the principle of 'the greatest possible happiness to the greatest possible number of citizens' has kept many political philosophers happy for ages.

All this is theoretical, however, for the happiness of men does not primarily depend upon how much they have or how much they are able to earn. Happiness is also not measurable in any scientific kind of way.

The real question behind the facade of argument is, for us, if it is possible to absorb the not-Whites into our Western socio-economic system without its going to pieces. The vociferous part of the world has decided that our civilisation is desirable and they want their part of it.

It is as simple as all that.

The rest is mere emotionalism, rationalisation and 'ethical motivation', intended to justify interfering in the natural pattern of human relationships

As usual the theory covers a simple, practical and present day desire. It is the injustice of not being able to get what one wants and not the injustice of the breaking of a law that is being waved about by the others. The laws and ideals that are being quoted are a means to an end - a very definite object that is in view, getting something without the necessity of earning it.

And we are either going to give in - or we are not.

Again, it is as simple as that.

What is important here is to find out what we are letting ourselves in for either way. If we know that, it may help us in our decision. It may make us try to let the take-over be as painless as possible - or it may make us start fighting back while it is still possible.



To repeat, the question is whether it is possible to absorb the not-White into our Western socio-economic system without its going to pieces.

Essentially our system produces for us a plethora of goodies, of gadgets, labour-saving devices, social services, welfare and security.

We use all of it and enjoy using it and there can be little doubt that the not-White will be able to use it with as much enthusiasm as we do.

There is however a price we pay, a price of which (because we have been paying it all our lives) few of us are conscious. We take it for granted that the others are willing to pay that price; or that, given the chance, they would be willing to pay it.

On the other hand, a large, if not the largest part of the not-Whites do not even know that it is there.

To them (as it seems to be on the surface) it is all free and simply for the taking. Those that have tried to stop them doing so must be either criminals or selfish spoilsports.

Nevertheless the price we pay is, in effect, slavery - a slavery that is much more brutal and heartless than any the world has seen up to now, no matter if the slave-driver with the whip is nowhere in evidence. Like a good slave-owner our system looks after us well, it even pampers us, but only if we do our work well too. Only those that do their work conscientiously, only those who drive themselves to the utmost, succeed. The others fall by the wayside and live on the scraps.

Not for nothing are the alarm-clock and the wristwatch in constant attendance on what we do. Brought to its final perfection it is the 'rat race' in which the American executives live, but it nevertheless invades and rules all our lives. Master, overseer, workman and drudge, all of us are in it. Duty here and duty there, do this, do that, even if we only tell ourselves to do it, is the root of our prosperity; no lying around in the sun if we do not feel like working, no dropping this job and taking another if we do not like it for, if we did, all that prosperity and wealth would fade away.

It does not come from nowhere.

Every little screw and every little thread in every little piece of cloth has been placed there just so. True, it was done by machines but those machines needed supervision and a management that saw to it that the materials were there and that the products found a paying market. And the same is true of our social services; all of them depend upon the unremitting doing of their duty by numberless individuals.

One third of most of our lives, half of our waking hours, belong completely and utterly to the civilisation in which we live, and the rest is slowly being invaded and whittled away. We 'live' only a part of our lives and that is cut into small fragments useless for anything other than frittering away in 'pass times'.

The question now becomes whether the not-White will be willing to enter into this slavery and (what is more important still) if he will be able to be his own slave driver. Will he be able to keep his own nose pressed to the grindstone too?

If he is the same as we are, the answer is obviously 'yes'. In that case the problem will be no more than the overcoming of the 'racial prejudice' which, despite the pontifications of Professor Dobzhansky, is as natural a characteristic of mankind as it is of the lower animals.

If he is not the same, then it becomes necessary to discover in what the difference lies; and, if we do, it is probable that we will also discover the reason for the typical pattern of the newly 'free' states of Africa.

We have already seen that every man is an entity in himself, different from all others. It now remains to be decided if that difference is only in superficial detail (like the personal fingerprint that all of us have) or if it goes deeper, down into the essentials that determine the form of one's life.

Here we come up against yet another twisted thought which is an evasion of the issue, namely, the concept that we are all potentially the same but that life and our environment make us into what we are. According to this theory even the first cavemen had the same potentials that we have.

They, however, had no schools and no teachers other than those who could tell them the little that their forefathers had been able slowly to garner from their experiences. If one had taken a baby of one of these Neanderthalers into one's family (as is often, for argument's sake, suggested about a Negro child) that Neanderthaler would not have been essentially different from one of our own children, except possibly in his rather simian appearance.

## CHAPTER XII

### *The Cause of the Difference*

All this denial of different hereditary capabilities contradicts most of what we know about reality, about the development of new plants and the breeding of animals not only for their physical but also for their (what one might call) 'psychical' qualities.

How is it then that we (and even a large number of 'scientific' minds among us) know and admit congenital variety to be true for animals but do not admit it for the super-animal: Man?

Why are not 'All dogs equal', for instance and why are their manifest differences both in body and nature also not due to environmental factors, as they are for us?

And the same thing is true of the whole theory of Evolution as preached from that standpoint. We find that, up to the appearance of man on the scene, evolution meant the continual addition and perfection of ever new abilities and qualities. This evolution is even supposed to have entered into the personal relationships in the herds and the family life of the animals.

Then, with the appearance of man this suddenly stops.

All at once there is a MAN, complete with all the qualities he will ever have!

He has a complete brain with all the synapses and association fibres already there, every one in the right place to be able to contain and to manipulate the knowledge and the information and the knowhow that will be imparted to some descendant of his a million years from then. His ethical structure is already there too, waiting only for the moment when some distant offshoot of his will have been taught the understanding on which such an ethical attitude must be based, although when the first man received the brain, through circumstances, he had to live and act as a half-animal. He was 'human' and 'kind', only he did not know it, and neither did his victims.

The idea is, like so many others, a running away from the unpleasant aspects of the theory of evolution. It is no more than an escapist fairy tale and yet it is the basic concept of a large part of modern thinking on the subject.

One could quote from monumental learned works on the subject but it seems more suitable to choose a quotation from B. G. Paver, writing in "His Own Oppressor- which can hardly be said to be a wildly anti-racialistic treatise. The writer is certainly an intelligent and very erudite man doing his best to talk sense and to see reality as it is. There is, however, not the slightest doubt about the fallacy of the background of his thinking when he, in apologising for the Bantu, uses the following words:

"The African suffers from the effects which 2000 years of isolated stone age culture have implanted, not indelibly, but very deeply, on his mind."

This is the kind of statement that even the intelligent reader is liable to read over without stumbling because it fits into the way his own subconscious mind works. He does not even realise that it contradicts all that he knows about evolution - and about history.

In it there is the basic idea that the African originally had the same soul and mind as our forefathers had and that it therefore was superior to what theirs is now. Then, from some mysterious source, those '2000

years of stone age culture' came and hedged him in. This 'being isolated' in that culture left a degenerating mark upon him with the result that he is now handicapped where he comes into contact with those whose ancestors were not so 'isolated'.

It is surprising how much mis-thinking hides in this one little sentence.

In the first place, why blame the isolation of the last 2000 years? Did history only start with the Christian era and did the Bantu not have a pre-history of his own? Did we ourselves only start to develop out of our stone age culture stage about the year 1 A.D.?

In the second place, is there any evidence that the Bantu in any phase of his history has ever progressed beyond the 'stone age culture' stage which his ancestors must have shared with ours?

In the third place, if there was such a time, how could a stone age culture then possibly isolate them where they had already progressed beyond it?

Fourthly, if this was not so, what 'effects' can a 'stone age' implant? The words 'indelibly' and 'very deeply' demand that this implanting was something that was positive in action. The sentence gives the idea that the Bantu was acted upon, probably to hide from the writer himself and from the reader that this was no more than a 'not developing any further'. As the idea of a 'stone age culture' is a culture that lacks the use of bronze, iron and finally steel, one can hardly think that the 'lack of these things' could be 'implanted' 'very deeply'.

Finally one can point out that our forefathers when they developed the new skills were as much isolated from the Bantu forefathers as their forefathers were from ours.

What the sentence means but what it tries to hide by its phraseology is that 'in the long ago' all our forefathers lived in a stone age culture. Our forefathers discovered bronze and after that achieved all kinds of developments and improvements which were not passed on to the Bantu, because they were physically, tribally or geographically isolated and therefore remained the happy-go-lucky people they were and still are.

That this might just as well have been due to their inability or their lack of interest and not by their isolation seems to be proved by the smelting ovens that are found all over Africa but which seem to have been of no other use than to produce the metal for weapons. Their 'isolation' was certainly not very marked either, for all Africa bears the scars and the remains of foreign invasions that stayed for a time and then disappeared again. The Bantu learnt nothing from them just as they have learnt next to nothing from seeing how the White farmers cultivate their lands, even while they were helping them in the work.

Let us try to see what must have happened, if for no other reason than that nothing much else could have happened. It is what still happens all round us in nature, and seems at the same time the only explanation of how things came to be as they are now, without introducing 'intelligent external influences' and 'teleologically orientated sequences of events'.

To do this we will have to repeat and paraphrase some of what is contained in my other book, "Now-men and Tomorrow-men-. The essentials can however be given within the limits of one or two chapters.

The thesis is that the basic difference between 'Man' and 'Animal', and especially between the original primitive men and the nearest primates was, and is, that the 'Animal' has a present consciousness and, to some extent, a memory of the past of which he can make use in manipulating his present while 'man' also has a future image. The animal however has no future-image at all.

The difference between him and even the most primitive of men was not that the latter made tools but that they kept them. Even the higher primates already used 'tools', sticks and stones that were picked up as necessary.

However, when our original ancestor picked up a 'tool' and seeing that it suited him, kept it, Mankind was on the way. He had demonstrated the appearance of a new faculty on earth - and possibly in the whole of the Universe - the faculty of having an image of the future so that one can prepare today for what is going to happen tomorrow. It can hardly be imagined or exaggerated how great the advantage was which that new ability gave in a world where all others acted only 'on the spur of the moment'.

Man was definitely on the way! It was merely a matter of extending that future-image further and further into the future and preparing further and further ahead for probable and possible eventualities.

Perfecting the tools was no more than a matter of intelligence and that even the primates had already had. The important point was that the individual had obtained an image of the future, and in a way, there is a greater difference between the picked up and the kept tool than there is between the kept tool and its final apotheosis in the Atom Bomb.

From the beginning of the 'kept tool' onwards, one can read the depth of man's future image, his 'temporealisation', in what he did and did not do at any particular stage of his development.

The original cave man was already quite intelligent and original in thought. This we can see from his magnificent cave paintings, the remains of the imprint of basketry work, carved tusks, methods of hunting and even the bow and arrow. What he does not seem to have discovered was that by planting the seeds of his food plants next to his dwelling place, he could considerably lighten the labour and the dangers of 'gathering'. There is no doubt that he was intelligent enough and that he knew that foodplants grew from seed. As Professor Levy-Bruhl points out, the savage is extraordinarily observant and has a long memory.

The reason that the cave man did not develop agriculture is easy to understand. To plant the seed his future-image would have had to be at least six months 'deep'. He would have had to have a sufficiently real image of the time of harvesting before it would be able to make him drop what he was doing today, in order to labour for what would only produce results such a very long time ahead.

That it was not a matter of not knowing is demonstrated by the primitive 'gathering' tribes who still exist among agricultural communities in several places of the world. They know that if they plant when the others do they will harvest when the time comes, but the knowledge is manifestly not enough. They remain 'gatherers'.

When agriculture appeared we can take it that man had developed a six-month future-image.

That original agriculture, however, was merely a 'cropping', 'seasonal' agriculture. Its planting periods started off with magical rites and ended with harvest rites. Then there was a 'free' period until the next season came along as determined by the medicine men. These people were farmers without farms and such things as manuring and irrigation were unknown because that would have needed a longer time-image and a sense of permanency which those primitive 'farmers' did not have. They were still 'predators'.

It is here that the Bantu became isolated or rather that he stopped developing. One can produce several theories why this happened (such as that with the advent of a sufficiency of food it was no longer

necessary to eat each other, thereby ending the accelerated version of the 'survival of the fittest' that had been active among them) but that is admittedly mere speculation.

What seems to be true is that the typical Bantu and the typical Negro's future-image is still not much longer than six months. Beyond that he may be able to imagine what may happen just as we may be able to imagine what will happen in ten or fifteen years' time, but it is not real enough for him to make him do something now to influence what will happen after, say, a year.

Then, in the great river valleys of Mesopotamia, and somewhat later in Egypt, the next stage was reached.

The tail end of the year joined up with the beginning of next year for them and time became a 'circle', a 'wheel' that could be overlooked and understood. Time attained permanency and structure and not only did irrigation improve agriculture, but it now became possible for men to specialise. As one could understand the structure of time, one could settle down and do some special work secure in the knowledge that the community would produce the wherewithal for living without going out and hoeing one's own plot. It is probably not without significance that the 'wheel of time' is still one of the basic symbols of eastern religions for it was on that wheel that the first civilisations developed; the Mesopotamian 'City States' still less permanent and continually shifting from one master to another; the Egyptian fully permanent because, as we can see, it discovered Eternity and saw time as the path along which the wheel of the years rolled on.

From there the faculty spread in different degrees all over the world, or developed differently in different places. But that makes another story which it may be interesting to follow up on another occasion. What is important here is that the future span of every individual is to a certain extent fixed.

Let the reader try to define for himself for how far in the future he is willing to sacrifice something significant today and then try to see if he can extend that period. He will find that that is impossible. He may talk or suggest himself into it but it will not be real and will not last longer than the time that he spends concentrating on it. That time will never become such an integral part of his present life as next month is to him now.

What is more, the measure of the maximum of one's future sense is born into one. It is congenital, like the shape of one's nose, the ability to do mathematical problems or learn languages, one's ear for music or sense of rhythm, and one's basic aggressiveness - or lack of it.

And what is congenitally determined cannot be acquired or learned. One can be taught to compensate for the lack of it up to a certain point. The non-mathematical mind can be taught how to do intricate sums and the non-linguistic mind can learn a language, but it will not be a part of the person concerned. For that reason a people or race that does not have a certain characteristic among the 'genes', of its members will not be able to acquire that characteristic otherwise than by miscegenation and - in that miscegenation they will lose their own original identity.

Among all the things that evolution and the acceptance of man as being essentially an 'animal with a brain' gives us to digest this is probably the pill that is hardest to swallow.

And yet - if we do not admit its validity, we go against all the evidence that we have.

If one has read "King Solomon's Ring" by Konrad Z. Lorenz and has enjoyed the chapter on 'The Covenant' (Ch. X) where he describes how the nature and the character of our present-day dogs as well as their external, physical appearances, more or less clearly show the admixture of the Jackal and Wolf ancestry, one feels that there is also no reason why our basic abilities and 'natures' should not have been

derived genetically. They, too, should have been laid down in the structure of the brain with which we were born, just as the colour of our hair and the length of our fingers were thus predetermined almost at the moment of our conception.

This fact is largely hidden from us because, though the environment can have little influence on our physical characteristics, our brains are essentially something that develop their functions and their ultimate contents by means of the mental material and facts which they gather in that environment.

If that mental material and collection of facts is not forthcoming, the personality, as we know it, cannot develop either.

A child, be it ever so potentially gifted, would, if locked up in complete isolation (or with another like it), not develop into what we would recognise as a 'Man'. It would probably not even come up to the level of a dog that had been placed in similar circumstances. Most likely it would be hardly more than an idiot. On the other hand, a child that, by an accident to its genetic pattern, is born without the necessary brain structures will remain an idiot, even if it is given all the possible facilities and intensive training that can be thought of.

The 'normal' human being must be found between these two extremes. He has a certain pattern of potential abilities and tendencies and that pattern is different from individual to individual. He also has a certain pattern of basic personality characteristics 'Aggressiveness' or 'Timidity', 'Associative' or 'Analytical', 'Extroversion' or 'Introversion' etc.

Among these potentials there is also the quality and the time extent of the future-image that the person will have.

Then, as the material comes flowing in, as the child learns to handle it, taught by direct experience, by teachers and the examples set by others in his environment, the wonderfully complex structure of the human personality begins building itself up and infusing the receptive brain structure with meaning. Some faculties are developed to their utmost potential (possibly even added to by an extension into what is learnt by rote). Other faculties again will be left unused and functionless because of the environment, or the combination of other tastes and tendencies. Others may be directly suppressed by the environment itself - such as a troublesome aggressiveness in a peaceful society, or by the vicious reaction of overstrict parents who will brook no 'cheek' at all.

It must be in this way that the environment and the genetically determined patterns in the brain together build up the final product and it is obvious that the environment which supplies the actual material will have the most important influence on the shape that that final product will take. It will, however, not contain any characteristics or abilities that were not potentially present in the original genetic pattern. (The author, for instance, after more than fifty years of practice, still suffers from the inability to add up simple numbers without a certain amount of effort although he has a reasonable conception of 'higher mathematics'.)

One can compare this to the 'Architecture' of a country. The building material available, the machinery that can be obtained or made, the amount of money that can be spent, the traditions, the inspiration drawn from what has already been built in the past and the information about the architectural trends in the world in general will be the major determining factors there - but that what will really distinguish it from others and give it its own 'personality' will for a large part be determined by the quality of the architects who live in the given period in that country. Besides that there will also be the 'spirit of the people' themselves, their pride, their love of ostentation or their appreciation of the 'functional', their social structure which will decide if the accent shall be on 'flat dwellings for the people' as in the

Netherlands and Germany at the beginning of this century, or on 'castles' and 'mansions' for the 'noble' and the 'rich' as it was some two hundred years ago in Europe.

In the same way it is the environment which produces the overall picture of what we are - but that which distinguishes us from others, that which is essentially 'our own', is congenital, inborn, and has been already present in our genes from the moment we were conceived.

It is not pleasant and flattering to realise that we have been laid down and predetermined before we were born. The idea causes a resistance in us. We are as we are because we made ourselves like that, we feel; not realising that that thought contains a contradiction. Whatever tinkering we may try to do with ourselves must, of necessity, also have been laid down in the beginning.

In fact this reaction confuses the producer with the product and vice versa; the basic and as yet unmaterialised tendency or aptitude, with the personality which it has formed out of the material available.

Curiously enough, when there is a 'fault' in ourselves or in others, we blame the environment. We are suddenly no longer responsible! When the house is ugly or the block of flats collapses, it is not the architect and the quantity surveyor, but the materials and the machines available that were at fault.

If we now apply this to the problem with which we are concerned here, we will see that the Negro child who has been adopted into a White family since birth, will not become a normal Negro, but neither will he become a White man who lives in a Black body. He will become the Man that a Negro brain will build out of White environmental material living in a Black body - always with the proviso that that White environment has been able to suppress or totally eliminate the instinctive 'racial prejudice' which would always be its natural characteristic. Anything strange and unusual will, even within a family, elicit 'prejudice', overt or only subconsciously there. If such a 'prejudice' is there, the Negro mind will inevitably have distortions of values and twisted personal relationships added to his already ambiguous composition.

One realises that this way of putting it must have caused many a reader to shake his head or to raise a deprecatory eyebrow because it accepts, ab initio, that the Negro brain is essentially different from the White one.

This resistance to the idea is however a symptom of the old, wishful, already half-brainwashed thinking we encountered before. It is itself contradicted by the most popular 'explanation' for the present day backwardness of the Black people of this world.

There the excuse is that the Black people have been isolated from the developments of the rest of the world. However to avoid the imputation that this 'backwardness' is permanent (or, as B. G. Payer put it so carefully: 'indelible') this 'isolation' is considered to have been purely 'intellectual'. The people of Africa did not obtain what the men in other parts of the world had been able to gather together in the way of knowledge and know-how.

Once again then we meet the strange idea that we only differ in knowledge and know-how, leading, as we have seen before, to the inference that only a bit of educating up to our standard is necessary for everything to be right.

As has been pointed out already, the early stone age 'gatherers' of the jungles of Papua and Malaya know how agriculture works and they are aware of the advantages to be gained from it - but they have not adopted it. They have remained gatherers to this day.



We can also remind ourselves how the great Civilisations (among them one in Egypt, in Africa itself) have come - and gone. Was it the knowledge and the know-how only that made them great? And if so, why did they die out, one after the other? Was that knowledge forgotten and the know-how lost? Or was it possibly the 'drive' that petered out?

Then again, we can remember that in large parts of Africa the education and schooling from mission and state schools has been for several generations already at least the equal of that available to the children of our ancestors in the Middle ages - or even during our Renaissance. Nevertheless among the Bantu it has provided no more than a few detribalised white collar workers.

When the Belgians left the Congo in a huff, there were more natives with schooling (and even higher schooling) than there were schooled men in any European country, when our Civilisation started on its way. Besides that, most of the civil service was already organised and largely manned by them.

It needed only a few thousand top men - and yet the whole thing subsided into savagery.

"Yes!" says the half-brainwashed victim of 'All men are equal', "but they never had a chance to develop normally. The learning was useless to them because they were never allowed to use it."

This may be true for South Africa, and to a lesser degree, for America. There and here the 'educated' Black bumps his head against the lower echelons of the Whites who, as is the nature of all people, close their ranks to keep him out. That is 'bad' and 'inhuman' but, paradoxically, it is also 'human' after all. They are not saints!

It is however not true of the countries to the north of us.

There the creation of a literate group could have spread (and if they had been Whites, it would have spread) into the body of the people itself.

The White man also would have begun to organise the schooling of his children himself and not waited for it to be given.

The 'White man boss' would have let them come up if they had been able to do the work as it should have been done. The possibility that the Black did not remain down because he was Black but because he was unable, is distasteful to the idealist who, whatever the facts, must have all men equal.

That the Black did not come up must, according to him, be due to 'oppression'. It could simply not be due to a defect in his make-up.

This is manifestly a fallacious argument.

Our colonisers may have had their full share of the disgusting quality of racial prejudice but they were mainly out to make a 'quick buck', or a 'fast thousand pounds or so'. They were only idealists on the surface and they would have been glad of a bit of assistance in their carrying of the White man's burden. A prosperous people with a rising standard of living would have made that burden so much lighter and an able and trustworthy staff would have been a godsend to them.

It must therefore be untrue that the colonisers kept the Black man down because he was Black.

They would not have admitted the Black man to their clubs or to their sun-downer parties but they would have admitted him to their offices and their administration if he had shown himself capable of doing the work and, especially, of carrying the responsibility.

An example of this is to be found in the pre-war Dutch Indies where the Malays and the Katjangs (half castes) did most of the work of administration and governing while still remaining outcasts and 'despised' by their White masters. It is also not irrelevant to note here that when those Dutch White masters had been kicked out of their colonies by England and America, the civil machine kept on functioning perfectly although the political system got out of hand.

Why did that not happen in the Congo except that the 'Malay' is not a 'Congolese' and the 'Katjang' is quite another person from what we call a 'coloured'?

The Belgians are near enough akin to the Dutch to have built their own 'Indonesia' in the Congo if they had had the human material with which to do it. No one who visited the Congo before the 'Great Debacle' would deny that they had tried.

Another example of the essential difference between people is to be found in the reason for the importation of Negro slaves into America. The colonists there had found that it was impossible to use the 'Indians' as labourers, not because they were weaklings but because they simply could not take it.

When it is now finally accepted that people may be basically different, it becomes time to face up to the question of what is different in them. From what was said at the beginning of this chapter the reader will have guessed that it is the contention of this book that the main (if not the sole) difference lies in the congenitally determined 'depth' of the future image of the different races - the measure of their 'temporealisation' therefore, their ability to admit the future into the actions of today.

We must now try to examine this in greater detail.

## CHAPTER XIII

### *The Nature of the Difference*

Once it has been realised what an enormous difference the extent to which the future is real to him can make to an individual, it becomes necessary to try and think ourselves into the world-images of people with temporealisation depths that are different from our own.

As always the only really valid way of 'trying to understand' is to put oneself in the place of the other, but when doing that, one must begin by divesting oneself as much as possible of one's own self.

Each man lives in his own world and judges and acts according to the values of that special world and of no other. It would therefore be foolish and egocentric to take our own set of values and ideas into the worlds of others and to try and understand them on that basis. One must start with a clean slate - or at least, one that is as clean as one can make it.

Unhappily this is not what is usually done - hence the continually mounting flood of misunderstanding to be found in the world.

Let us try to avoid this error as much as possible here.

Admittedly we can never eliminate ourselves completely but we can try to think what the effect would have been if, from the very beginning, a certain function (like, in this case, our temporealisation) had been absent, less, or more strongly developed than it is in us.

If we do so we find to our surprise that we are forced to build up personalities and characteristics that are perfectly easily recognisable. We can find their prototypes everywhere in the world around us. The things people do and say (which may have seemed incomprehensible, or foolish, or weak, or criminal) now suddenly turn out to be logically interconnected and explicable on the basis of our idea.

In a way, therefore, these findings are a 'proof of the pudding' and that the theory seems to hold good in the existing world.

Let us begin by thinking ourselves, as best we can, into the world of the short-futured person. It is easiest to do so because it is easier to take something away from our own equipment than it is to add something, the effect of which we have never personally experienced.

To most of us the 'present' is about an hour long, the next fourteen days are more or less completely integrated and present in the light of almost all that we do at the present moment. Beyond that the next three or four years will still be relatively real to us and, where cogent, included in our calculations. From there on, till about thirty years from now, there is still something there but after that the future becomes completely theoretical.

Let us now imagine being in a person in whom all this is foreshortened or telescoped together to about one tenth of its length. For such a person the 'present' would be about five minutes. Only today and possibly tomorrow morning would be more or less completely integrated. The next half year would have a still relative reality, sufficient to significantly influence, where necessary, our deeds of today. The next three years would have some vague validity, and beyond that the future would be completely theoretical again.

When one imagines how it would be to exist in a world like that, to one's surprise a great weight suddenly falls from one's shoulders. All at once there is very little to worry about!

Tomorrow is really just 'another day' and we find ourselves in the condition which Jesus describes as the ideal when He quoted the example of the fowls of the air and the lilies of the field.

It will be remembered that He advised us to follow their example: -Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek)." And again, "Take therefore no thought for tomorrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Here the thought occurs that it is probably correct to equate the "Gentiles- of St. Matthew 6:32 with the 'White man' of our day. Certainly the most striking characteristic of our Western civilisation (however much it still considers itself 'Christian') is that it takes thought for the morrow, and next year - and for as many years ahead as it can imagine.

If one accepts this text one would therefore have to transfer the mantle of 'superiority' which we arrogate to ourselves (overtly, or by implication in that we think that the others should be educated, or should develop, up to our standard), to the shoulders of the Bantu and the Negro.

This again leads to the strange conclusion that our own 'Christian' religion tells us that the Bantu is superior to us exactly because of the trait which makes us think him inferior - the trait which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to fit him into our Western Civilisation; and which is, among other things, one of the main causes of what he is doing with his governments in the 'Free Africa' of today.

One realises that here it is better not to pursue the thought too deeply, but "in the silence of our little rooms", it might be well to ponder on it.

We will go back to the world-image in which the short-futured person lives.

Having hardly any worries at all, such a man will, if he has health, and enough to eat, be happy-go-lucky. He will find it easy to laugh and, where the future is so short, also easy to cry because even a little cloud will darken all his future for him.

As there is no extensive future for which it is necessary to provide, he will be prodigal and improvident; he will spend and eat what he can today. He will also be generous, for the cause of frugality lies in making doubly sure that oneself will have enough tomorrow.

As he has no real tomorrow, what can he do with more than he can use today? What otherwise than to waste it or give it away to make others happy - or like the typically short-futured 'prodigal son', to buy their momentary friendship and appreciation?

He will also throw the left-overs of today's meal (which the missus intended to make into tomorrow's cottage pie) into the dustbin, thereby making himself completely incomprehensible to her.

In general then he will be improvident, like the birds and the lilies and the Bushmen who represent the extreme example of the shortfutured personality, eating all they can possibly hold today and not worrying about the hunger they are almost sure to feel tomorrow.

It is therefore also inevitable that he will be unconscientious for, to be conscientious, one has first to have an image of the future with which one is tempted to break faith. After all, the 'duty' which rests on

one's shoulders can only derive its validity from the fact that it remains existent into the future. If its future aspect is non-existent there is nothing that can have the necessary compelling influence on today.

Being unconscientious, the short-futured man cannot be depended upon and it is wrong to blame him for that.

We see it as a breaking of faith, as a lack of personal integrity, but it is nothing of the kind. We forget that for us, and only for us, 'keeping faith' and 'doing our duty' have a meaning because the future, where they will be discounted, has a reality for us.

(The best way to bring this home to ourselves is to ask how conscientious we would be towards some 'duty' that would only be discounted in fifteen or twenty years' time - if the present offered us sufficient inducement to break it.)

The Black is not a blackguard in whom one can place no trust. He simply does not have the burden of the future on his back as we do. That this characteristic makes him unfit to be a full partner in a system which has most, if not all, of its values anchored fairly far into the future, is just too bad for him - and for us who do not know what to do with him. In the meantime he has the advantage that he does not have to worry about it. We will also do that for him as we are doing all over the world today.

Another result of having a short future is that such a man, like a child, wants what he wants now - and not tomorrow or next year, which is the most striking characteristic of all the Uhuru-seekers who go to thump their fists on the table, and to stage their 'walk-outs' at Whitehall. They are not interested in constitutions and what have you. Nobody knows what will happen next year - and anyhow, all that is merely theoretical. They want it now.

To them, promising Uhuru next year is like offering us Freedom in ten years' time and that (supreme insult) only if we have shown ourselves to be worthy of it in the meantime.

Here one is reminded of the poor, still completely unsophisticated pioneer of 'Freedom', Patrice Lumumba, may his soul rest in peace. In May, when Uhuru had been promised for June, he suddenly could stand it no longer and began raving that it had to come tomorrow and not a day later.

All this, curiously enough, does not mean that the short-futured person is unintelligent. Far from that! He may even be extremely intelligent and know exactly what is going to happen. The embezzler, among ourselves, is an instructive example of that. He is often, as he has undoubtedly demonstrated in his work and by the fact that he has arrived at the position of trust and influence that he has, very intelligent and able - even the method of embezzlement itself may show a more than average intelligence - and yet he does what he does. He must surely know that eventually he will be caught, that Nemesis will descend upon him and those whom he loves. But that moment of ruin is not 'real' to him. It is theoretical and he keeps on robbing the books 'in the present' because, for as far as the future is real to him, he is still safe.

In the same way the 'liberator' and the 'leader of his people' may even admit that he knows famine and disaster will follow the abdication of the White man as Sékou Touré did when he antagonised General de Gaulle by declaring: "We prefer poverty in freedom to riches in slavery."

Nevertheless the cry "Better famine and disaster than being a day longer under this foreign oppressor!" still has validity and meaning for him. He knows what is coming but the ruin of tomorrow is not real to him. It is something one talks about but does not really believe in. At the worst it is something that happens to one's people in the faroff future of the next three-four years, and those people are not the people who exist today. They are no more than words and images.

It will therefore be realised that using intelligence tests to ascertain if a people is ready for self-government is futile. For the same reason the 'I.Q.' of a prospective 'voter' gives only a minimum indication of his fitness to vote in a fully future-orientated state.

But all these things are still minor issues. They are the lesser characteristics of the short-futured man that show more near the surface. It goes very much deeper than that.

We hear it asked so often why the Black people of Africa have never developed a major or even a minor Civilisation - but the more important question would have been to ask why it is that, among them, there has never even emerged a system of governing that was more than an extension of the natural one automatically present in a family.

Why are all their rulers no more than 'fathers' who have finally moved so far up that they have become 'gods'. Why have they only families, and families of families and finally only a family of families of families -and no more? Not 'Nepotism' but 'Patrocracy' and/or 'Matrocracy'?

Why also has the Bantu no words for the concepts 'State' and 'Law' and 'Justice' - but only for 'People', 'Rules and Orders', and 'According to those rules and orders'? Why have they not even a word for 'Humanity' and 'Mankind'?

If we live ourselves into the world-image of the short-futured man this becomes directly understandable, for if there is no future stretching into 'eternity' then the 'State' is no more than a collection of people who exist in the present in a certain set of personal relationships.

'Laws' again cannot be a set of rules that define the living together of a people in such a way that they insure a permanency of existence to the State. They are merely the rules and edicts, laid down and imposed by those in power, according to which one must live - or else!

It is no wonder therefore that the policeman is, to the Bantu, not 'the arm of the law' but the servant of the Magistrate; and that the Magistrate is not merely the personification of the Law but the man who has decreed that we must do this and that, for fear of being punished by him if we don't.

'Justice' itself, being an entirely abstract idea which is based on the concept of living in an eternity in which the deeds of today reverberate and have their effect in numberless years to come, is an ideal that has its validity far beyond anything that 'exists'. It is a concept beyond and above the laws that try to express it - and it must necessarily be as completely meaningless to the average Bantu as it is to our own short-futured ones.

'Truth' itself also falls in this class.

To us (the longer-futured ones among us who think of things as existing by themselves) it means essentially that the image transmitted to another consciousness must be in accordance with reality - that is - that it must be a correct representation of things as they are.

When one has read such books as Professor Levy-Bruhl's "Primitive Mentality" (Allen and Unwin), one realises that nothing of that kind exists for the Bantu. 'Truth' there merely means: "I am not telling a lie," or: "I am expressing what I think"; where we mean: "I am telling you how it is."

As what the Bantu thinks is nearly completely rooted in himself he can say exactly the opposite a little later and still be telling what is, to him, the 'Truth'.

The Bantu does not live in a world the existence of which stretches out into eternity and is of such a nature that it can change only due to physical movement from place to place under the influence of force. For that reason only his present images have validity and as these are evanescent, 'truth' has not the same, slightly Sacred connotation that it has to us.

If, however, reality has little meaning (certainly beyond tomorrow and not at all beyond six months or so) it becomes a mere matter of 'truth telling' as an antonym to 'lying'. The only thing that really matters is that one should not be found out if punishment is likely to follow. In all other cases even being 'found out' is not important.

Therefore, where the ideal of the White man (at least up to the last generation of us) was little George Washington with his naughty axe, we find that the one the average Black man appreciates is the equivalent of our own 'Tyl Uilenspiegel' and 'Reynard the Fox' from the days when we, too, were mostly very short-futured. The 'successful liar', the 'chap who gets away with it' (like Brer Rabbit, who is the apotheosis of a large part of the stories of Africa) is the one they really like, the one to be admired, and if possible, emulated.

Furthermore there is no moral stain in lying. Being caught in a lie, being found out, can cause no feeling of shame. It is just too bad - that was one that one did not get away with. There is disappointment rather than shame in it as it is also to our short-futured ones.

Without much fear of contradiction we can here point out how the blatant lie (already scientifically defined by Hitler as a 'weapon') has been successfully introduced into the diplomatic chicanery of our world.

Not that our diplomats did not lie - far from it! One of our own definitions of a "diplomat" was that he was a man who lied for his country - but there is a difference as deep as that between day and night, between then and now. If one of our diplomats (even one of Hitler's own men) was caught out, his career was finished. He had publicly been demonstrated to be 'undependable' - he had lost face.

One of the causes of the First World War was the intriguing by Iswolski, a Russian diplomat who five years before had been made to lose face by Count Berchtold. For that Austria had to be destroyed!

The idea seems childish now.

Would any modern diplomat dedicate his life to vengeance on the country whose representatives had shown him up to be a liar and a cheat? Impossible! One smiles a 'diplomatic' smile and goes on to the next item on the agenda.

Our Black brethren in the United Nations have shown us very efficiently that no harm comes to him who lies in public.

By the time that a commission of enquiry has been appointed and a blue or white book has been published the matter is as stale as yesterday's newspaper. But the untruth has been established and remains. Nobody reads the blue or the white book.

Almost unnoticed by ourselves, 'International Diplomacy' has ceased to be a chess game, played according to certain rules. It has sunk back to the level of a teenage debating club if not already to that of a political discussion in a tavern.

Here "Welensky's 4000 Days" gives us a beautiful analysis of our traditional 'lying for one's country' compared with the 'committee of inquiry' instituted by the United Nations.

At the same time the reaction of the 'exposed' liars in England is a disturbing demonstration of how far the poison has already penetrated into our lives. The 'defence' consists of more or less in declaring Welensky to be a 'cad' because he published some details of a 'private' conference. "What will become of the world when one can no longer connive and plot in secret?" seems to be the main reaction. "We are getting to be as 'low' as the Russians with their 'bugging' of the American Embassy buildings!"

It is likely that this description of the short-futured man will make some of us feel good (it 'shows up the Bantu' wonderfully doesn't it?). Others again will feel either unease, as when something is being said openly that should only, as in Welensky's case, be whispered in private, or they will be troubled by a sense of guilt because they cannot help feeling that they are 'better' - which is a sin in anyone who claims to be enlightened.

But all these are very much mistaken.

There is nothing wrong with the short-futured man. As a matter of fact, in a lot of ways he is better than we are.

If one takes a close look at what one has considered to be his failings it turns out that they are only failings in relation to the set of values and ideals that we have built up on the basis of our relatively longer future image. None of them have anything to do with him as a living, human individual.

Actually he is to be envied for he has a much greater capacity for enjoying life than we have. One has but to see a picture of a jive session in Harlem and compare it with one among even the most abandoned White teenagers and beatniks to virtually see the difference. Sometimes one feels that what the American Youth is doing today is no more than trying to capture some of the 'joie de vivre' of his Negro compatriots - and failing miserably in the effort.

Naturally this capacity for enjoyment has to be paid for, like everything else in the world. As a counterpart to the capacity for greater enjoyment there must be the capacity to suffer more deeply, hence the short-futured, like the child (who is, in a way, their prototype) feels pain and sorrow much more profoundly, even if for a shorter duration, than his longer futured counterparts.

The question of whether the joy is worth the sorrow is a moot point that must be decided by everybody for himself, but it can hardly be doubted that the short-futured persons, and among them the Bantu and the Negroes, are very much more 'human' than any of us is ever likely to be.

On the other hand they are consequently bad material for citizenship in any 'Western state' and for positions of importance and trust in the Western economic and industrial world. They are also unlikely to be welcome in Western social circles because of their inevitable lack of understanding and respect for the great number of shibboleths, the intrinsic valuations and the etiquette of what is done and what not done in our personal relationships. Most of these are symbolic of 'standing' and 'worthiness' in relation to a scale of values that are also anchored mostly in the future.

Nevertheless it must again be stressed that none of this is to the discredit of the short-futured man. It certainly does not mean that he is less intelligent, it also does not mean that he is less gifted and it does not mean that he is an 'inferior' person either.

He is merely 'inferior' in our particular community just as we would be 'inferior' in the socio-economic pattern that they would build up if left alone for any length of time.



"Yes," the reader says, "that may all be very well, but a liar? Is that not an absolutely bad thing? To call a man a liar is after all a fighting word!"

One can only answer this by pointing out that the long-futured man is a liar too and, knowing the nature, the near-holiness of 'Truth', he is so much more the sinner.

At the same time not all of the short-futured ones (Black and White) need to be habitual liars for lying's sake. Just like our own short-futured specimens, they may at least pay lip service to the truth. What is underlined here is that they lie easily, glibly, and if need be with enthusiasm and abandon, which cannot be said to be true of the careful, calculated and much more dangerous 'misdirection' in which the long futured indulges when he thinks that it will be to his advantage. As said before, the short-futured person does not consider being called a liar to be greatly derogatory. His attitude is 'So what?'. He knows that all people are liars, some more, some less, some foolish, some positively gifted. He himself has done no harm. At most he may feel ashamed that he has been an unsuccessful liar, a liar who has been caught out.

The world image of the other extreme, the world of the person with the very long future image, is much more difficult for us to live into. It is fairly easy to take things away and to imagine what the whole would be like without them but to add something is quite another matter.

Here we do better to take known examples and to deduce from their words and actions what we would like to know.

Russians and Chinese, and, in general, the people of the Middle East are of that kind. From experience of them one would say that the possession of an extremely long future sense reduces the importance of today until it is like the view from the window of a railway train. 'Here today and gone tomorrow', lies at the back of their attitude and it is probably not without significance that these are also the people who have the quality which we know as 'Fatalism'.

Among all three of them an almost similar concept is in daily use. "Nichewo", "May Yo Faze" and Kismet are all expressions of the sentiment: "There's nothing to be done about it", combined with a mental shrug of the shoulders.

According to them one does not 'fight' things. One 'bears' them.

The long-futured man also does not laugh easily, and when he laughs his laugh has a bitter sound, often mixed with his fatalistic philosophy. He laughs at and not with people. He may even find a kind of masochistic pleasure in rubbing salt into the wound as is typical of the Jewish joke. At least it shows that he himself is able to laugh at his own worthlessness.

The long-futured man laughs at the futility of life and not so much at its foolishness, unless that foolishness brings out the futility of it all.

He may also laugh at seeing others suffer and many a long-futured person is essentially cruel. Deep down in himself he hates life. And the suffering of others who, in a way, represent that life to him, does him good. He is getting his own back. Here the masochist and the sadist are close together.

His smile is not a sign of friendliness but of the wish to be friendly which is quite another thing.

This type of man has a disdain for the values of the present moment. He really belongs somewhere else among the stars or in the eternal dust of the desert. This is the trait that, once understood, gives the

Russian novel its peculiar flavour to the Occidental reader. It is always there in the background, as the puppet men struggle and strain in their various disguises. Why am I here? Does God know that I exist?

The Chinese, again, does not really consider himself to be an individual. He is no more than the 'present' link in the chain which stretches from his original ancestor to his ultimate descendant. It is therefore the worst thing that can happen to him if he dies without a son. In that case the chain will be broken and Chinese law and customs have a series of interesting subterfuges that can be used to remedy such a catastrophe.

The typical attitude of such very long-futured people to political questions therefore follows almost logically. They ask no more than that they should have a little corner of their own in which they can be reasonably comfortable and safe during the time that they have to be part of the pattern of the universe. To add the trouble and dangers of having to rule to this, is for most of them too heavy a burden and few are willing to accept it. Few have the ambition or power as they are aware of its intrinsic futility. The ideal of the Chinese is, for instance, the fat, jovial man who has no cares. Wealth rather than Power is their 'summum bonum'.

In social relationships they, as naturally, tend to overstress the meaningless affectations of 'good manners' that degrade 'living together' to 'being polite to each other'. Here we have the tendency to make oneself small. The 'Little Father' mode of address of the Russians and the verbal self-deprecation of the 'This worthless person' of the Chinese, both of them combined with shameless (and meaningless) flattery, are cases in point. They are the expression of the wish not to be 'high trees', not to be in the way of anyone else's ambitions, of hoping to be thought not to be aggressive. "I am dust before your feet. "

When one of these men, however, accepts the burden of power he is apt to do it fanatically - and not for himself but for the 'state'. He does it for 'humanity' because that is the only reality that he knows; the valuator of all his own values.

Hence Communism, which to us is and will remain a mystery.

It should have told us something that, unlike Hitler and his crowd, not one of the Russian dictators died a rich man.

It is probably also wrong to see their periodic purges as what they would have been had they happened among us or in the new states of Africa. It could well be that in all honesty, the leaders or the potential leaders of their people took their views on what and how the state should be run so seriously that anyone who was against them (or who might be against them) would self-evidently be a definite danger to the State. It would follow axiomatically that they would have to be removed not only from power, but from the scene itself.

It would be foolish to think that personal advantage and ambitions do not play a role here. There must always be chaff among the corn, but in most of the communistic rulers that aspect may not even have been consciously present. Krushchev's fatherly public figure need not have been a 'facade' even though he may have ordered numberless executions for the 'political crime of dissension'. He would merely have been crushing the head of the snake that endangered the life and happiness of 'his children' - however difficult that may be for us to accept.

Some of what seems to us to be obvious discrepancies between his different public statements do find a kind of an explanation here, if the pattern is seen in the way sketched above.

As said before, the lie of the long-futured man is dangerous. It is made with the full consciousness of the effect it will have, both in the present and in the future. For this reason it has a good chance of sticking

where the lie of the short-futured man tends to shatter into pieces the first or the second time it meets reality.

Between these two extremes there is an infinite gradation of depth of future images and we, the Westerners, being the product of a miscegenation on a scale such as the world had never seen before, have all of them among us.

The 'Ile de France', the area around Paris, where our Civilisation started on its way when the first Gothic Cathedrals were being built, is, if we read our history books, the centre where (itself often escaping occupation) numberless invasions, both martial and peaceful, ran out of steam and settled down into the human substratum of the country. Moors from the South West, Longobards from the South East, Huns, and Goths, Norsemen and Romans - all of them planted their seed there or in the environment. As the centre of Education and famous Universities, it attracted scholars from everywhere and all of them left their genes to mix with and influence the central pool.

We obtained the sense of reality behind the appearance of things from the Greeks and the Romans, the sense for Space from the Nordic races, the sense for time from the Moors and the Jews; and it all boiled up and amalgamated until we had a mental image of the outer world that was almost complete and perfect, so that we could use it as a model on which to try out and pre-fashion what we were going to make and do.

But the reality of the future image and its depth in time remained, like a physical characteristic, differently apportioned to the different individuals, like the colour of our eyes and hair, the shape of our noses and the size of our bodies.

Where the mass of Oriental men and the population of Africa produces only a limited number of special types within the overall pattern of races, our race if 'race' it can be called, has an almost infinite variety of 'types' and 'characters' and 'personalities' - from the placid to the overactive, from the timid to the aggressive, from the serious to the facetious, from the cynic to the idealist, the true believer to the atheist who believes in nothing, the sadist and the masochist, the intellectual and the boor. There simply is no end to the variety.

Nevertheless there is something that most of us have in common, a legacy probably from the original stock that lived in small kingdoms and baronies continually at war with each other. This is the quality of refusing to be ruled arbitrarily and without our consent, the refusal, in fact, to be 'slaves'.

Fatalism, too, is not typically in our constitution. If we cannot do anything about it we will at least try - even if it means death. Or so it was up to not so very long ago.

It is for this reason that the typical Westerner cannot bear the thought of anybody else being a 'slave'. It seems certain to him that that must be the greatest evil that can befall a man - the final degradation that must sear his soul in agony. It sets the Westerner's teeth on edge merely to think of it.

What he does not seem to know, or what he is unwilling to accept, is that the largest part of humanity does not share this view with him. Most of it has never known any other state and most of its people have, in this definition, 'slave mentalities'. They only feel secure when they have a 'master' who stands between them and fate, who feeds them and guards them in a bewilderingly complex and essentially inimical world.

This feeling of security is also in direct proportion to the greatness and the authority and the power of the master. Under the cover of such a man's wing one can indulge in the little intrigues, the jockeying for position, and the acquisition of minor advantages and perquisites. It is the typical attitude of the

major domo of the powerful rich man, whose importance and authority is a reflection from the man whom he is 'privileged' to serve.

That that service may sometimes be arduous, and that such a master may be cruel, is to the underlings often no more than evidence of his greatness - and therefore of the basic measure of their own security under him.

When such a master degenerates, when he allows the 'winds of change' to blow through his mansions, they may over-run him and each other, but they are not happy. After the first flush of triumph and, what is virtually 'looting', is over, they start looking around to see who the next master is going to be. They are congenitally unable to take over and to be free for that entails the taking of responsibilities. They want a new 'father', however cruel, for only such a father can have a 'family' in which one can be reasonably secure.

Because it is characteristic of us, and of our whole system of personal values, that we at least desire to have a say in how we should be governed (even if it is by the almost meaningless tool of the single vote allotted to us in a democracy) this is not necessarily true of all 'Men'. It is certainly not true of an overlarge part of them (as the low percentage poll of even our own elections seems to demonstrate most convincingly). Outside our 'democracies' most of them are either afraid of the responsibilities and the senseless battle for power, or they feel themselves completely impotent to handle such an 'eternal' thing as the 'state'.

When one has read Erich Fromm's (now unhappily almost forgotten) 'The Fear of Freedom' (Kegan Paul), one realises that even we are not clean of this taint either. The 'reversion' to authoritarianism among the Nazis, and the flight into slavery of public opinion and the advertisement-determined set of values in America are hardly anything other than symptoms of the wish to get rid of this troublesome 'Freedom', which has turned out to be linked to a responsibility that the French Revolution has squarely placed upon our shoulders. We do not like it, but as long as we can save our faces by vociferously demanding our 'right to vote' we can still have the opportunity to crawl back into the safety of the centre of the herd.

## CHAPTER XIV

### *All Governments are by the People*

Among the animals (or should we say; just above them?) there is a group which we call 'Men'.

The question of whether they are all of one 'Genus' or one 'Race' is a theoretical quibble dependent for its answer upon how we happen to define the words 'Genus' and 'Race'. If we had all been agreed upon that definition, there could hardly be any mentionable argument, even if it turned out that the Chimpanzee is a blood brother of ours in that he can cross-breed with us.

This problem is, however, as is so much of our thinking, no more than a playing with words. We accept that these words have a meaning and do not realise that they are no more than the labels which we have pasted on the things around us. We forget that they are dependent for their validity on the correctness of the reasoning and observation of our ancestors in the days when they were invented.

After all it is not really a question of whether a certain animal is a horse, although we express it like that. What is actually meant is whether it is an animal that falls within the definition of what we have agreed to call a "horse".

It is the same with the question of the 'Genus Homo' and even more so with the question of the different 'Races' of Man. Both words have their uses in organising the pattern of life-forms for ourselves and making it understandable - but they do not have a meaning and do not necessarily represent anything that has an existence and reality in the world of things that exist and are real.

We are not members of the Genus Homo. The Genus Homo, is merely a label and we are actually "living beings that fall within the definition of what we have agreed to call the 'Genus Homo'" no matter if it 'exists' or not.

Even if it turns out that Man's genetic qualities reach down into the upper layers of the Primates, that also makes no difference. We can easily bypass that contretemps by coining yet another word and deciding that there is a "group" of animals that we will agree to call "Men".

These "Men" have certain definable characteristics in common. They are all fully bipedal and they all walk erect. All of them have relatively little hair on their bodies and there is a distribution of the location of the areas of full hair growth that is also common to them all. Besides that they all have a nose that, more or less, sits on the face and is not built into it. All of them have relatively large brains for their body size and communicate by some form of speech.

Finally all of them can cross-breed among each other.

But there the resemblance ends, and within the limits of the above definition there is an immense and often bewildering variety - especially when one includes such refinement's as the cross-section of their hairs, their blood groups, their body odours, the RNA templates on which their proteins are made (the biochemical structure of their material existence therefore), their language groupings etc.

Nevertheless, just as within the animal, kingdom one can distinguish the Group Homo, so, within it again, one can distinguish Sub-Groups (that is, if one does not wish to use the somewhat emotionally contaminated word "Races").

These Sub-Groups, it is true, tend to run together at the edges and sometimes to overlap, but there is no doubt that in the central core of each such Sub-Group there are a large number of 'typical' individuals who are immediately distinguishable as belonging to that special Sub-Group.

It is not the intention here to go into details which are anyhow better left to those who have devoted their lives to studying the subject. What is important to the argument, however, is that there are such Sub-Groups. We can see and define them.

With a certain amount of concentration and effort we could construct the definitions by which we could place any 'typical' individual in the place where he belongs in the pattern of humanity.

Besides this we know that the physical structure of the individual at least, is genetically determined by the way in which his or, her ancestors have combined their genetic potential in the pairing out of their chromosomes.

If these two premises are accepted, and it is almost impossible not to do so, we come up against the popular contention that all these "men" have the same average brain potential - as if the brain was not subject to genetic influences or as if it had been there first and the differences in the bodies came only afterwards.

What is more, this contention is almost catatonically held to, despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary; not only in regard to the average size and volume of the physical brain material - but also in its shape, configuration and structure.

That people, even intelligent people, can be so stubborn as to deny the evidence before their eyes seems impossible but it is no more than yet another symptom of the brainwashing to which we have been subjected, combined with the subconscious fear of the implications which such a 'total difference' places before us if we dare to look.

When we rid ourselves, possibly with some difficulty, of the obsession that, 'All men are equal', we find that there is no other conclusion possible than that, just as Mankind is made up in groups of individuals with distinguishable patterns in regard to the qualities and sizes of the physical details of their bodies, so also their personalities, their mental structures and abilities will be present in different patterns for each of these groups. There will not only be typical 'Asiatic', 'Negroid', 'Australoid' and 'Caucasian' bodies, but they will also have typical 'Asiatic', 'Negroid', 'Australoid' and 'Caucasian' mental equipment.

What, in life, these different 'equipments' may build out of whatever environmental material is available to each individual, may differ as the Sun from the Moon or the Stars - or they may, to the superficial examiner, be almost identical - but the final products will still be limited by the congenital pattern of equipment and potentialities with which they started out.

A selection of individuals from all the races, growing up in absolutely identical environmental circumstances, may very well seem to differ as little mentally and morally as a similar number of individuals from one stock growing up under the same conditions.

Nevertheless, deep down, the difference will be there and it will come out the moment that the basic environmental conditions (in which they have all learnt to be at home) are changed so that individual reactions become important.

To make this clear to ourselves we may indulge for a moment in what the Scientists call a "thought experiment".

Let us, in imagination, take two 'tribes' of people, the one aggressive and warlike, the other peaceable and timid. Let us also take it that in bodily characteristics they differ little or not at all.

Then, one night, we interchange half the children of one tribe with those of the other.

Is it now conceivable that the children of the warlike aggressive tribe, growing up among a peaceable and timid people, will become peaceable and timid while the children of the peaceable and timid tribe, growing up among the warlike aggressive one will develop aggressive tendencies and find joy in murder and rapine?

One would say that Mussolini's experiment in 'breeding' brave soldiers out of the Italian stock by, almost from birth, placing them in military and militant surroundings must have put an end to that idea. Will a Bull Terrier, or a Dobermann Pinscher, growing up in a kennel full of Spaniels, become sweetnatured and sentimental? Then why should it be true of man?

The conclusion seems inevitable that it is only because the final product of the human personality is so infinitely more dependent upon the material which it absorbs from its environment, and because the basic potential, and characteristics can only be discovered by focussed analysis, that the difference in the latter is often overlooked. That, plus the wish to be equal, must at least be the reason why so many (even intelligent) people find themselves able to deny it completely.

If there is retention of the basic characteristics and qualities in those who grow up in 'alien' surroundings, how much more must it then be true that, within the group, certain potentials and characteristics strengthen each other; and (what is more important to the argument) that, if certain characteristics and potentials are absent among them, they will remain absent as long as there is no miscegenation - no cross-breeding with immigrants or invaders.

All this would still not be very important, for it takes millions of varieties of man to build up 'humanity'. The more varieties the merrier, one could say - but there is one characteristic that is genetically determined and which is of the utmost (if not of supreme) importance in regard to the way in which the society, the living together of the people in the group, will take place. This characteristic of the 'temporealisation potential' in a man determines, as we have tried to show, most of the qualities which will themselves again determine what kind of a citizen he will be.

As has been seen, it is likely that as mankind developed, this quality or gift or whatever one would like to call it (for unqualified blessing it certainly is not!) was the deciding factor.

It is also likely that this development of the temporealisation potential did not take place everywhere to the same extent and that, even to this day, different people have different characteristic temporealisation potentials with which to face the problems of life and each other.

It is therefore probable that in our world, we have groups of people who are almost all short-futured, others who are almost all very longfutured and others again among whom the depth of the future image varies from person to person between any pair of extremes.

From this it follows that we have groups of people who have, overall and as an average, different kinds of citizenship qualifications - and it is by the average citizenship qualifications of its citizens that the different kinds of 'states' are necessarily determined.

It should almost be a truism that Governments develop (or grow) out of the people. Yet few theoreticians seem to be able to grasp this essential point.

Autocracies are not autocracies because they have an autocrat in control but because the people have the nature that needs an autocrat to rule them. If this was not so, where would the autocrat find those willing to enforce his rule? Being of the people (unless they are mercenaries or the minions of a foreign power) these forcers would lack the ability to use power on others if they were not themselves 'dictators' in a small way.

A free-minded people also would not permit an autocrat to enslave them. They would rather die.

Again, a Democracy is not a Democracy because it has a democratic government. It has a democratic government because it consists of people who are essentially democrats - people who will permit 'ruling' but only in so far as it is necessary to keep the state running smoothly. Besides this they have a sense of civic duty and a sense of responsibility to the state, to their work and towards each other.

If this was not so, some power-hungry group would soon take possession of the key-points of the state and hold the rest to ransom -as happened to the Germans who are, at heart, not really 'democratic'.

It is a fundamental mistake, surprisingly rife among us, to think of 'Governments' as something apart from, and above, 'The People'.

After all they also are only men and these 'governing men' will be of the people and of the same genetic stock as the people themselves.

It is never 'The Government' that does this and that. It is always a group of individual men (each rising from his bed in the morning, shaving, having breakfast and going to work) who, among themselves, decide in what way the law should rule 'their' people, their own people from whom they differ very little, if at all. There is nothing godlike or esoteric about being in the Government. The governors are as liable as we are to catch colds, to have indigestion and headaches and to do the inconceivably stupid things that people often do.

In short, our governments, even if they are dictatorships or tyrannies (unless again they are alien invaders) are 'we ourselves' and typical of the group or 'race' (?) to which we belong.

In this way it is not merely a quasi-profundity to say that all people have the governments they deserve. In general it can be added that they also have the governments they actually want! (Even if they do not realise it).

It has always been a favourite communist thesis that the workers of the West are being ground down under the heels of the 'Capitalists' and it is amusing to realise that, even if this was so, it would still be due to the fact that every man-Jack of us is, at heart, an embryo Capitalist. The capitalist system will only collapse when the worker stops thinking 'capitalistically' - that is when, for instance, having won the football pool, or drawn the Irish Sweep, he will consider the possibility that it might be his moral duty to give most of it to the State - or to distribute it among his fellow workmen. When that time comes, but only then, will we be ripe for our Stalins and our Kosygin - not to mention our own version of the OGPU.

## CHAPTER XV



## *The Short-futured State*

Which type of states typical temporalisation patterns among its citizens tend to 'grow', has also been worked out in my "Now-men and Tomorrow-men"; but in a more theoretical vein. Here, where it is a matter of sketching in the background to the apocalyptic play entitled "Delenda est Homo Occidentalis", there is the need to see it more clearly in relation to reality.

What will a state consisting almost exclusively of short-futured people, who all or mostly live 'on the spur of the moment', be like?

One must remember here that to none of them will the concepts of 'State', 'Justice', 'Law' and 'Esoteric Truth' mean anything. All of these have, if not their main objective, at least most of their justification in the fairly distant future.

We have to imagine the nature of such people and therefore the state they will build, by means of telescoping our own average future depths into about one tenth of their present value.

One can see that it would be pure, intellectual acrobatics to try and build up such a state from mainly amorphous human material. It is therefore better to start with what, to us, would seem the most ideal beginning possible, namely with an already fully established and working Democracy together with a Civil Service in which all but the top echelons have already been 'trained'. There will also be a reserve of fully trained top men ready to take over, each of them having sat at the elbow of the original, long-futured incumbents for say five years. One could hardly think of anything more ideal and nearly 'Utopian' than that. (It would also be as impossible, for no Uhuru-directed 'topman' would have sat there for that time. He would have known it all after a few weeks. One need only remember the 'dressers' who took over the Surgery departments in the Congo hospitals to realise that. But never mind. In a way this is also a 'thought experiment' and we are leaning over backwards.)

Given the described starting point, what would happen when the flood of 'Africanisation' (which, in this context, we can call 'Defuturisation'.) rose from rank to rank?

Naturally, for a few days, or weeks, or months, depending upon the aggressiveness, egotism or impertinence of the new incumbents, there would be little change. Soon, however, the originally future-orientated spirit of departments would become a 'present-situation'. One by one all the points of reference would retract themselves into the immediate tomorrow. Personal rights and privileges and advantages would no longer be restrained by the realisation that all were subject to the proviso that the department should function efficiently in regard to the work it was doing for the future; for the continued, and theoretically eternal, maintenance of a standard of peaceful living together in the state.

Relations would become personal and not departmental. Not the work but the worker would become the deciding factor. What else would be the use of the African having become a 'free' man?

Nevertheless, for a time, possibly for several years. the department would freewheel on, unless something unusual happened in the community. Established habits, the effect of the training (obeyed, but not understood), would keep it functioning automatically. Even minor repairs and adjustments could be made. It would be like the nonmechanically minded man who had been given a motor car. With a bit of half informed tinkering he could keep it going for a time.

The work, the forms that had to be filled in, would be done and attended to - as long as the new head maintained the discipline on which he had been trained to insist, and as long as the clerks accepted the discipline to which they had been trained to submit.

But a civil service, even though it seems to us to be no more than a machine because a computer could do most of the work just as well, is more than that. It, like the motor car that is more than a "machine to produce movement", has its steering wheel. Working by rote may be the quality of the clerks and the office boys but that is not true of the top men, the managers, the heads of the departments.

All our systems of administration consist of intricate networks of infinitely conscientious checking and counter-checking and the moment must arrive when some detail of this system lags behind or derails, thus losing contact with the rest, while keeping on functioning like the tail of a lizard that has fallen off.

As the tide of 'de-futurisation' rises higher, as more and more Whites receive the golden handshake and go home, chaos will spread with everybody going through the motions but with little being done.

(In passing it must here again be emphasised that this will not be due to lack of intelligence, nor to any 'inferiority' in the workers. It will be no more than a symptom of 'unsuitability'; of doing, or having to do, a kind of work that does not fit the personalities and the world image of those who do it.)

At the same time, higher posts carry the possibilities of the use of power for immediate personal advantage and immediate personal prestige.

To resist the temptation to use this power needs, as in us, a vision of the future in which such taking of advantages must lead to a disruption of the department that will in no way be compensated for by what can be gained now. For the short-futured one, despite the warnings he may have received (and even despite the knowledge that it will happen) it is all too easy to shrug one's shoulders and to label it 'foreign nonsense' -or, if one is sufficiently educated, "stuffy bureaucracy".

One will therefore see palaces arising in a land of destitution, and minister's wives buying golden beds in London, to the only half-hidden dismay of those who wish Africa well.

In the meantime, in the readymade Parliament with which the country has been presented, still stranger things will occur and soon it will be no more than a mockery of democracy because not one of the members is in his heart a democrat. Being a democrat entails, in the first place, having a belief in the permanency of the State and ruling one's life accordingly.

One could call it a "Demockery" if it was not all so serious and infinitely tragic; if it did not need to end in legalised murder, or, at best, legalised ruination and sequestration for life for the so called 'opposition', which in these circumstances becomes not 'opposition' but 'competition'.

All this is logical. What is not so logical is the reaction of the idealistic White man. One sees him nod his head and murmur to himself, "After all, this could have been expected". He forgets that hardly a year or two ago he did not expect anything of the kind, for if he had, he would have, or should have, thought twice about the moral implications implied in making the "generous gesture" of dealing out Uhuru in all directions. He forgets that not so long ago he cursed those who mentioned the possibility that it could happen for "harbouring the abomination of 'racism'".

He nods and says, "After all, they have no experience yet. We have no right to blame them, for we ourselves, when we started out had our debacles and our birth pains.

"It will all come right. They will learn. Our hundred or two hundred years of influence and example cannot have been without any influence at all. They are intelligent enough. They will learn. Maybe it will not end up as pure, unadulterated 'Westminster Democracy' but they will evolve some African equivalent to it. Let us have patience. They will learn," and so on.

To the observant reader of newspapers and periodicals there has lately been the appearance of a set of pronouncements by the higher ups and the original promoters of Uhuru, which are gently and 'wisely' preparing the world for the realisation that Democracy, as we know it, will not strike root in Africa.

One of the most authoritative of these is to be found in the 'Optima' of March 1964. The article "A New Democracy or a New Totalitarianism in Africa" is by Sir Walter Coutts, who has, besides the imposing letters K.C.M.G., M.B.E., K. St. behind his name, the authority of having been the last governor of Uganda before it became 'free'.

In reading it one feels sympathy for the writer, who is manifestly a man of high ideals and integrity with basically a calm and detached view on what is happening in his old haunts.

Nevertheless he simply has to take the best view of it. He prepares us carefully for the fact that the 'Westminster pattern' cannot survive - but he still has this to say: "I am sure, therefore, that Africa as did Europe -will require time for evolution and that, therefore, strong criticism of present happenings, for reasons which I will discuss, may well be precipitate." And later on we find: "I think that the average African, because of the social background to which we have referred, would consider the imposition of the supreme authority of one individual - evil."

The typical verbalisation of the thought is such that it should be placed in a museum for future historians to help them understand what made us tick; but what is more immediately important is that, when we investigate that which 'would be discussed' and that 'to which has been referred', we find that it amounts to no more than that the African "lives in a family system" and that there have often been "councils of elders".

That all of Africa has always been ruled by virtually unrestrained authoritarianism is not mentioned at all.

One is reminded of S. N. Kramer, who in his book 'History Begins at Sumer' sees literally everything starting there, including 'Democracy' because there is evidence that there too the rulers sometimes had 'councils of elders'.

When however an elder or an adviser is liable to be liquidated if he does not give the right advice, the democratic component in such a state becomes, it has to be admitted, somewhat ephemeral.

We should also remember that, although it is true that we took a long time to perfect our Democracy, we started off with nothing and had to try it out, step by step. Most of Africa had the framework of it, together with the blueprint of how it should work, before their eyes.

There is an amusing twist to the end of the article, for it turns out that between the writing and the publishing of it there were the 'salto mortale' in Zanzibar and the 'mutinies' in Tanganyika and Kenya, not to mention the 'coup' and 'countercoup' in Brazzaville.

Nothing daunted, however, Sir Walter keeps his stiff upper lip (so beautifully lampooned by Gunther in 'Inside Africa' where he describes the conditions in the Sudan before the abdication). He merely adds the addendum: "The present political leaders, even at the expense of loss of both local and international prestige by calling in British troops have *taken very strong action*, to restore the situation, *to bolster their own position, and therefore to avoid general chaos*. The lessons of the Congo *in the interest of the masses* have been well learned." (The italics are mine.)

The conscious or unconscious self-delusion and/or the conscious or unconscious misdirection of the understanding of the reader are blatantly exposed in the italicised phrases.

It is true enough that 'bolstering their position' would avoid 'chaos', but it is by no means made acceptable that the avoiding of chaos was the prime motivation for calling in the British. It is much more likely that it was pure self-defence; the ex-son, calling to his estranged father for help in an inimical world. Neither is it likely that the 'lessons of the Congo have been well learnt' in the interest of the masses. Both these 'motivations' have been inserted by the writer off his own hook. What has been learnt is what happened to Lumumba when he let the army get out of hand. Not what happened to the people there.

Finally it is legitimate to ask what 'very strong action' has been taken other than to ask for help - and some mild punishment for the mutineers instead of executing them as an example for having brought the whole country up to the verge of a general bloodbath. One could also ask what 'very strong action' could have been taken where it would have been impossible to find either Black or White executioners to do the work.

It was not intended to discuss this particular little peccadillo itself.

It will be 'dated' before this book is published, for by that time it is most likely that there will be many more - and probably much more striking 'incidents' to discuss.

What it has been intended to demonstrate is the typical White attitude of mind which, incidentally, is the only one that can make it possible for intelligent people to keep on cursing South Africa for its 'abhorrent' practices, while at the same time seeing what is happening to the north of us. It must be either that "attitude of confident patience no matter what happens" or, disgusting thought, being forced to agree with us.

To return to our subject, the most important factor in regard to the communal life of a short-futured people is that the short-futured man only obeys (or does what he is not himself inclined to do) because of fear of punishment.

The supreme and devastating importance of this fact cannot be overstressed.

We are so used to living under a smoothly functioning system in which law and its enforcement is a self-evident presence, that we forget, and find it hard to realise if we are reminded of it, that even our own short-futured ones are like that too. We may honestly believe that most, if not all, of us are essentially law-abiding people, but then something we left at the roadside or in the waiting room disappears and we know that one of our own short-futured specimens has passed that way again. There was no fear of punishment to restrain them and the thing was 'snitched'.

The short-futured man has no permanent values by which to regulate his life. He is free to choose anyone, any slogan, any principle that appears to permit and even encourage him in what he wants to do at that moment.

*The unavoidable implication of this is that a community of shortfutured people can only be ruled by fear.*

It must inevitably (slowly or suddenly, depending upon the circumstances) develop - or degenerate (?) - into a pyramid of fear, with the one most feared on top and with each layer fearing those above it and being feared (and, as is only 'human', adored) by those below.

In a somewhat more long-futured and better organised community, the fear of the shorter-futured ones may take the form of fear of being discharged, and fear of the loss of an established standard of living

which may, for them, penetrate into the 'now'. In a fully shortfuted community, where such unpleasant things are often too far away in the future to create any immediate, 'present' fear, the fear of direct punishment - the fear of pain and death, will tend to take over.

Here the possession of arms is an all-important factor and, because the modern White firearm has taken the place of the sword and the assegai, there is no longer the need to be a personally brave and able fighter. It will therefore be difficult to build up a loyal army and a loyal police force. The possession of a 'gun' automatically gives the individual a power which, when he sees his way clear to it, he may use it to his own immediate advantage and to the destruction of anything like law and order.

'Mutinies' like those in Tanganyika and Kenya are but straws that show which way the wind is blowing in Africa. There is no need to blame or suspect the "Communist".

The idea that an 'army' is an entity that automatically supports its rulers is wrong. It need not even be an 'entity'.

It is a collection of individuals. Its 'entity' consists in that it is or should be bound together by a pattern of forces which all its members recognise as valid and which they therefore obey without question. When the soldier begins to throw out his White officers because they insist on a discipline which is repugnant to a 'free' man in a land where Uhuru has risen like a sun above the northern horizon, it is no longer an 'army'. Even the Army that Sir Walter Coutts seems to believe could, if necessary, influence and do things, would therefore also be no more than a dream. The question of whether the Black soldier will take more kindly to being disciplined by his own kind, has only academic interest. Even were it to have inspired leadership, it would still be something out of Alice in Wonderland.

The same is unhappily true of a police force, and without dependable, unpartisan policemen, law - and finally, order - becomes a thing of the past.

These are simple but, male dictu, indisputable facts.

It therefore becomes more and more likely that, before Africa returns to its original, natural state of 'family rule' (because one can expect loyalty only in a family), there will be an epoch of total disintegration, banditry and anarchy in one or another of its violent forms, just as it is still to be found in the Congo of today.

The irony of this is that, where the White man had hoped to replace expensive military overlordship by 'economical subjugation', the materialisation of that ideal (!) becomes more and more unlikely too. He had hoped to earn the 'friendship' of the new rulers whom he would place in power, however autocratic they might turn out to be (and to hell with the 'rights' of the common man), but the White man did not know, or did not realise, that the loyalty and thankfulness of the short-futed man is also determined solely by the advantage he obtains in the present (which is an unintended, but still remarkably valid pun!).

That this barefaced accusation of the White man's real intentions is not exaggerated is demonstrated by the retinue of 'concession seekers' and 'handout providers' that attend the courts of every established or potential 'Leader of his people'. The quality of the bought 'friendship' again is demonstrated by the hands that are held open alternately to the east and to the west.

It has proved to be impossible to divide Africa into zones of 'friendly' influence, sustained by surreptitious and unofficial support for the 'friendly' rulers. Africa, or rather, its leaders, bedazzled by the gifts that are showered on them from all sides, have the bit between their teeth.

Anything may happen - anything, except the emergence of something remotely resembling democracy.

It may even happen that, to safeguard established interests, the White man will take over again in certain enclaves, with or without the permission of the nominal rulers.

Again, rulers may make a habit of what happened in Tanganyika and Kenya and call in the White men to subdue their own people when they get out of hand, but this will depend upon for how long the White man will be willing to intervene, without pay or obligation, only to be cursed again once the immediate danger is over, as happened in Kenya. Gratuitous continuation of 'bearing the white man's burden', as was done in those instances, will have its time limit, even if it is not yet visible to the short-futured men, be they Black or White.

Another and more likely solution would be if, following the pattern of history, the Black Rulers discovered that their problems would be solved for them by engaging White mercenaries.\* They might then even have wars among themselves. The White renegade has always been a part of the picture in history, from those who fought and lived with the Indians of America to the 'advisers' whom the Warlords in China used to have.

There have always been, and there will always be, Whites who are willing to sell their special White abilities if the price is high enough - and - strangely - it is also true that these White mercenaries have a certain kind of loyalty to what they undertake to guard or to sponsor.

One could also see the development of recruiting soldiers in each other's countries and ruling one tribe with policemen from the other. But that would again need a well-organised and conscientious civil service; even if there is no dearth of money for that will be streaming into the coffers of the government in return for concessions and the providing of workers who will cause no trouble by daring to strike.

All this is horribly inevitable and unavoidable.

The 'Africanism' which Sir John Fletcher-Cook, former Deputy Governor of Tanganyika (in another such statement, as reported in the Rand Daily Mail 3/4/64), says is the real 'danger' in Africa, is actually the only and final possibility.

We uprooted the old tribal 'pyramids of families' structure of authority in Africa. We have tried to give them our ideal democracy' as a legacy when we left - but, as Sir John says: -Westminster Democracy required the general acceptance of certain fundamental ideas, apart from technical needs such as universal literacy.

"One of them was the Greek dialectic method of thesis and antithesis - this is virtually incomprehensible in sub-Saharan Africa (which is dangerously near a 'racist' remark!).

\*This was written some time before Tshombe took up the idea and some 200 White mercenaries, badly paid and equipped, recovered most of the Congo for him.

One can now ask, in some surprise, why then in heaven's name did you try to foist it on them? What possible moral justification could there have been for the prating about one-man-one-vote systems when you knew that it would not work? And, if you wish to deny having known, why then, knowing it now, do you still insist upon the same beginning for those who are next in the queue?

It seems, however, that the light is beginning to break through even among the original promoters of Uhuru - but two sentences in the article deserve to be repeated.

"Western peoples were heirs to Christianity and were restrained in dealing with minorities. This approach was not deeply rooted in the African way of looking at things." As this was written after what

has happened and is still happening to the Watussi in Rwanda, it becomes an almost ludicrous example of the English gift for understatement!

The other quotation is: "I do not think this emergent African movement necessarily involves any anti-White feeling at all. That may well come from developments in the southern parts of Africa." (sic)!

After a first impulse to argue it out, it has been decided to let it stand as a monument to the strange arabesques into which the human mind can twist itself - and not even be conscious of doing it!

"Blame South Africa for showing everybody else up - and spoiling everybody else's game or fun", would be the most fitting inscription one could put on its pedestal.

In Africa the only final, stable form of government can still be no other than the one that it found for itself in the beginning, the pyramid of families instead of the pyramid of fear through which our abdication is now making it go as if through purgatory. Only inside a family, which is daily visible as a framework for living, for loyalties and even for sacrifice can the short-futured man find stability. The African only really trusts his relations. Strangers are like sand the structure of which one does not know. At any moment it may turn out to be a quicksand after all.

The family has or needs no future. It is there and has always been there (in his life at least).

He can also understand and accept a family of families - a pyramid of families - but not an abstract 'State'. He can understand a father's authority, but not the authority of an impersonal law.

In all the foregoing one possibility has been purposely avoided up to now: the possibility that there may be a heaven of longer-futured ones among the men of Africa.

It would certainly not be strange if that was so but, in practice, the actual events seem to show that either these men are not there or that they are keeping out of the fray.

The reason why there should be at least some is because there can hardly be a fully 'pure' Negro or Bantu left in Africa. The known invasions that have taken place since the beginnings of recorded history, from the Romans onward, show that thousands of Whites have been absorbed into the Black population.

Once a whole army of several thousand 'Christian renegades' led by the 'blue-eyed' general Judar, and sent out by El Manzur at the end of the fourteenth century, finally settled down in what is now Ghana. A few generations after that no visible trace was left of them.

Long-futured Arab 'genes' were planted in Africa regularly during the slave and ivory trade and a continuous 'contamination' by shipwrecked sailors must have occurred along its coastal regions.

It can be shown mathematically that this must have resulted in almost total contamination of every individual, just as we must all be 'contaminated' by the after-effect of the Black slaves that were imported into Europe in the time of the Romans; and, still more, in America where a large number of 'Blacks' finally succeeded in crossing the line.

Unhappily it seems that in the combination between White and Black the long-futured gene is recessive, for even our own Coloured people usually show a 'happy-go-lucky' nature and an insouciance which almost outdoes that of the Black half of their ancestors.

Nevertheless it may have struck roots here and there.

There are tribes in central Africa that show hopeful signs - but even then, what can one or a handful of long-futured ones do to rule a nation of short-futured ones when any law aimed at the future good of all will be an imposition and an injustice, a possible cause for rebellion instead of praise?

One is afraid that the hopeful murmurings and cluckings of Sir Walter Coutts and Sir John Fletcher-Cook are actually no more than an attempt to close their own eyes to the enormity of what their countries made them do.

The sin of shrugging the responsibility for millions of human lives from their shoulders was infinitely worse than what our ancestors did when they overran this continent and took it for themselves. They at least ended by *improving* the lot of the African *individual*.



## CHAPTER XVI

### *The Long-futured State*

As when we were examining the individuals, we will first go to the other extreme and look at the kind of state that a very long-futured people will 'grow'.

Here we also cannot be so relatively sure of ourselves, because, being at best only medium long-futured, we cannot imagine ourselves fully into their way of seeing things.

We can, however, try to make them theoretically understandable.

One thing is important and that is that we must learn not to interpret the things they do and say as meaning what they would imply if we had done and said them.

Where the state of the short-futured people, who only obey for fear of punishment, must produce an autocracy based on 'ruling by fear', so a state of very long-futured people is probably the most easily ruled of all.

To very long-futured people the things of today - and even they themselves - are not very important. They incline to fatalism and not doing anything about what troubles or endangers them. Their feeling of existing is rooted in eternity and not in the now. Hence they are easily ruled by whatever authority is 'placed' over them.

One could say that, strangely enough, they will be ideal citizens with whom to build up anything but a democratic state.

Only when the ruler, whoever he may be, takes advantage of their essential placidity and goes beyond what is endurable will they revolt.

On the other hand, we can see that, if such a revolt takes place it will be a 'revolution' and not a 'riot' such as there was in the Congo. It will be accompanied, and often preceded, by a great deal of planning and theorising (always into the future). Some of this planning and intrigue will go wild, for it is a characteristic of the very long-futured that their future is 'real' to them beyond the range where it is still predictable and predeterminable. There will be 'cloak and dagger' stuff and secret meetings that are presided over, not really by the chairman, but by the 'Cause', so that even if there is nothing to discuss, one must show some enthusiasm and activity.

The theoretical picture shapes itself for us as we combine the conditions with the life and attitude of the very long-futured and it fuses fairly well into what we know that has happened and is happening there.

Those who are interested in what makes people tick and who have read "The Jungle is Neutral" by F. Spencer Chapman must have been struck by the almost incidentally described details of life in the Communist Guerilla camps. From these, more than from any (inevitably prejudiced in one way or the other) books on the subject, one can extract an insight into the roots of 'Communism' as there one sees it acting in the primitive, unsophisticated individuals who make up 'The People'. (It is almost weird to realise that the Communists were still our allies in those days!)

The image with which one comes away: the strict, infinitely serious discipline, the discussions on whether smoking should be permitted or not, the reading of what to us is 'propagandist' literature almost as if it was the Holy Writ, finally overshadows the memory of the more 'derring do' part of the book.

Those readings and teachings and moral disciplines were manifestly the equivalent of what, to us, is the reading of the Bible and going to church on Sundays. It answered the same need that is in us, and, one supposes, in most men. Doing these things is, to each of us, not an intellectual or purposive act but the expression, and an assuagement, of an inner need.

To most of them the actual meaning of the words of the 'texts' were probably as secondary as, to us, the clearly laid down instructions which are to be found in the words of the 'Sermon on the Mount'.

Here one can find the reason for the fact that arguing with a Communist about his ideas (which are his 'faith') gives one the same sensation as arguing with a rather bigoted minister of religion. One is not talking 'logic' but 'belief' and that belief presupposes, in the one case the absolute truth of the Bible, in the other the absolute truth of Marxist texts. One can argue about their explanation but not about their intrinsic validity.

Where our Bible is, for us, the only link with the eternal, to the Communist, Marxism is the exposition of the structure of the pattern of eternity - and that eternity is part of his life. Possibly it would be more correct to say that he is basically always conscious of being a part of that pattern, and feels himself no more important in it than a little ball-bearing that can easily be missed.

The very long-futured will therefore be ruled either by an autocrat, a Tsar, an Emperor or a Shah - or by a 'Committee' of citizens who take over the duty of representing and personifying the 'State'. It is amusing to realise that just as the Black man cannot understand the 'Law' to be above those that implement the law, so it is practically impossible for us to understand how the 'State' can be something so completely above those who rule us as it is to the Communist.

This rule by Committees takes the form of, to us, unimaginably devoted men who have risen from committee to committee, each more conscious of its importance in the pattern of the State and with an upper limit to the amount of responsibility that most of its members dare to accept. It will therefore be a rule by 'Soviets' (Committees) up to the supreme Soviet of them all. Each man there is part of a great and eternal system that is, in all respects, more important than he is.

That, to us, strange and often repulsive actions (mixed with those that are recognisable as due to self-seeking) must result, is obvious. In such surroundings every disagreement and lack of respect becomes the equivalent of what Calvin in Geneva and the 'Auto da Fés' over a large part of Europe punished with often diabolically devised ways of dying painfully. It is the equivalent of 'sacrilege'. The Machine gun is a humane treatment compared to what we used to do to those who did not see our eternity as we did.

All this is nearly impossible for us to imagine. We will sacrifice something - even our life - for our state and our country, but we will not live for it. It is there for us and we will defend it, again even with our lives, just as we will defend our property without being willing to live for that property. If we like we will let it go to rack and ruin. That is our business. But nobody is going to take it away from us.

The attitude of the very long-futured is, strangely enough, almost the inverse. He lives for, or rather, as part of, the state. He is acutely conscious of being a part of it and derives his own personal meaning from it. But dying for it (in the present tense) seems rather foolish. He will die if it is deemed necessary - like a sheep. He will fight (and incidentally possibly also die) as part of the State but he will not 'defend' it. One could possibly express it the best by saying that in that case, he is part of a State that defends itself.

The difference may seem hairsplittingly small, but it is such little differences that determine what we do and how we see what we are doing.

The character of very long-futured thinking also comes out in the space of five- and ten-year plans which Russia and China have produced.

The very long-futured man needs a goal somewhere in the future to spur him on to doing things. Otherwise the natural procrastination of one to whom today is not important, takes over. Here again, as in the tendency to develop an authoritative government (even if it is by an authoritative 'State' in the case of the very long-futured) we find a resemblance to the short-futured ones. The latter, however, leave things undone because they do not see the need to do them, while the former leave them undone because there will always be time enough or something may turn up that will make doing it unnecessary.

No Westerner could have conceived the idea of the 'five year plan' principle. It is too vague and it places a definite time limit to an indefinite amount of achievement. The Westerner's equivalent would have been: first the definition of a definite goal, a calculating of the time necessary to reach it on the basis of known facts and, if then it turned out that it would be finished in five years' time he might call it a 'five year plan'; he might also call it a 'five and a half year plan' if that was the time that would be needed. The 'five' and 'ten' year plans give themselves away because of the rounded off figures. These numbers are no more than an 'anchor', or a 'wall' that the very long-futured has to place at a definite point in the future to get anything done at all.

The 'five year plan' of a Westerner would mean that he had a clear image of the whole period and what was to be done in it. Beyond that there would be, for him, almost nothing. The very long-futured remains conscious of the interminable time stretching out beyond the marker which he has placed at a certain point to give him some kind of perspective there. It is not really a time limit at all.

The more one goes into this, the more remarkable it becomes how the extremes of temporalisation, the very short and the very long, produce what on the surface seem to be very similar results.

Both produce men who are content if life gives them a place in which they can be reasonably comfortable, reasonably well fed and reasonably secure. But the short-futured man obeys his ruler because he is afraid of him. The very long-futured obeys because that ruler is, like himself, a part of the overall pattern of existence. He obeys the ruler somewhat as we obey the ten commandments which are a part of the basic pattern of our life.

In both cases the obedience is (what seems to us) abject and almost grovelling. In the case of the short-futured man, however, that is because disobeying may cost him too much, even his life. In the case of the very long-futured man disobeying is simply not to be thought of. Kismet!

In both cases insurrections will also only occur when life has become unbearable - or when the 'winds of change' start blowing and the ruler, either 'tyrant' or 'tsar', abdicates. Infringement of 'rights' is never a cause because, basically, there are no 'rights'. In the case of the short-futured, only the strong and the powerful have rights. In the case of the very long-futured, only the 'State' has rights - whatever that 'State' may happen to be - it would be unthinkable that an individual should have 'rights'!

On the basis of this insight, it is as improbable, if not impossible, that Communism, as such, will ever find a foothold in Africa as it is that our Democracy will do so.

Governments grow, let us repeat it once again, out of the nature of the people and they cannot be imposed from the outside for long. They are also not due to, or built up according to, the theories of a group of the more intelligent who know what is best for the country.

Although we see only their outer appearances, they in fact consist of a framework of individuals who will inevitably do their work and interpret their rules and regulations in accordance with their own natures, personalities and perspectives. And those natures, personalities and perspectives will be those of the people themselves.

If an African state were to go really Communist, that would have to mean that it would have to have a committee of devoted people in the seat of government and they would have to be men who would put the country before everything else. They would moreover have to be people who could not only, as Sir John Fletcher Cook said: "use the Greek dialectic method of thesis and antithesis", but the "Dialectic Materialism"- of Marxist theory as well. And even we find most of that a mystery!

We need not fear that Communism will become the system of ruling in Africa - but we must fear Mob-rule - which is not Communism in any sense of the word.

This does not mean either that Russian and Chinese influence and power, or even their replacing the old, criminal Imperialism by means of some 'dialectic' quibble, is impossible - or even unlikely - and it is that that we should fear.

Nevertheless it is wrong to see Communistic influence in Zanzibar and even behind the futile 'mutinies' on the mainland. At the worst it is Russian and Chinese influence.

That those who are at present in power are 'Peking trained' or have had their 'schooling' in Russia does not mean that they will try to install anything like real Communism where they rule.

The Russians may be incomprehensible to us, but they are definitely not fools. It is likely that, long before our own mumblers discovered that 'Westminster Democracy' would not fit on the shoulders of Africans, they realised that Communism would be as alien to their cast of mind. (To see some of the things they do, one starts to wonder if they think that the African has a mind at all!)

What both Russia and China are 'training' are not 'missionaries' (although they try to give them the rudiments) but 'saboteurs'. These trainees are 'revolutionaries' without a distinguishing label to whom any form of stable government is something that has to be overthrown.

They are the 'burrs' which the Russians and the Chinese insert under the saddles of any rider they can find because that will keep the Western Powers continually on tenterhooks and tire them out with endless shadowboxing with an opponent who is not there.

That a 'Peking trained' man is in power does not mean that he will even try to promote Communism. He is, first and foremost, a 'saboteur' who has overthrown a stable government. He is now in the saddle and he has to see to it that nobody puts any burrs under him. Having been trained in the trade and knowing all its tricks, he may even be better able to survive and to produce, unpleasant thought, a more 'stable' government (even though 'autocratic') than one that starts out with undigested, democratic principles which have lost touch with reality a long time ago.

It may be too that, when the time comes to establish or promote economic contacts, he will do so with those who have placed his feet on the road to success - but that again does not mean that his country will have become Communist, or even a 'Communistic Satellite'. If it does not get good value it will still be free to change its 'grocer'.

What it means is that, for the time being, the Russian or Chinese trick has been more successful than ours (probably because it was nearer to earth and reality). It means that 'trade' will go to the other side and there is nothing horrible or disgusting in that, except that the West will lose some money.

We also tried a 'trick' behind our pious words and gestures.

We knew that Lowell had already said that, "Democracy gives every man the right to be his own oppressor," which, in so many words and under the given circumstances, would mean that: "Democracy gives every man the right to choose his own oppressor, not only politically but economically as well."

As it then seemed, that should have been easy, for the 'generous' donator of total 'freedom' would obviously be the choice when it came to deciding who the economic exploiter would be.

Africa, however, has a habit of not being what is obvious to us.

It would now seem that the Russian idea of bypassing the one-man-one-vote routine and providing the 'oppressor' themselves, works better (naturally only after French and British soldiers are too far away to keep their 'democratically elected' candidate on his tottering throne).

## CHAPTER XVII

### *Mr. White Man Himself*

Having in this way sketched in most of the important parts of the background in which the White man of today exists, and having, we hope, provided some new and valid insights by which to judge, it is now time to take a look at the White man himself. '

A special 'temporealisation potential' is not typical of him. The overlarge part of his kind live for only a medium time-span into the future. Very many, too, have very short futures, some even shorter than that of the average Negro or Bantu. On the other side, there are many who have a fairly long-future span although rarely as long as that of the very long-futured peoples of whom we have been speaking.

This situation works to our advantage in two ways.

In the first place, our future span, not being too deep, has the quality of being more clear and more immediately real to us than that of the long-futured ones. It also is well within the limits up to where a reasonable intelligence can work out the important probabilities with a certain amount of confidence. What is beyond that point does not bother us anyhow and we can attack our aim in the middle distance (of a year or so) with almost the same directness of purpose as that with which the short-futured goes at his 'present' objects.

Conscience and metaphysical considerations (although they are forever in our mouths) do not trouble us too much and it is even possible for us (when thinking ahead too far would cause too many heart-searchings) to shorten our future image and 'forget' about what comes, as the poet has it: after . . . after ...

At the same time (but often only in certain aspects) we have the long-futured quality and are able to take advantage of it by, today, preparing the way for a future success when the time will be ripe.

In the second place, as a community, we have the advantage that we have a supply of human material for all kinds of purposes.

The relatively long-futured among us for instance cannot stand repetitive work. To them it is like a man who has to walk down a straight road across an endless, unmarked plain, finally being hypnotised into counting the telegraph poles he passes on the way. The meaningless, unimportant, enforced, mechanical actions of the moment are seen by them in relation to the passing of time until the futility of it all could make them scream. The short-futured man, however (like a knitting woman) can find pleasure in the ever-recurring pattern happening in his foreshortened 'present'. It has a restful effect on him because he does not see it in the framework of extended time.

And there is an adequate percentage of these short-futured ones among us to do the job.

We have also those who can plan and organise the work that has to be done so that it will be used in its most efficient form, and others who can organise the relationships of commerce and social life.

Beyond these we have an adequate number of long-futured thinkers, and idealists, philosophers and theologians to give us the feeling that, as a group, we are linked in a definite relationship to Eternity.

They make us conscious of the fact that what we do has some purpose, that we are living as in a ship that forges through the sea of time from a definite beginning to a valid and worthwhile purpose even if it is hidden beyond the far horizon. It gives us a sense of having a meaning and worthwhileness in ourselves which the very long-futured miss because they are merely a part of a pattern - and what their eyes can see of that does not make any real sense at all.

We *also* do not know the meaning of it all, but we can at least delude ourselves into believing that it lies valid and clear waiting for us *beyond* the horizon.

At least we are moving and moving must get us somewhere. If we get a chance we will even take a spell at the wheel.

It is difficult to realise that this existence-image is peculiar to us and not at all common to a large part of mankind who compare us to 'mad dogs and Englishmen'.

Naturally this has its dangers and drawbacks, for to many of us the questions of why and wherefore, when they do come, are very disturbing to our peace of mind.

There are still two other qualities that set us apart from all the others, the one an ability, the other an attitude.

The ability is essentially one which we obtained from our GrecoRoman stock - the ability to see things clearly as something that has a valid, individual existence outside of ourselves. We have the gift (not found in most of the others who do not have Greek ancestry) to see, in our imagination, how things are outside, not as a part of what we are aware of, but as things that are there by themselves.

From Nordic sources we have obtained the gift of seeing this 'existing' as happening in 'space' (which the Greeks did not have, as can be deduced from the lack of backgrounds in their art) and from Eastern sources we have the ability to see that existing as happening in 'time'. The result is that we can 'see' movement. We can see it, not as a series of cinematographic exposures in the way that the Chinese see it, for instance (and as the Greeks must have seen it too to judge by the way of thinking about 'time' which we find in Zeno's paradoxes on the 'tortoise' and the 'arrow'), but as a continuous change of place in space and time.

It is this latter gift that has enabled us to develop Calculus to the almost perfect mathematical instrument that it is - and the 'Analog' computer as opposed to the 'Digital' one which is no more than an overgrown electrical Greek Abacus.

These, our images, seem also to have a clarity and a manipulatability which is missing in other people. They enable us to make almost perfect replicas of the things we are thinking about; mental graphical representations and models on which we can try out the effect of different actions, forces and influences. We can combine them and 'see' what happens. We can take them apart and 'see' what they are made of and then mentally put them together again in other ways.

The result of this is that we can organise things down to the finest detail, arrange checks and counterchecks and controls. We can predetermine and direct a large part of the events that will occur within the next four or five years, that is, within the stretch of time within which imponderables and uncontrollable factors are unlikely to make too much difference in our results - and that is after all, all that we want. Beyond that we are usually not really interested.

What is still more important is that this gift has enabled us to design and build machines as the materialisation of the way in which we could 'see' forces doing what we wanted them to do. These machines do the repetitive work that we hate and the 'labour' that we think to be the work of 'animals'.

It is not generally realised how much this ability to design, build (and even maintain) these machines of ours is limited to us. A comparison between the number of first year students in engineering and the mechanical arts, in relation to the number of good engineers that grow out of them, and the number of not-White students in the subject and the number of good engineers that grow out of *them*, would provide a surprising result to those who preach 'racial equality' in all things. (And for this one would not even need to take into account that the not-White students enrolled were pre-selected from a much greater pool of human material.)

Judging by the distribution of successful engineering projects over the world, one would say that only our Japanese students made the grade (and then some!). Elsewhere, in countries no less rich in potentials, the engineering achievements are meagre and in those that are functioning relatively well one is sure to find the ubiquitous White engineer using his 'White' abilities to keep the whole thing going smoothly.

The Negro and the Bantu especially seem to do badly in this respect, and this is no wonder, as research by the N.I.P.R. has shown that they have the greatest difficulty in translating a flat picture or design into a three-dimensional mental image. In general their world-image anyhow seems to be more an auditory than a visual one, and it is likely that this disability in regard to our industrial world is as congenital as the tone deafness or the colour blindness of some people. This defect could therefore not be overcome by 'education', but only, possibly, by 'miscegenation'.

It is after all on our great herd of machines, on our 'industry', that our Civilisation depends for one of its main characteristics - on our machines and on our ability to organise and use what they produce for us. It is through them that we (and not 'Man' or 'Humanity') have reached a standard of living such as has not even been touched by any other Civilisation that the world has seen - a standard of living that has, in our case, percolated down into almost the lowest layers of our populations and spilled over in all directions into the life of those that are not of our blood.

***And it is this that they want from us, not our to them peculiar and often half-mad Civilisation itself.***

On the other hand again, this extraordinary clarity of vision has its disadvantages. It prevents us from seeing vague and abstract things like 'influences', 'trends', 'zones of influence' and 'probabilities of *human* behaviour'. In general it has prevented us from understanding anything about other people at all. For that reason, now that the simple and definite 'killing wars' are taboo, we are lost in a sea of intrigue where even a simple 'native', by knowing when to speak of the 'possibility of a world war', 'democracy', 'human rights', and when to thump a table or to walk out in a huff, can bamboozle us until the onlookers must be killing themselves with laughter.

And still we keep on inviting them one by one to come upon the stage, and strut their piece, and go home laden with an Emperor's ransom!

Lastly there is the 'mood' that distinguishes, or used to distinguish, us from the not-Whites: the special, personal aggressiveness and the almost brash egotism that we have. The attitude of "Here am I and who are you?". The almost completely self-centred existence of us, each in his own personal universe.

This too is typical of us and we must have it from the original human stock of our homelands for it was already there before our Civilisation started on its way.



It comes out in our love for personal battle and personal competition - up to the death or to final victory.

One wonders why it has never been remarked that this too is a special characteristic of ours which we have in common with no one other than the Japanese.

Most of this is gone out of us, at least on the surface - although it will sometimes still break out when the crowd at a boxing match starts yelling for blood.

Nevertheless the typical White man, even now, still does things on his own and rarely as one of a crowd. He still is the centre of his own Universe and he, even in his degeneration, is vociferously proud that *he* is any time as good as the next man. He will still tell off his government. He still knows what *he* wants. He still has his 'rights' and demands his personal say in everything. He still thinks that he is qualified to judge, even if he knows nothing about whatever it is.

The 'little man'. standing up and demanding his vote (and the vote for every man else) is, possibly in caricature, the old berserker who stood widelegged, beating his shield with his sword and yelling, "Come on you scum! I am Beowulf the Red! "

This then is Mr. White man. And how are you going to rule him - or rather, how is *he* going to rule himself?

How else than by the strangest of all governing methods - by Democracy?

## Chapter XVIII

### *This Democracy of Ours*

Up to not so long ago Democracy was, as Socrates once defined it: "An Aristocracy carried on with the approval of the multitude.

Lately the little man has become conscious of the fact that his vote is about the only 'right' that he still has. He has become vociferous about the political power which he exerts by placing his personal little cross in one of two or three squares. Which brings us up to G. B. Shaw who said: "Democracy reads well, but it doesn't act well," or, to quote another interesting observation, this time by Fisher Ames, who said that a monarchy is like a merchant ship that sails well but will sometimes strike a rock and go to the bottom. A republic is however like a raft. It will never sink but - one's feet are always in the water.

Obviously that was written before the spate of Dictatorships took over in Europe and showed us that the democratic raft happens to be an inflatable one which is full of wind and easily punctured. But the image is still basically correct.

It shows the contrast in the attitudes between 'riding high and going somewhere', taking one's chances with fate knowing that, if one makes a mistake or fails, there is an end to it - and the little man's wish for safety at any price, even if it means sitting with one's feet in the waters of futile, monotonous mediocrity, while drifting with the currents all the days of one's life.

Between the 'merchant ship' and the 'raft', Herbert Spencer, in 'The American', sees still another possibility (or impossibility): "The Republican form of government-, he says, "is the highest form of government but, because of this, it requires the highest type of human nature - a type nowhere at present existing." To which one cannot resist adding Keith Preston's dig: 'We have sometimes been tempted to define democracy as an institution in which the whole is equal to the scum of the parts.'

Maybe that is putting it too harshly but democracy is so full of internal contradictions, so full of undefined, high-sounding words and spurious definitions, so larded through with saying what one does not mean and meaning what one does not say, while besides that, it is so fantastically vulnerable to attack from the inside, to corruptions and veniality that it would be a miracle if it worked - and, the miracle is that it does!

It works for us because it is the exact expression of the White man as described in the last chapter. It is the expression of his variety and his gifts as well as of his failings, his brash, know-all egotism together with his insight into the need for a system of government that will give everybody a chance (even if that 'chance' is not as 'equal' as it is said to be).

It is a miracle, but it works, and it works because in it, by some magical insight, or instinct, a system of ruling has been created, slowly and painfully over the generations by trial and error and by the repeated slamming down of any aspect of 'living together' that showed signs of becoming a cancerous growth.

Very few of us are conscious of what a wonderfully delicate and unimaginably complex thing it really is. Many of us (and certainly the most vociferous part of us) seem to think that it is no more than a 'one-man-one-vote' system of electing those to whom we delegate the power of 'ruling'.

But nothing is further from the truth. The one-man-one-vote idea is but a very minor aspect of it and, as a matter of fact, one of its weakest points. The 'one-man-one-vote' idea is actually something to which democracy has to accommodate itself and for which it must make allowances. That it has not been

scrapped and replaced by some system of voting-power proportionate to personal qualifications is due solely to the fact that such an adjustment would offend and make our vociferous morons (of whom we have as many as any other race) intractable.

Democracy has the White man's organising ability as its principal constituent. Without that it simply would not work. It is our organisation according to hard and fast rules and regulations which are still elastic enough in conception and practical application to adjust themselves to the variety of forces inherent in it; an organisation that is strict but not too strict, and just but not too just, that makes it possible for us to survive even the evil that is in ourselves.

The Communist states also have such a system. It is even more marked there. But it lacks the vitality of ours. It is dead and is more than the human beings whose life it rules, simply because it is part of the pattern of the State. No man really dares to tamper with it.

Our organisation is alive. We are continually adjusting it to changing circumstances and conceptions, as is demonstrated by our laws with their long tails of appendixes, addendums, sub-sections, amendments, etc. etc.

It is true that, according to Parkinson's law, this produces an accelerating increase in the number of those who are busy filling in papers and forms, but it still works and, as long as it has not clogged and suffocated itself to death, democracy will work too.

We do not always realise it, but it is only, repeat 'only', possible for our democratic rulers to rule because of the perfection of our Civil Service (however much we may dislike and even despise it,) which serves as the central organisation of everything. How otherwise could a 'man of the people', selected to express the 'will of the people' ever hope to go about his 'ruling' them if he had no idea how it all really works, its infinite complexity and its need to adjust.

This Civil Service again can only function as it should where there are those with a sufficiently long future span to give them the necessary sense of duty to the organisation for which they work. And only we and the long-futured ones have these.

Strangely enough this selfsame, hidebound, blinkered group of pen-pushers in our midst is, in certain ways, a more important expression and implementer of the 'will of the people' than the whole electoral system itself.

We in South Africa have seen several instances of attempts by the 'men of the people' to rule in a way that went against the 'spirit of the people'. As a result there are also several imposing 'laws' gathering dust on the shelves of our law offices.

They had forgotten that one may pass a law but that it still has to be 'implemented'. It has to be 'administered' after it has been made 'official', and here what is happening to the laws we gave to short-futured people together with their democracy, also has its effect among us ... It is one of the adjusting 'feedbacks' of democracy itself.

Just as among the short-futured people it came automatically into action and made the laws 'obsolete' because they did not fit the people, so among us the final test of a law is not its passing in parliament but that the 'administration' shall find that it can implement it. (When, for instance, have we last heard of the £50 fine for parking or stopping a car on the macadam of a road as having been 'implemented'?)

In the Civil Service, the will of the people who are also the Civil Servants is expressed by their willingness to put their heart into implementing it, or by the way they kill it by procrastination and

'doing other, more important, things first', or 'having no time to do it' or asking for extra staff that is not available', etc.

We could spend a long time discovering the numberless greater and smaller, automatically acting, self-adjusting mechanisms which force the whole to be and to remain the expression of the nature of the people, but it is time to turn to one of the most important aspects of Democracy in relation to the 'temporealisation potential' of the state itself - the 'selection of the governors' and the 'cause of the Caucus'.

We can start by pointing out that, although we are not conscious of it, the electoral system of Democracy tends to select the more long-futured ones. The short-futured men in our community never make the first grade and that is not because the system is in any way loaded against them.

The long process of the electoral campaign, the speeches that are to be laboriously worked out, written and delivered, the insults that have to be shrugged off (for the sake of the future, where the shortfuture man would instinctively take off his coat and wade in), the endless sessions on 'policy', 'slogans' and the meticulous construction of a facade that will dazzle the voters - all of it, although most of it is ballyhoo, make believe and 'boerebedrog', still serves a useful purpose of which few, if any, of its participants are conscious.

The whole thing is motivated fairly far into the future. Most of what has to be done is aimed at objects some six months or more away and, despite the circus trappings and the fanfares, it is still imbued with a sense of dedication to the good of the community. Besides, there are no immediate advantages to be gained - rather the opposite! In our variation of Democracy the parties may pay, or help to pay, for the election expenses but there is no 'salary' or 'bonus' for the candidate as long as he is only a 'candidate'. There are only incidental expenses and most of these still come out of the candidate's own pocket.

One can realise that all that does not fit into the life of the shortfutured man. He may dream about 'being' a famous - or infamous - member of parliament who puts everything right in a day or two, but that is merely the equivalent of the dream of 'being king for a day'.

To throw himself heart and soul into an election campaign - or several successive election campaigns - during which he must convince others that he will be a suitable candidate, is simply not in him. He eliminates himself, and contents himself with limiting his political activities to the voting booth - if even that.

The short-futured person in parliament must therefore be an extremely rare bird, if only for this reason.

We should here remind ourselves that this 'sieve' does not work in short-futured states. Not as they are at present. To the erstwhile kitchen boy or minor clerk, the riding around in large American cars, the 'administration' of party funds, the handouts from the White man who has suddenly gone crazy, the yelling and the shouting and being the centre of everything are immediate recompense enough, even for the most short-futured of them all.

In our system, once the man is a candidate, he has still to pass a second sieve. Although much of the candidate's official publicity is aimed at the prides and prejudices of his electorate together with promises of immediate advantages that are usually given with the tongue in the cheek, the voter is not altogether an ignorant rustic.

When it comes to election time, (if he is long-futured enough to care about it) his future sense will come into play. He may even use his intellect, his tempocognition instead of his temporealisation, to make his decision on the basis of what he knows about the future instead of on what there is 'real' to him in it.

After all, making a cross is not doing work today for an advantage that will only materialise very much later.

It follows that the election slogans and promises, the actual programme of the party, must contain a certain amount of valid long-future planning. Not all people vote with their stomachs or even with their hearts. A significant number will vote with their heads and one can imagine that the candidate with a mainly short-futured programme will have less chance to be successful than the one who includes the future to a fairly extensive degree - as long as he also does not forget to sprinkle it liberally with the sugar of almost immediate advantages.

That this is not merely theory is demonstrated by England itself where, as Macaulay said: "Our democracy was, for our early period, the most aristocratic, and our aristocracy the most democratic."

There, up to not so very long ago, the Commons was occupied by 'Sirs', the semi-nobility and the rich. The electorate of the common man could, at any time, have filled it with men like themselves but, although they may have ranted about the rights of the common man, when it came to elections they knew - or thought they knew - that the helm of state was safer in the hands of the 'gentry'.

In the same way, in South Africa, at even our first election after 'Union', the Afrikaners could have thrown out all, or at least most, of the English and followed up by legislating them out of the country. And they would have done so had they been predominantly shortfutures - as is being done in the 'new' states of the Africa of today.

It was one of General Smuts's most difficult tasks to convince the English statesmen that that would not happen here and it turned out that he was right.

There were enough long-futures men here who realised that in the long run throwing out the English (in those days when the British Lion still had all its teeth and had not yet become a vegetarian) would have led to having to fight the Boer War all over again. And probably with less favourable results.

That is the effect of the two primary sieves on suitable human material in a Democracy.

But that is not yet the end for there is, within the group of those who have become 'Members of Parliament', a process that works towards placing the long-futured 'cream' in the more responsible positions amongst the others.

Here we come up against a difference in the meaning of words.

In South Africa the name "Caucus" indicates the whole membership of the party that sits in Parliament. In England and America it is a kind of central committee which decides questions of general policy etc. This is done in South Africa by a collection of specially appointed committees and sub-committees each intended for a special purpose.

Nevertheless, in both systems, the selecting process works (no matter if the 'Caucus' or the 'Committees' are elected, selected or appointed) to the same end.

The basic material is the 'Member of Parliament' who has passed the two sieves.

He need not be particularly intelligent. As a matter of fact, the intelligent man (who is likely to be successful at his chosen job in life) will not be prone to dabble in politics to find himself whisked away from his work for half the time of the year. He can't afford it.

Those who land up in Parliament therefore belong to one of three groups. They can be of those who could not manage outside to earn the equivalent of what they 'earn' by being 'Members' - or of those who are bitten by the bug of power and glory - or, again, of those who are genuinely devoted to the welfare of their country and their 'cause'. (The really long-futured therefore.)

For all of these, once in Parliament, the primary aim has been achieved, but if there was nothing more than the wish to become a member in the candidates, there will be a perceptible slacking off of the drive. Those who were unsuccessful outside now have their membership fees ensured for the next few years. The pure demagogues have their membership and the possibility of making as many speeches to the cheering multitudes as they like.

There is however not only the kudos that are to be gained - there is work to be done, and as Parliament settles down into its routine, another almost automatic process of selection comes into effect. One could call it "sedimentation".

What must happen is that those who have shown in practice that they are willing and able to devote themselves to doing the kind of work that has to be done (as always, the 'willing horses') will find their places in the solid underlayers of the party machine where that work is done and where the general policies are decided upon.

The rest will be willing, often more than willing, to leave it to them and to content themselves with being no more than living, but sometimes very sleepy, 'tally sticks' representing the 'strength of the party'.

One can now see how the system must have centrifuged out the able, the willing and the truly devoted - besides an occasional overambitious individual. In this way the most long-futured have arrived at the focal point of power in the state.

This was not consciously done. It was inherent in the system itself. The system of Democracy, without using force, without tricks and subterfuges, without coercion and 'loading' of certain factors, has produced for us a group of long-futured men ruling over the more or less short-futured rest.

It is amusing to realise that, being what we are, if it happened to be that the extent of one's future sense could be read on one's face or in the colour of one's hair (or skin) this would lead to an insurrection.

If, say, the extent of one's future sense was accompanied by a proportionate loss of hair, 'Democracy' would suddenly have degenerated, for us, into 'Alopecocracy'.

We would hear "What price Democracy?" and the battle cry would suddenly be "Down with the Baldies!!", "Who do they think they are?" Wig makers and the manufacturers of 'hair restorers' would suddenly experience a boom.

Happily for us the long-futured do not show this quality in their external appearance so that they can keep on ruling us without anybody realising it.

This then is the mechanism by which the miracle of Democracy survives.

Nevertheless it remains a miracle. Democracy is a very delicate structure, a living pattern that does a tightrope act, aided by a set of built-in, cybernetic feedbacks that keep it in balance. And this brings us to the most important, practical point of all.

Democracy depends for its survival almost completely on the pattern of the distribution of the temporealisation potential among its citizens. It has grown out of the mixture that we are and it can only survive (in its present form) in such a mixture. Too much of one or the other extreme will make it topple over into either Autocracy or Communism.

One could say that our 'magic mixture' consists of some 20% short and very short-futured ones, 50% with a medium short-future, 25% with a relatively longer-future and around 5% with a long-future (not so long as that of the very long-futured of whom we have only an occasional specimen).

If democracy is transplanted to a group of human beings with another composition, or if the composition of its own people changes appreciably, the structure of Democracy collapses.

One can here quote the obvious examples of the 'Democracies' of New Africa, but a more subtle one is to be found in what happened in Germany when we forced Democracy on it at the end of the First World War.

One can imagine that it may be due to a slow seepage of Russian long-futured genes into it from the East, but the people of Germany are certainly more long-futured than we are. This can be felt in their tendency to 'Weltschmerz' and a deep 'Weltanschauung'. (Those with a German dictionary will be amused to find that it has a whole page devoted to words starting with 'Welt' where the English language has but three of four words starting with 'world'!)

To the German too, (even if not as much as to the Russian) 'Government' and 'Authority' is part of the pattern of Life and Eternity. As such it is to be respected and obeyed without question. Being also a descendant of our egotistic forefathers, he is however more personal about it and admits that 'authority' factor into his personal life and his relationships with those about him.

The ordinary German does not concern himself very much with who or what kind of a system rules him. He has his place and his authority over those under him. That is enough.

The result of giving him a democracy was therefore that a group of power and authority seekers of small personal calibre saw their opportunity and managed to 'capture' the democracy by grabbing hold of it in its key points, its nerve centres' - after which it was helpless. The 'miracle' did no longer work.

Most instructive here is the collection of fortunes that the German 'leaders' managed to collect and hide in future treasure troves. These dictators were not fully devoted men like their Russian counterparts.

Here too it is well to remember Chesterton's wise quip in 'Tremendous Trifles' - "You can never have a revolution in order to establish a democracy". Democracy is, and has always been, a sitting duck for revolutions and revolutions must always end in Autocracies.

When power has been used to break up a system of government (with the remarkable exception of Kemal Attaturk!), the necessity for retaining that power to keep the 'new' system going remains an obsession with the new rulers. They cannot - they dare not let it go.

One of the most futile examples of wishful thinking is the thought which one so often hears expressed nowadays, namely that the 'stage of authoritarianism', which we see taking over everywhere in Africa, is a 'passing' one.

All governing systems, (even when they are the best of democracies) when under stress, become 'authoritarian'. This, in itself, follows from the well-known fact that the committee that functions the best is the 'committee of one.'

An African government, governing as it does over a horde of short-futured ones, will always be a government under stress. It will always have to be ruled by a 'committee of one'.



## CHAPTER XIX

### *The Machine as 'Slave'*

In the first part of this book we gave an exposition of the pattern of forces that are probably active in the initiation, the development and the decay of Civilisations.

All Civilisations seem to start off with the appearance of a special new quality among a group of people - often, if not always, due to an amalgamation of two different but miscible stocks.

When this new quality provides an advantage over others, those who have it immediately begin to exploit it. They develop a new weapon and/or a new way of fighting to which the environment has no (or only a futile) defence.

This provides the new men with slaves who do the work and gives them the chance to enjoy leisure and develop their gifts for peaceful purposes. From there on we see the application of the new gifts or ability (and the resultant new attitude) in thousands of different ways to 'human living'. Next comes the 'moratorium' and the appearance of laws and a police force which puts an end to overt 'survival of the fittest' competition. This again leads to a slow, or a more rapid, degeneration of the 'masters' who no longer need to be fit (and willing) to kill in order to maintain their position.

In different ways they are then submerged in the 'crowd' until either there is no more than an amorphous mass of 'fellahin' (which is the end product of the little man's attitude to life) or there is a taking over by another, usually 'alien', group of those who are on their way up.

This pattern seems to be so inevitable in the manner in which it has been played out time after time that it can almost be called a 'law'.

In a way it is the political equivalent of the 'law' which we meet in everyday life and which says that if we do not go forward we go back. It is impossible to stand still and survive. The overall pattern of human existence seems to be a 'treadmill' or, in its more vicious form, a 'rat race'.

One would say that there could be only one possible reason why this pattern, this 'law' which was valid for others, should not apply to us. Our Civilisation has produced a new factor, something which the world has never seen before, and for the action of which we therefore have no precedent by which it is possible to judge what it can do. This is the 'Machine'.

In it we have created a slave which does our work and gives us leisure without demanding the exertion of discipline or the sword. In it we have the ideal slave who will give us service without constraint, without the need of the readiness to punish, and if need be, to kill. It needs no discipline. It is without a pride that can be hurt. It is without the potentials for plotting and insubordination and the basic ambition to get rid of us or usurp our place in the scheme of things.

Is it therefore perhaps possible that this new slave can break for us the blighted, ever-recurring circle of Conquest, Mastership, Degeneration and Disappearance from the stage of History? Does it possibly contain the elements on which a 'Permanent Civilisation' can be built?

This question is probably one of the most interesting ones which we have put up for ourselves to examine, although, we fear, its answer is also not very encouraging. The machine does our work for us and even now we are only half-way to enjoying its full potentials.

From it we have received, even down to the most common, unskilled labourer, a measure of Liberty beyond the wildest dreams of our ancestors. This is especially so because it has even relieved us of the necessity to remain 'Masters at Arms'. Notwithstanding this, the strange logic which we have found everywhere in life causes the same old rule of retribution to emerge for us in another form.

To our dismay we find that, like the Human Slave, the Machine changes into a Master the moment we become dependent upon it.

The master is always the one upon whom the others depend. In our life he is the one who directs the lives and faces the problems of existence for others. In serving him, they 'pay' for their safety and the absence of the need to think for themselves. This was overtly expressed in the old feudal system where the vassal ceded his problems and troubles in regard to the outer world to his Lord in return for his Vassalage, and his obedience.

As with the family, the 'Master-Slave' combination is a group, a unit which combined, faces the rest of the world to the advantage and safety of both.

'Freedom from a master' means the right to make one's own decisions. It also means the duty to stand or fall by what one does - alone.

In the 'Man-Machine' combination the men are and must be the Masters. Each man again becomes responsible for himself and is liable to be punished for his failures as well as rewarded for his successes. The first disadvantage in this new relationship is therefore that there is again no safety for the weaker brother other than that of depending on the charity of the strong.

The 'Master of the Machine', however, also still runs the same risks as the 'Master of the Slave' in the bad old days, for he can only remain free as long as he is the Master - and the Machine is a much more exacting servant than the human slave ever used to be.

The Human slave, to function well, needed no more than a certain amount of supervision, discipline and food (which it could be left to himself to produce, to prepare and to eat). His body, although it was subject to disease, like all living things, also had a built-in self-repairing mechanism. Besides that it tended to reproduce and to replace itself by new slaves.

Each slave could be used for a hundred tasks, some easy, some extremely complicated; and could be, within certain limits, trusted to take decisions.

There was also this, that little skill or knowledge were needed to be an efficient and effective master of slaves. When, finally, the state backed up the power of the slave-owner, there was not even the necessity to be strong or able, personally, to fight. It was enough to have sufficient money to buy the slave - to be a Master.

It is quite different with the Machine, which is infinitely more difficult to rule. Its resemblance to the human slave is only superficial.

It can only do one thing. If broken or out of order, it can only be repaired by a human expert as it, by itself, is entirely unable to do so. The self-repairing machines of Science Fiction belong to the second half of that name, as any consideration of the complexity of such a machine and the realisation that those repairing machines would again need installations to repair them, will show to even a not mechanically minded person.

The Machine needs constant attention and a constant round of tunings up, repairs and finally the replacement of worn-out parts. It cannot be overstrained without the danger of a total breakdown which will not be repaired by a good night's rest and, replacing it means the production of an entirely new individual. It does not reproduce itself.

It needs exactly the right type of fuel and lubricants, power and voltages at exactly the right times and places. Failure to supply them results in immediate stoppage of the work when it is the least convenient.

All this means that the Master must have a full knowledge and training to be able to handle his slave. It needs a split-second conscientiousness in him, where in the bad old days he could leave decisions until tomorrow or the day after. Failure to attend to essentials may irreparably kill the machine-as-slave.

It is true that it is possible to delegate the duty of obtaining the knowledge and the responsibility for maintaining the Machines in good condition to others, but then the real mastership of the situation slips out of the hands of the slave-owners into those of the Mechanics and the Engineers, while the supposed 'Owner' together with his leisure and his freedom becomes a slave to the latter. In the England and America of today much of this is already visible on the surface.

The Master ends up by being entirely dependent upon the Machine to such an extent that when it breaks down, he is unable to look after himself and has to call in the help of professional slave-masters.

To what frightening extent this is inherent in the situation of our mechanised civilisations becomes apparent when one considers the probable result, in time of war, if a selection of bombs were placed and exploded with adequate discrimination in a few power-stations and a few hundred petrol dumps. Such a deed, if successful, could paralyse a whole nation and cause the death of millions without a shot being fired.

Western man, without realising it, has already to an alarming extent become the slave of his machines. One has but to remember the effect of a few hours of power-failure in a large city to realise that.

As with the Master of Slaves, the Master of the Machine can only remain Master if he can do without it if necessary. In any relationship, the one who is dependent upon the other is the servant.

There is nothing derogatory in being the 'slave of a machine' but it is as well to keep this aspect of the situation in mind, especially where the machines have their real masters in the Mechanics who repair and the Engineers who design and make them.

The citizen of the machine age is therefore not only the slave of the machine, but also in the absolute power of the engineering profession. As long as these 'masters' are not conscious of their power and not organised to use it, this fact remains unnoticed in the ordinary run of modern life. Strikes may give one an inkling of it, but the real truth remains obscured.

In times of stress, however, or in the case of a degenerating of the moral fibre of the whole, such a factor may well become overwhelmingly important. Rare are the occasions where a man, or a group of men, have had absolute power without using it to their own advantage. We are generally not like that.

Let the reader ask himself if he would forego a chance to enrich himself at the cost of the community if that could be done within the law, and if he believes of himself, that he could, does he think that his neighbour would not do it also?

However, such a situation has not (yet) been reached and maybe it never will happen for there are other factors at work, factors of much more immediate importance.

The basic law that leisure acts as a degenerating factor on masters is effective also on the masters of the machine. To be, and to remain, master of the machine needs a devoted concentration to which the availability of an 'easy life for little effort' is not conducive.

Where easy money, high standards of living and a plentitude of free time are produced by these machines for the community as a whole, where it therefore is possible to enjoy life to the full in the semi-skilled jobs, in the administrative trades, and in the lesser professions, it will become less and less probable that the required number of devoted, conscientious and unselfish workers will always remain available.

We see how, in order to produce this leisure and to replace the human workers by 'robotising' the factories, machines are becoming more complicated so that ever more skill, learning and training are necessary to run them. It has become a life's work to master even one branch of the science. Soon, single-minded zealotry will be needed to understand and to be able to be responsible for a department.

It must be obvious that, seen like this, the Engineer's trade will become a calling and start to partake of the qualities of a priesthood.

The study of higher mathematics, robotics, cybernetics, electronics, nuclear physics and higher mechanics will need a self-discipline of remarkable proportions, a self-abnegation which will be nearly superhuman if done from no other motivation than from a sense of duty to mankind or a pure interest in the subject itself.

Where a similar, or even better standard of living can be achieved without trouble, such a devotion will surely be the exception rather than the rule.

It becomes a very moot point if our race will keep on producing a sufficient quantity of such men, such High Priests to the God of the Machine, to maintain the Mechanical Age in a running condition.

One is sorry to have to doubt it. The symptoms are about us everywhere. Our mechanics have, for a large part, already arrived at the stage where they can only replace part Fc/M 5-607 by part Fc/M 5-607 - if they are provided with an 'exploded' diagram to show them where three nuts and bolts have to come.

We are building up huge air-transport systems, ever bigger and more luxurious jets and skygiants, but the human factor on which all of it depends for efficiency and safety is lagging behind. As the complexity increases, the interdependence of the whole on the parts becomes more profound and a single inattention, a single piece of slovenly workmanship, may mean the death of a hundred or more people and the loss of millions of pounds worth of glorious machinery. It will crash uncomplainingly into ruin just because a 'master' somewhere has omitted to attend to a minor part of the ritual it demands from him. And it will not even do this in 'anger' or 'frustration'.

It is a chastening thought that those hundred or so victims will also really have nothing to complain about because they, too, in their own spheres will have been guilty of similar 'oversights', similar shruggings of the shoulders and 'we'll see about it tomorrow' kinds of attitudes.

Is it not already to be found everywhere in our world? Would anyone care to risk his life on the conscientiousness of the average worker in his environment?

We know that the utmost care is being taken in the selection of personnel for the air services but they are already complaining about the paucity of suitable human material. The rot which puts bolts in the garage

workshops and which has lowered the standard of the medical and nursing professions (where working hours and pay are now as important as in the offices and factories of the community) - will inevitably rise till it encroaches on the higher engineering projects, on airlines and atomic reactors.

Enthusiastic and devoted disciples enough will be found for the purpose of materialising trips to the moon and beyond but to do the highly skilled but unsung work of keeping the wheels and electrical relays of industry going in unfaltering efficiency is quite another matter.

It can therefore hardly be doubted that the effect of a civilisation which is nearing the end of its possibilities in matters of its special human developments, will be as potent here as it was among all the other civilisations which came and went before us.

We must realise that this 'Industry' and this 'Civilisation' which, to us, have a personal existence, are not 'Somethings' at all, huge as they are.

We are always forgetting that they are no more than the summation of the qualities of a hundred million individuals. If the quality, the ability, and especially the conscientiousness of those individuals deteriorates below a certain point, both that 'Industry' and that 'Civilisation' will disappear as if they had never been, leaving only monuments of useless stone and iron, and machines that will have become mysteries to all.

There will be major breakdowns for which there will not be the men who will be able to repair them; and, just as in the great halls of the temples of antiquity the nomad descendants of the erstwhile builders camp around their meagre cooking fires. and just as the caravans use the palaces of once glorious kings as storehouses and stalls for their animals, so it may come about (no, it will come about) that man will use the cabins of triple-million-dollar skyliners as rooming houses. Perhaps some young one will one day wander around, wondering vaguely what all the gleaming tubes and wires he sees around him really are for. Limousines with the heavy, useless motors taken out, will serve as animal-drawn carriages for the 'rich' till the tyres give out.

Industry can only exist if there is the human material, the brains, the devotion and the understanding necessary in those who rule and run it. If any of these factors is missing, the whole will collapse and the Machine will have shown that, as a slave, it has been as dangerous as its human counterpart in days gone by.

The machine, more than the slave, demands complete mastership by its lord. It cannot be punished or cajoled, frightened or argued into resuming its work. No brute can put the fear of death into it, and, much more than with the human slave, the master of the machine must remain able to do the work better than the machine, if need arises.

Above all, he must be able to do without the machine and be able to remain alive.

## CHAPTER XX

### *The White Man now*

What has been discussed in the previous chapter leaves our Civilisation subject to the full implementation of the basic pattern of history.

It is very unlikely that there will be any excuses or special dispensation for the White man, and we will have to walk the logical path of cause and effect.

If we, the White men as a group, cannot learn from history in the practical sense of 'having had a lesson', we, that is, those of us who try to understand, can at least learn enough from her to build up a tolerably accurate idea of the meaning of what we see, and will see, happening about us.

It is not expected that this insight will or can make any difference to the outcome at all. Hegel in one of his less abstruse moments put it all in a nutshell when he wrote:

"Rulers, Statesmen, nations are wont to be emphatically commended to the teaching which experience offers in history. But what experience and history teach is this - that peoples and governments never have learned anything, or acted on principles deduced from it."

There is no reason to think that man has changed since Hegel's day and that therefore this dictum is not now as true of him as it was then.

The continual repetition of the same mistakes, the endless series of needless misery and despair, the fratricides and genocides continually recurring even in our 'enlightened' age, demonstrate that it is only too horribly true that "all men are brothers."

This may sound a paradox, or unnecessarily cynical but it is true that ever since Cain killed Abel, we only rarely find brothers who love each other and who manage to live together in peace and harmony.

And this is not even mysterious.

One can shrug one's shoulders at an irritating stranger but one's brother gets under one's skin and - have civil wars not always been more vicious, more disgusting and cruel than those between countries? And is it also not easier to forgive an enemy than a brother?

The nearer one is to the other, the better (?) one understands him and the more he is like one, the more his personal differences become an irritant that can finally no longer be borne.

Or isn't it true again that, for instance, the dislike of the Afrikaner for the Hollander in this country is (or at least was) much more marked than his dislike for the English 'Rooinek'? - If only because the latter swore in his own language whereas the Hollander swore in what was virtually Afrikaans.

When the Englishman said: "God damn it!" it was nothing, but when the Hollander said "God verdomme!" the Afrikaner's hackles rose. The Kaaskop was committing blasphemy!

The thought is worth taking and turning over in one's mind for in it lies the key to an insight into much that troubles humanity.

It is as yet only a small example of a situation that is to be found all over the world. We will meet it again later.

As said, understanding of what is going on will not make much difference to the outcome. Understanding can only make us forgive and be *tolerant*. And that only up to the point where tolerance becomes dangerous. Then we too will have to take off our coats and enter the fray.

What is obvious, however, is that if we are to be 'saved' something must happen that every idealist has already underlined until it has become a platitude. "Mankind must have a change of heart".

A more inane idea can hardly be thought of! Who is this 'Mankind'?

Millions of human entities, grown up in millions of different environmental circumstances, starting off, each with his own combination of qualities and aptitudes, nurtured by millions of different combinations of conceptions, truths, lies, ideals and cynicisms - that is what 'Mankind' is.

How then can any intelligent person think that the whole of mankind could possibly ever have a 'change of heart'? That would have to come in from the outside and what or who could possibly affect each individual one of us - and all in the same way?

A multitude of individuals whose personality and concept on the nature of life and living have already been formed *cannot* have a change of heart. The multitude of individuals who will spring from their loins and who will grow up in a world that is the expression of what its immediate human environment is like, will not be able to have a 'change of heart' or to grow up very much different from what their parents were like - and neither will the next generation, or the next.

And, in the coming and going of the succeeding generations, should a change of heart, even then, *as long as there remains only one group of us, anywhere in the world, that does not have it*, we will still have to be on our guard. We will still have to mistrust anything they do and say because - if we don't we will most certainly be overrun. It is true that we may all go to heaven for that sacrifice in the name of 'Humanity', but we will disappear off the face of the world and our change of heart will have benefited only ourselves. Those left behind will be the same 'mixture as before'

The apparent change of heart which nowadays seems to have overtaken us is so spurious that it would only impress a fool or a child or one who is blinded by wishful thinking.

All this 'modern' abhorrence of 'war', and 'fratricide' and 'injustice', and 'racism'; all this deification of Democracy is not a change of heart, but fear, clothed in stainless, sterile, ethical ideals. If that were not so, Hungary, Ceylon, Burma, and Rwanda, to name but a few, would be the 'whipping boys' of the world, and not South Africa which at least *tries* to find a workable solution within the limits set by human nature.

Before reading on, it might here be a good idea for the reader to get hold of Brian Crozier's book "The Morning After", (Methuen, 1963).

Reading this book is a chastening experience. All that has been said up to now, is confirmed in it. And that despite the fact that it has been written by a confirmed idealist whose refrain is everywhere: "True, it has all gone to pieces. Everything is collapsing and grinding to a halt but that does not mean that it will remain like

that. We must have patience. Give them a chance to get themselves organised and sorted out. It is only a temporary set-back."

Nevertheless, in his imposingly wide and meticulously worked out canvas one clear pattern is repeated with monotonous regularity despite his underlining all the hopeful points.

The White policeman is gone and, despite the ugly implications of the word, racism is not only rife but running wild wherever we look.

Mankind is almost automatically sorting itself out into its basic racial patterns. Every little ethnological group is battling for its place in the sun, not as individuals but as groups of human beings who treasure their own way of life, who find satisfaction in their being different from others - *and glory in being 'themselves'*.

And what is worse is that they do not just want to survive.

They want to be masters in the artificially delimited geographical areas that the original masters (whose place they hope to take) left behind them after they had cut up the map of the world into 'geographical' and not 'ethnographical' entities.

Self-determination is only considered legitimate within limits that have no more than an historical meaning. The 'self' that can be allowed to 'determine' its future exists nowhere other than in the mind of Politicians, history books and in outdated atlases.

All, or almost all, of the new states consist of heterogeneous collections of different people with different backgrounds, different values, different languages, different physical appearances, different minds and souls. We used to think that we, here in South Africa, had a difficult problem on our hands, but there is hardly one of these new ones that is not more complicated - and more imperilled, because they all lack anything like a collection of cool heads dedicated to trying to find even a reasonable solution.

We think that racism is a dirty word, and it is that for us because it implies that other human beings could possibly be 'inferior' to us.

But racism is not a dirty word to the others (except when they orate in the United Nations). It is to them a major characteristic of the pattern of life itself, and only the amorphous, 'detribalised' city man (be he White or Black) cannot see why this is so.

Basically it naturally rests in the herd structure which is common to all mankind and by which they found safety and survival. But it is more than that.

'Living together' as human beings entails a very complicated network of relationships of which we are usually not even conscious.

Yet it is not only with words that we communicate with each other.

The tone of our voice, the structure of our sentences, the idiomatic implications of what we say, the facial expressions (especially the smile and the half-frown), the gestures (or their absence when they should have been there), the preferred distance between speaker and listener, the special meaning of words taken in different contexts and in the different circumstances, in which they are spoken, and in many ways more, such as the possibility of a certain amount of telepathy between speakers that are attuned to each other - all these are the real background of our social life. There are also those things of which it is understood that they are 'not done'.



The words (the words that can be written down) are merely the highlights on the living shape of 'communication'. This can be realised if one imagines a group of people communicating only by the written word. However instantaneous both the 'writing' and the 'reading' would be - communicating would still be a dead thing compared to the "So what?" of the American for instance, or the smile that passes between two older people when they listen to the enthusing of a teenager on his favourite Rock and Roll 'artist'. It is not a mere witticism to say that many people would be struck dumb if their hands were tied behind their backs.

One cannot possibly exaggerate the importance of all this in our lives, and although we may not realise it, in it lies the essence of the 'password', the 'sign', that gives admission to the 'Secret society' of our own personal group. Those that say Sibboleth, are not of our kind and although we do not take them and 'slay them at the passages of the Jordan', we nevertheless do close the door in their faces.

With those who are fully like us in these respects we feel safe. With those who are of our kind, communication is simple - almost instinctive and automatic.

With those who are not of us we have to be on our guard. We cannot, for instance, know if the smile hides a sneer - or if it actually is a sneer that we see as a smile. We do not know simply and directly what it is meant to convey or what it should convey.

To live with those who are not of our kind is therefore tiring and finally irritating. It needs energy, and continuous, unremitting focussing of the awareness (even when we are not directly conscious of it). And that energy and attention should not be needed. It should be done by the subconscious like the balancing of our bodies when we walk.

In the social life of the cities which largely takes place at the superficial level of the word meanings, this does not matter - but such life is not very 'human'. It is a surface life and has no depth - or rather, its depths are artificial and often contrived. They are part of a caste system and a valuation of the person, not according to who he is, but according to his social, his financial or his political position in the different, relative situations of life.

It is communicating with the head and not with the heart - still less with the whole self.

And here again we meet the swearing Englishman and the blaspheming Hollander. It should now be obvious that where backgrounds are so much alike that one momentarily forgets that the other is not of the 'chosen', differences suddenly become offensive because they are instinctively given the 'own' interpretation. The Afrikaner heard the Hollander's "God verdomme!" as what it would have meant had one of his own people said it. But it was nothing of the kind. It was actually as alien to his world as the Englishman's "God damn it!"

It is significant that this antagonism between the Afrikaner and the Hollander is dying down as the former becomes an inhabitant of the cities of our land.

There we are all reduced to a mere cosmopolitan common denominator and the Afrikaner, besides losing his overwhelming disgust at the 'blasphemy' which is now a permanent and almost accepted part of his environment, has learnt to live (in public at least) at a more superficial level.

As 'racism' is therefore not only the primitive wish to 'keep the stock pure' but also (and possibly even more so) the more immediate need to live in fully familiar, directly understandable surroundings, one wonders how the idealist can think it possible that the problem can be solved by blindly insisting that all those who live within a set of artificially laid down boundary lines should amalgamate and become one 'nation' and one 'people' living together in amity - loyal to one government.

Only the fully 'detribalised' city man could think of such a possibility as not being absurd. Only a man who is himself completely out of touch with the reality of living at any level other than the head (and possibly that of "performing the acts of 'love'") could have generated such an idea which falls an infinity short of what he calls it: an "ideal".

Men, like other herd animals, can only fully live together in a homogeneous herd. When those herds mix, trouble (and often murder) cannot be avoided. And it is bootless to say that it shouldn't be so - for shame!

After hundreds of years of living together and mixing, the English, the Welsh and the Scotch are still separate tribes who do not think much of each other even though they, being civilised, have learnt to keep it under their hat - officially. It is significant however that the Irish 'segregated' themselves at the first chance they had, into their own 'Eristan' and that their 'migrant labour' is an acknowledged part of British economy.

It is all rather sad but there it is. That is how we are, although it is by no means how we should be. It is also not only a characteristic of our relation to not-Whites. It is common to all humanity although like the 'law of the survival of the fittest' and the 'personal responsibility for what we do', we would like to ban it out of our life.

This then is the picture of the world, now that the self-appointed White policemen have gone home, tired, or simply fed up with their job.

"Après nous le déluge," they say - and the deluge is coming in, close upon their heels!

This 'following up' is not, and will not come, in the form of military action.

There can hardly be a possibility that artificially constructed countries, whose externally engendered economic structure is freewheeling to a halt under the maladministration of rival political leaders and factions, will ever in the foreseeable future be able to start or to maintain a 'war' against the Whites - always with the exception of that paragon among the not-Whites: the Japanese.

Their weapon is not War but the much more subtle, effective and cheap Intrigue, coupled with the supreme weapon of the weak: Ghandi's 'passive resistance' which forces the conscience of the oppressors to make them give way - and to give and give and give again.

One takes what one wants and, when somebody dares to object, there is the inspired answer: "So! You don't like what I'm doing, hey? All right. Here I am. Hit me! Go on! Bomb my innocent women and children and make your name stink in the nostrils of the world!"

In such things it is always the attacker who is at fault. The one who has provoked the attack is the poor innocent sufferer.

In this 'new' ideal world of ours a man may spit in your face, but if you knock him down for it you are the uncivilised brute.

It is as simple as all that. We have even learnt to use the principle ourselves in our sit-down strikes!

Divide and get a present - get two presents - three, four, five, six presents. And as long as the White man does not see that he is being played with, it will keep on working every time. And he steadfastly refuses to see.

Here the not-Whites have discovered a strange characteristic in us that makes us as vulnerable as children.

They have discovered that we really believe that words mean something! For us they have an existence and a validity of their own.

We have forgotten, or we have never known, that they are simply a means to arouse emotions or to create images in the other fellow's mind.

On the one hand it is true that, to a large extent, we have come to reach the heights that we have by means of that peculiar quality of the Word-image that we have. On the other it would now seem that, with a curious kind of consistency, it will be through that same quality of our word-images that we will be tripped up and gulled into incoherence.

We Whites think by means of 'named abstractions', 'abstractions that are named, or identified, by words'. When we have a problem to solve, we abstract the cogent, relevant factors out of it, and neglect the rest as secondary. We manipulate these abstractions in our minds and, when we have the theoretical solution, we translate it back into the reality of actions and things.

The not-White (and, for a large part, also our own women) 'think' by imagining all the possible solutions and choosing the right one by instinct or, possibly, on the basis of experience, remembered or even congenitally acquired. Here the female intuition and the (to us) completely incomprehensible solution that a Black will arrive at when faced with a problem for which, neither by personal or racial experience, he has any clues, have their places.

And the trouble is that especially where it concerns the more primitive problems of life, they are often more right than we are!

Our system works wonders when it is used on *things*, on mechanical situations, on animals and even on humans where, in the context of the problem their individuality does not have any importance. When the 'stone' or the 'tree' or the 'voter' is a unit, or is defined and definable by certain qualities which are implicit in the problem, it is as dependable as Algebra - but only then.

It follows that in that domain we are streets ahead of those who have to find their answers by instinct and/or previous experience. But the method has outgrown itself in us.

It has led to the idea that because we say "Justice", there must be such a thing as Justice, and not merely the certain quality in the affairs of men that we have decided to call "just". When we speak of "Liberty" we think that there is such a thing as Liberty and we do not even bother to look or to ask ourselves what we mean by it. It is there for all to see. And the same applies to most of our other slogans like Human Rights and Democracy etc.

It is even true of ordinary words, like "Love" for instance. When a man feels ten times as much for a woman as we do - but drops her after a week or two, we feel justified in shaking our heads and saying "But that is not 'Love'!" on the other hand when we are true to one for ten whole years and drop her then, "But that is not 'Love'", does not seem to be applicable. We do not even realise that that means that we have integrated our personal time-sense into what we think is "Love". The man with a much longer time span again, might use the "But that is not Love" remark on us. Each of us has therefore a different definition of "Love" and yet we still feel that there is such a thing as "Love" which is not the same as "Loving".

This characteristic comes out in the whole of our language which consists for an overlarge part of 'nouns' made out of Adjectives, Adverbs and even Verbs themselves. A 'Noun' is essentially the name of something that exists. By making Nouns out of the others we have given them a vicarious existence of their own.

They do *not* exist however and, when one thinks that they do, one becomes bound by them and loses touch with a living reality. And the not-Whites have discovered this in us.

They have discovered that we really and honestly believe that 'Justice' and 'Human Rights' and 'Democracy' exist; that they are not just words and ideas to us. And by that discovery they hold us by a string through a ring in our noses.

One has but to listen to, or to read, any of their speeches in the United Nations, or in any of the liberated - or to be liberated countries of the world. The enthusiasm, the elan, with which the game of 'White-man-baiting' is being played there knows no bounds. And the funny thing is that we do not even notice it.

'Human Rights', 'One-man-one-vote', 'Liberty', 'Democratic Principles' roll from their tongues at all occasions so that we can no longer keep up and are not even trying anymore. Yet these words have no meaning for them.

What is worse is that they know that these words *have* no real meaning. In their own countries they do not exist except as rhetorical expressions for the politicians.

Let us take the simple word 'Country' for instance.

What is a Country?

A group of people who live in a certain defined area and have a central government? That is all very well for a country that has been established for a long time -but does it have any meaning whatsoever for, say, Burma - or Kenya?

All people 'live in a certain area', but whence the definition which defines the size and shape of the *country*? The number of people who are 'in' and those who are 'out'?

And again, where it is a question of installing a government and not merely indicating a government that is already there, how can a government rule a mixture of people of different casts of mind, different natures, languages and moral fibre and still be the vaunted "Government of the people, by the people and for the people"? Who are now the people?

Can one *make* a country by writing a few lines of ink on a piece of paper to indicate that thus and so it shall be?

The artificiality of such a thing is obvious to everyone except the White man who honestly believes that there *are Countries* and that they are somehow *more* than groups of people who are satisfied to live under and to be ruled by one government, for, if that were not so when they are no longer satisfied, the 'Country', as such, would no longer exist.

To us it *is* a 'Country'. It has the name of 'country' in the first place. And it also has its own personal name. It is Burma, or 'Vietnam' or 'Kenya' or 'Congo'.

We cannot see that our mental processes are wrong. That they do not agree with reality.

But the astute politician sees in it *his* way to make capital out of our delusions. He hammers on the key-words that he knows will get us into a lather of excitement until he obtains what he wants in the name of 'Humanity' and 'Justice' Amen! That the effect is inhuman and unjust in regard to the people themselves does not matter. Neither to him nor to us. It is all too difficult to unravel and, anyhow, it does not really concern us anymore.

We forget that before we came, hardly any of the 'countries' that are now being 'liberated' *existed as Countries*. They were simply the pieces of Africa and Asia that we took for ourselves and to which we gave 'local' names to identify them. There never was a 'Kenya' or a 'Ghana' or a 'Tanganyika' or a 'Burma'.

Now, suddenly, because we have given them names, they are countries and, as such they must have a people and a government. It stands to reason doesn't it?

But all this does not really matter as far as we are concerned. Or not concerned. What happens to the 'others' does not threaten us. We are safe.

We are no longer responsible. Murder and rape, famine and disease - we close our minds to them. Even if a few of our own (who have been foolish enough not to get out in time) are crushed in the rout, that is just too bad.

We look the other way and raise a cry to high heaven about the Williams Family who are not allowed to land in England because 'they have no work permit'.

In a way we would like to put the whole problem on the shoulders of the S.P.C.A. and forget about it. As this would be a slap in the faces of our Black brothers we organise charitable societies and send over relief parcels and food and grants-in-aid and make magnificent donations. We even build dams and electrification and housing schemes. Yet all of that is no more than a cheap way to get rid of our responsibility, a sop to our consciences about what we have done to their ordinary people. It costs us nothing personally except for a few pennies out of each man's pocket.

What is disturbing is that where the people in those faraway places were tolerably happy and prosperous under our rule, and while at the same time we *must* have been able to take money or value out of their countries; now, despite the fact that they are free and despite the millions of pounds and dollars that go back to them out of *our* pockets, they do not surge forward in a wave of prosperity.

The answer to that conundrum is one that we prefer not to think about.

And their own politicians? The men who have engineered their freedom? They too do not care very much, as long as the mixture of races does not blow up in their faces. As long as they manage to stay on top, it is all right.

If such a man is the 'leader' of the strongest faction he simply, and completely suppresses the others - as happened in Ceylon. Otherwise he has to have at least a try at appeasement and may even ask for an occasional 'Return of the Policeman'.

Another way in which we are, and have been, fooled is that we think that Leaders must be those who express the will or the wishes of those whom they claim to lead. It follows therefore that where the leaders of Africa demand freedom, it is Africa that demands freedom. We have a wave of 'rising national feeling' on our hands and 'the people of Africa are on the move'.

Because a Leader is, for us, a man who 'speaks for his people', we do not feel the need to ask how these men became leaders. That they may be men who speak only for themselves is out of the question. The adulating, acclaiming crowds are 'proof' of that.

Again, when a man casts his 'Vote' especially in secret we take it as obvious that he must vote for the man he thinks the best. That his vote may be for the man whom he thinks best able to rule and, because as far as

he is concerned the best ruler is the most ruthless one, that he will 'vote' for such a man, seems completely impossible.

To us it is unthinkable that, even in a secret poll, a man may vote for the man he fears the most, that he will voluntarily attend and cheer enthusiastically at his rallies and that he may even wish such a man to be his ruler. We know what Voting and Political representation, Government and Opposition mean, and we do not seem to realise that probably some of the bravest men the world has ever seen are to be found among the present oppositions in Africa.

They are either that - or the most foolhardy.

In the meantime the words are the same and we therefore take them to mean the same. As a result 'Leaders' are given 'power' because they have a 'democratic right' to it and, for us, the 'Voice of Africa' is heard in the 'Wind of Change' that blows from Whitehall!

A most interesting situation.

## CHAPTER XXI

### *Nearer Home*

What the others do among themselves, however, does not directly concern us and we can afford to overlook the mess they get into. Or observe it from a safe distance.

But this, unhappily for us, is not the only way in which the quality of our word-images makes us vulnerable.

What is infinitely more important and what may finally become dangerous to us is the pair of catch words: 'Communist' and 'Imperialist'. To us these again indicate something that exists and one is either the one or the other. The possibility that one could be neither is rather theoretical. To be both is impossible. Even the shaking of the hand of a member of one or other group more or less automatically makes the 'Neutralist' a member of that group.

And this division is, to us, permanent because the groups are what they are - as permanently as a horse is a horse. Where, in other times, countries used to change from enemies to friends and back again, according to circumstances and configurations of personal advantages, here the division and the essential enmity and distrust are situated in the division itself. And that division is anchored in eternity.

It would seem that this difference between the new situation and the older one of 'changing partners' is not generally realised. It is a new situation in a more disturbing sense than merely being 'new' in time.

The difference can be felt if one changes "Imperialist" and "Communist" to "American" and "Russian", for in that case the innate invalidity and ridiculousness of much of our thinking - on both sides of the line - becomes immediately apparent. We have replaced the names of people by 'dirty words' and we are suffering the consequences.

Happily there are a few vague indications that light is starting to break through, but it is still very far away.

This vertical split in the White man's world is not, in itself, important here. It is the strange, almost compulsive effect it has upon our thinking about the newly 'uhurised' countries and their so called 'alignment' with the consequent advantages they derive from it, that must be looked at here.

America made a colossal mistake in her calculations when, in need of markets for her astronomically expanding industrial potential, she began levering England and France out of their debilitated military hold on Africa.

The basic idea was simple.

As Dulles put it, America 'supported legitimate nationalist aspirations' and emotionally pointed to her own 'liberation' as the cause for this attitude. She was not a renegade from the White camp, she merely invited others to follow her example.

Here a re-reading of Gunther's 'Inside Africa' is very instructive, as between the lines and behind the astute phraseology of a master journalist one can already read all of it there.

He knew what was coming.

Dulles himself never tried to hide his intentions. He depended on the impossibility that France and England would believe America capable of what would have been, in their eyes, such utter perfidy. And Gunther sneers at them for thinking it to be 'lack of skill in diplomacy'.

Significantly too it was Dulles who was the most openly disappointed and even disgusted when 'the plan' eventually backfired.

The aim was basically immensely simple and would have been foolproof if the 'All men are equal' idea had had any validity.

As it is, 'All men are equal' is one of America's principal new weapons of aggression, and manifestly they must honestly believe in it.

To arrive at the goal one supported (and hence inevitably instigated) 'legitimate nationalistic aspirations', except those of the White South African naturally. By adding the word "legitimate" one astutely reserved for oneself the right to select those whose 'national aspirations' were, to be 'legitimate' and therefore to be supported. There is no need for a great measure of cynicism to see what that implied. The history of Katanga tells us enough.

Nearly bankrupt, and militaristically impotent (as was clearly demonstrated by what followed Eden's abortive attempt to stem the tide at Suez), England and France would have to withdraw from the almost complete monopoly they held in Africa.

This would then unlock the market to all corners on the basis of another 'moral' weapon of the Americans, namely, the 'Right to Open Competition'.

Theoretically everybody would have the same opportunity and the best man would win. There was no doubt however, at least in Dulles's mind, as to who that 'best man' was to be.

In the first place a liberated slave does not like his ex-master. He has old scores to work off. He will (or so the 'White' mental outlook of Dulles and his advisers thought) have to become the loyal friend of, and a lucrative market for, the 'liberator' Uncle Sam - especially if, besides engineering the liberation, one spent a few millions in helping the new nations to get on their feet.

There would be no immediate profit from the money spent but, nevertheless, it would be well invested in 'Buying goodwill'.

In the second place, when it came to competing in the open market, nobody could have a chance against the great, already partially mechanised and robotised, industry of America. It would be able to underbid any other possible newcomers in the field.

There simply could be no doubt that, helped by the emotional, anti-colonialist feelings of the people one would be able to lift the old rider out of the saddle and take his place.

Gunther, in his introduction, even gives details of opportunities and the chance of inserting 'advisers' in the right places.

The third, and possibly the most astute 'moral weapon' of all was the 'raising of the standard of living' of the poor oppressed people of the black continent. With the help of Unesco - that is with the help of the dupes themselves - one would, by raising the standard of living of the Blacks, be creating a demand for



consumer goods. Teach them, by lending or giving, to need certain 'essentials' and they would be forced to work to earn the possibility of keeping on enjoying them so that they would be made to enter the White man's rat-race where they would be easy marks. It was something like the dope peddler dealing out his wares to beginners - free.

As said, the plan was foolproof. Even the most starry-eyed idealist could not publicly protest against the application of the high moral principles which the world in revulsion from the last war - had taken to its heart.

God and Ethics had been inspanned on the side of America!

As usual, life and reality were not half as simple as American 'diplomacy' thought them to be.

This did not mean, however, that it would not be effective. With only a half-hidden wish to have an excuse to get out, and with its almost pathological vulnerability to 'moral precepts', England had no defence. France, more matter-of-fact and more deeply involved because of its 'colons' in Algeria, could not stand alone, and was forced to follow suit; while Belgium, the third of the unholy trio of 'colonisers', seeing how the wind blew and knowing that it could not survive, decided, most wisely, to cut her losses and get out immediately.

This was not playing the game in the way America had planned it. The sudden move brought some of the cards on the table before they could be effectively hidden.

Here we see, reading between the lines and looking through the smokescreen that was immediately thrown up, how Patrice Lumumba had nearly closed a deal with a huge American combine, selling out the whole of the economic and industrial potential of the Congo to Uncle Sam - exactly according to 'the plan'.

The poor man had however not realised that the sale was contingent upon his being, and remaining, firmly in the saddle. The thing exploded in his hands and he had nothing left to sell, but he tried to save something. He talked - and the 'combine' suddenly disappeared into thin air thus providing a little drama that may well, someday, be the subject of a book "The Twenty Three days of Lumumba", or something in that line. And why was Lumumba killed?

As things developed, it soon turned out that America (or shall we say Dulles?) had made two basic mistakes.

The first came from the fact that all men are very definitely not alike - even if they may be 'equal'.

The Africans did not fall into the net of American commerce. They were 'free' and they considered that they had no moral obligation to Uncle Sam, who had arranged their freedom. They were not going to play the 'moral' game at all. They were going to 'sell' in what was, ironically enough, a form of "American Auction".

Each bidder paid the amount he had bid and the last bidder - if there ever was one - would get the prize.

The second, and still more colossal, mistake was that Russia had been left out of the calculations. This was, in a way, understandable for how could a land that had nowhere near enough of the consumer goods it needed for its own people, compete in the 'fair' open market with America?

The idea - if it occurred at all - would have been considered preposterous.

What Dulles and company had overlooked, however, was that in the opening up of Africa it would (at least for a time) be eleven million square miles of 'troubled waters'. And, as they should have known, such waters have always been ideal fishing ground for the Russians.

In opening up Africa to competition it had also been opened up to other than legitimate competition. It was available to people who did not think it shameful to play the game according to other rules than those laid down by America for what she already considered to be her own private reserves.

When it was realised what was going to happen, probably already in the days of the Congo, it was much too late. The snowball had been set rolling and the avalanche could no longer be stopped.

The basic trouble was that the African mind, being different from the Western mind, is one that is much more interested in power politics (which promises an incomparably higher reward to the individuals indulging in it) than in mere economic development which may be good for the people but not half as good for the politicians.

The result has been the logical, cause-and-effect, inevitable, almost Pre-destined series of events which we have seen in the last three years.

Brian Crozier puts it very clearly in "The Morning After" (p. 20): "The late Mr. John Foster Dulles and the government which he represented found this attitude hard to stomach, on two grounds. One was the proud memory of America's own struggle for independence; it was painful to discover that Americans, no less than British or French, were regarded as 'imperialists'. The other ground for Mr. Dulles distaste was the belief that 'freedom' was absolute good and 'communism' absolute evil. It was hard for anyone holding such a belief to conceive that any responsible statesman should not unhesitatingly align his country on the side of the United States. So hard that the former Secretary of State poured his bitterness into a long remembered phrase: "Neutralism is immoral".

"What Mr. Dulles and the American officials of the McCarthy era overlooked was that the new leaders had no desire to exchange one form of colonial rule for another. They asserted their new freedom by travelling to Moscow and Peking, but the Warsaw Pact was no more attractive to them than Nato or Seato. Moreover, neutralism, positive or not, brought certain impressive advantages. The new leaders could hold one hand out for the Russians to fill it and the other for the attention of the Americans.

This describes the situation adequately - including the Western obsession with the words 'Imperialism' and 'Communism' which befuddles our thinking and even that of Brian Crozier himself. It shows the point of view of a fully informed and somewhat disillusioned man who still thinks in the 'western' terms that have grown out of, and that have obtained their meaning in, an age that died a bloody death a score of years ago. He too is struggling with what are merely ghosts of the past.

What, for instance, is the meaning, translated into real facts and events, of a country -aligning itself on the side of the United States - or on that of the Communists?

In fact that can mean no less than either one or both of two things. It will provide a military advantage in case of war, and/or its commercial possibilities will become linked to and partially integrated into that of either one or the other of the two great camps into which we have divided the world.

Thus, seen for what it is, the 'alignment' takes on another shade of meaning. It is no longer a moral or an idealistic action.

Let us look again at what lies behind the two 'words' that build it up: "Military alignment" and "Economic alignment."

Military alignment can have importance only for two reasons either because of "Strategic possibilities" or because of "Belligerent possibilities".

Taking these two apart again, we find that "Strategic possibilities" have two aspects. 'Strategic position' and the 'possibility of maintaining the strategic advantage'.

The 'position' of a country is decided by fate. Both Cuba and Bizerta, for instance, are where they are, natural bases for 'defensive' attack in our Atomic age.

In the first aspect both are therefore 'advantages' in a military sense. In the second aspect, the answer to the question of whether it will be possible to maintain them is more doubtful.

In the case of Cuba the strategic position is so vulnerable to counterattack and the lines of communication are so long and vulnerable that one marvels at the cynicism of the attempt to make Cuba into a striking base.

One can be sure that America has her bombs primed and sighted, ready, twenty-four hours of every day so that it can be wiped off the map within half an hour and it will be impossible to re-establish it as a base at least.

Bizerta (and England itself) suffer as Atomic bases from the disadvantage that the people do not like to be sitting ducks for the initial onslaught of World War III. Where, unlike Cuba, there is no strong and ruthless dictatorship, this will find expression in objections whose efficiency will depend upon the military or political ability of the 'strategic base' to eject the would-be 'strategist'.

This is happening to the Air bases that have been established at fantastic expense all over the place, causing a total loss which could have been avoided if this simple fact had been taken into account when they were originally decided upon.

One could, for instance, hardly expect to keep the Algerian bases if one at the same time 'liberated' them from one's own ally France. The French might very well have been convinced of the 'painful necessity' that a chunk of Algeria would be likely to be blown into atomic dust, but it would be too much to expect the same attitude from the Algerians.

And the Libyans are obviously likely to follow suit. They would be fools if they didn't, just for the sake of a 'word'.

It will not make any difference to them who wins in the next war when it materialises. They are also human and maybe some of them have read about the reaction of the American public itself when they realised that they themselves might be sitting ducks right in the middle of their ideal American way of life. They were not going to let anybody take pot-shots at them - not for the sake of Europe anyhow!

The strategic aspect of 'Military alignment' for the rest of Africa is very nearly non-existent; for both factors, the 'people' and the 'lines of communication' on the one hand, and the 'positions' themselves, are more or less valueless.

The need to keep harbours open is unlikely to be very important in the new ways of warfare that are on the books.

Anyhow they could only be made safe by the establishment of military strong points which would place them under the next heading of 'Belligerent possibilities.'

The 'Strategic possibilities' in South Asia are of secondary importance as Australia (like South Africa) will obviously become expendable in case of a full world war. They are too far away and will be 'Saved' or 'Attended to' when the rest have sorted themselves out.

The 'Belligerent possibilities' heading is, if not more important, at least more interesting as it concerns the possibility of countries developing aggressive military qualities.

These aggressive military qualities can be either 'local' or 'introduced'.

Local aggressive potential depends on a group of factors.

In the first place, naturally, there is the human material that is available, for, despite the invasion of the military field by machines, wars are still fought by human individuals who will by personal qualities determine the efficiency of that military machinery.

Here the personal bravery of the individual still has a certain amount of importance although much less than when wars were still fought face to face.

There is however no reason to think that in personal bravery the average African or Asian is different from the average of any other nation.

More important is the ability to instil and to submit to, discipline. Modern wars must always be a co-operative effort, ruled by a central intelligence (whatever form it may take). The ability of that central intelligence to make its human instruments do its will and the willingness of the instruments to obey unquestioningly (because they do not know and cannot know the overall plan) are a primary requisite for effective action.

Here the African and the Asiatic differ immensely.

For the African, as he congenitally only obeys for fear of punishment, it becomes a question of what he fears most, his commander, his enemy, or the result of not fighting back. As long as the action is successful, as long as he is better armed (and better led) than the others, he could theoretically be a relatively good soldier, for he is no coward - but when things go wrong, he will become a 'neutralist' and try to find where he will be safest under the circumstances.

Besides that he is not naturally gifted with the ability to use the Western 'machines of war'. Essentially his concept of fighting is still the more personal, preferably onesided type of fighting which is entailed in a raid and not that of a set battle.

Cold-blooded, calculated fighting is not in his system. It is, for him, preferably initiated by an emotion-rousing bout of vituperation and yelling or dancing - until he is able to forget himself. And all of this does not find a place in 'modern' warfare. The only thing in which he should be good there is in the ambush, which can hardly be called 'aggressive' military potential.

The human element of Africa therefore does not seem to be very suitable for the purpose of organised belligerency.

What is, however, still more important is the organisation of ten or twenty men behind the lines who have to work in perfect harmony and efficiency to keep one man in the field in modern warfare. Finally there is also the (perhaps) most important part of all: the basic industrial potential and wealth needed to back up the whole process.

Where we have not yet had any evidence whatsoever, even in peacetime conditions, that these characteristics can be forthcoming, this should eliminate the probability of 'local' aggressive military possibilities developing in Africa.

The typical Asiatic again is good at instilling and submitting to discipline. It is among these people that one finds some of the best soldiers the world has yet seen.

Their weakness is at the top of the military organisation (again, as usual, with the exception of the Japanese).

The long-futured Asiatic can obey. He can also command, but he tends to get lost when he comes to the top and has nobody to tell him what to do.

It is not that he is a fool or a nervous ditherer. It is that the immediate project does not stand clear and defined before his mind to the exclusion of almost everything else, as it does to us. It is partially submerged and dissolved in the image of the ages - in the pattern of time flowing from the eternity of the past into the eternity of the future. In that way it loses its immediate urgency and importance. One can linger by the wayside and pick a flower, or in other words one can procrastinate and be unwilling to 'take time by the forelock', while cashing in on some personal perquisites that may occur.

One can use them now - and in the eternal scheme of things they are not important. Nobody will miss them.

When at the top (or near it) where it becomes necessary to make decisions, where to us it is as if the work itself gives us the orders, the Asiatic tends to fall for the 'human' temptations. Bribery and corruption (besides procrastination) have always been a typical ingredient of Oriental social and economic relationships.

A single-minded gearing of the whole machinery of the state to the war-machine is therefore also unlikely. 'Local' aggressive potential, although higher than in Africa, is not a very great danger except against neighbouring states who are in a similar pass. The actual fighting of the armies, although still tending to guerilla and raiding tactics, would be more efficient.

'Introduced aggressive potential' has four possible variations:

- (a) The supply of weapons and materials of war.
- (b) The training of the army by imported instructors.
- (c) The occupation (by permission or otherwise) of an enclave by an alien military garrison.
- (d) The taking over of the command of the army by alien officers.

The supply of weapons only will make no great difference to the essential factors of the situation in either Africa or Asia. One could at most expect an intensification of internecine wars and an extension of the power of those dictatorships that were so assisted.

The only form in which the supply of arms and ammunition might have some effect would be in the arming of guerillas and saboteurs. But, even that, when it becomes dangerous, can be counteracted (at least in Africa) by firm measures such as applying the death sentence to those caught in these activities.

That will act by making the fear of being caught greater than whatever temporary impulse may drive them. In Asia, where long-term ideas and ideals are important, arming of insurgents may lead to the breakdown of the afflicted country's economy.

Training by foreign instructors will fail, for the same reason. 'Training' presupposes that the qualities to be trained into the army must already be there, potentially. One cannot make fine Chinaware from potter's clay. Those from South Africa who were soldiers in the last war will remember Mussolini's troops, 'trained' almost from childhood, as an example.

One might come to the point that a perfect military tattoo could be staged (although Chapman, in "The Jungle is Neutral", reports that after a year and a half of daily and intensive training, it was not possible to get his Asiatic human material to march in step). One might still be able to build up a perfect military machine but even then one would be very little nearer to an aggressive military potential. With the 'backing' of the army missing in commissariat, intelligence, transport etc. it would soon collapse if faced with determined resistance.

Furthermore, in Africa with the spirit of Uhuru still rife, the authority of such 'instructors' would be a precarious thing and, without authority, discipline would be impossible to install - as has been seen lately in Tanganyika and Kenya.

The instinctive reaction to the 'White' or 'alien' instructor is that he is using his 'White' or 'foreign' prerogatives to give the orders. It is not understood that he is expressing the 'spirit of the army'. The situation is, as in the law courts, brought down to the personal level.

Naturally, if there has been a concomitant importation of arms, such instructors could teach the soldiers how to use them. But ability to handle arms, does not guarantee effectiveness in the field, under fire. It is doubtful, for instance, if a corps consisting entirely of Bisley winners would be much better as soldiers than an average army unit.

The occupation of an enclave (with or without permission) is really like a 'Strategic' possibility and it suffers from the same disadvantages. There is furthermore this, that if the enclave guards a vital factor on the coast, it would be vulnerable to attack and it would be difficult to come to its aid in case the enemy decided that it was worthwhile to eliminate it

The taking over of the actual command by alien officers and staff is probably the only way in which 'alignment' with the enemy could cause trouble - and then only if it were to be backed up by an almost complete supply of armaments. This would have to mean that only the common soldiers and the lower ranks would be of the country itself and the action would constitute almost a complete takeover. Such a thing could hardly be done with the full and free consent of the people themselves. It would entail an absolute authority of the aliens over the 'home' soldiers, including such things as execution for desertion and cowardice in face of the enemy. It is difficult to think that this would not most certainly run into racial and personal snags.

Such an army, officered by alien fighting men, would be immensely effective against a neighbouring country that was not so 'blessed', but as an effective fighting force against an army that consisted entirely of 'aliens' it would be only of problematical quality.

In Asia, however, there would certainly be a real danger, especially if fear - or the willingness to submit to discipline - could be instilled. The Asian will accept whatever ruler fate puts over him, as long as that ruler by his power shows that he is the ruler that has to be there. This would, however, entail complete domination over the leaders or the real rulers of the country.

That again would be no more than the same as 'colonialism' which both the Imperialistic and the Communistic regimes have declared that they most profoundly abhor.

In it we would be back to where we started before the last war and after one example, one country or nation having been so 'subdued', it would be difficult to spread the process to the next victim without an overt invasion, and thereby driving all the 'others' into the enemy camp.

Besides that it would also cost a great deal of money and material and it would be doubtful if that could be justified by the results.

One can imagine that it would be better to take the men and material thus used and to employ them as a fighting unit by themselves.

All together therefore one has the impression that, unless it is considered possible that either side intends to return to the bad old days of 'colonialism', the fear which Military alignment instils is merely founded on its historical implications and not on reality and fact. It is the contents of a 'word' and has no particular importance, certainly not enough to make us go to the almost ridiculous extremes of paying out large sums of blackmail and swallowing insults - as we have been doing.

The logical attitude towards it should be: "All right! Let the others have the trouble and the expense of playing soldiers with them. Let them waste their money on guns and ammunition, aeroplanes and an old gunboat or two, it'll keep them busy and give us a chance to concentrate on more important things."

If one observes the effectiveness of present day Russian tactics in Africa one has the impression that they have already realised this. They are certainly expending only a fraction of what we do, and they often get off best.

A rather striking example of this is the nervousness of the Imperialist camp at what happened in Zanzibar.

It does look possible that the last variation of 'Belligerent alignment' may develop there, and, in analogy with Cuba, we fear that a 'Strategic point' may be established there, with Zanzibar under Russian or Chinese officers as the 'garrison'.

But against whom would it be effective? If such a condition does eventuate one can be sure that the rest of Africa, oversensitive about any kind of colonialism, would close its doors to Russian infiltration completely. Getting hold of any part of Africa would therefore have to be in the form of an overt invasion of the mainland. If this were to be done under the threat of atom bombing it would need Russian and not the 'Chinese' occupation which seems to be in the air. At the same time the foreign 'officers' would be living on a volcano which might erupt under them at any moment.

Moreover, such an invasion would tell the world that the old days of armed attacks had returned and we might see a re-grabbing of the old colonies, in another pattern, by 'imperialists' and 'communists' alike.

It might also be the slow match that would set off World War III, but, if that came, it would have been decided long beforehand that such a War was to take place. Once it has flared up, Zanzibar will be only a small and, in itself, fairly vulnerable asset in the struggle.

If a World War was meant to be provoked it could have been done much more cheaply and efficiently somewhere else.

Lastly one might think that the island is the base for atom bombs directed at South Africa. But if it is intended to gain the approbation of Africa, by doing that, it would be a curious way to go about it. After all, statistically (as Apartheid has not been fully implemented here), it is almost sure that two or three Africans would be killed for every White man that suffered the same fate.

One imagines that that would not please the rest of Africa at all. It is therefore probably but another move in the war of nerves designed to make us spend more energy and money.

Seen like this, it turns out that the whole question of 'military alignments', is but a blind spending of money and energy, both emotional and physical, which is wasted in tilting against windmills unless the primary (and not the secondary and incidental) aim is the obtaining of the 'Economic alignment' of the countries concerned.

As practically always in history, the shopkeeper and the trader stand behind the soldiers and egg them on with high sounding, patriotic (and lately moral and ethical) ideals, telling them to go and die for Fame and Glory and the Bankbooks of those who stay prudently at home.

Dulles's dictum of "Neutralism is immoral!" means that he considered it a shame that the 'neutralists' had opted for 'free trading, selling themselves and their goods for the highest price obtainable.

That was certainly wise, and infinitely more profitable for them.

In the meantime the 'Alignments' have to get off their idealistic pedestal to degenerate into an aspect of mere horse trading. And here we of the West are, almost a priori, outdone. We have been good traders as long as there was a gun in our cupboard - but the art of trading is essentially one of the East.

Our gun has been confiscated and we are slightly lost, like amateurs. It is, for instance, impossible for us to get away with an inspired deal like that which the Russians had with Burma.

As Crozier describes it (p. 82): 'The inexperienced Burmans bartered away their 1955 surplus and much of their anticipated 1956 surplus (of rice), then shipped off the 1955 instalment without arranging at the same time what they were to receive in return or making sure the value of the goods to be shipped in return would correspond to the value of their rice at prevailing world prices. The Russians shipped 60,000 tons of cement - a whole year's supply - to Burma without notice. The cement arrived in Rangoon at the beginning of the monsoon, and most of it was left in the open in the absence of storage space, when the rains came, it turned to concrete.'

One cannot express it better than by the slang: "That makes you think, hey?"

We would not have dared to do such a thing! We would have feared that our 'good name' would be lost for ever. But the Russians knew that they were not dealing with 'Burma' as we would have been doing - or thinking that we were. They knew that they were dealing with a few top Burmese who are sure not to have lost on the deal (being Asians, and good traders). The only ones who did lose were the Burmese people and they did not matter. They will also not matter when the next 'deal' comes along.

In the meantime it would seem that Burma's "immoral" neutralism has not paid off very well, always with the exception of those concerned in the actual transaction. What now of this question of the importance of 'Economic alignment'?

In trade it is finally no more than a matter of profit and loss. What we should ask therefore is not about ideals and "immorality" but if the price we pay is worth what we may possibly get out of it.



We must not forget that all these grants-in-aid, these bids in our American auction, these relief funds, this money to be spent on 'raising the standard of living', on housing schemes and roadbuilding etc. are neither 'conscience money' nor the meeting of 'moral obligations' in the way in which they are represented to the public who, in the final instance, have to pay. They are merely attempts at buying the goodwill of people who have and often can have no 'good will' because they live only in the present moment.

Nevertheless - it might be successful, so let us accept it as such.

Is it now not time to tot up what has been spent and what, at this rate, must still be spent; and to ask ourselves if it will ever be possible for Africa to repay even a few per cent on the money thus invested

It is certainly time that we realise that if we think that we are 'giving money towards a good purpose', we are ludicrously mistaken. The insistence on 'no strings attached' may sound to us the expression of a proud people, but it is not without significance that 'having no strings attached' prevents us from seeing where the money goes. We are like the man who, accosted by the panhandler, suggests that, if the fellow is hungry, he will take him to a restaurant and stand him a meal.

The panhandler tells him where he can go and the man to salve his conscience, gives the tramp a shilling.

One might think that the mansions rising up in a dreary expanse of squalor and misery should have shown us where the 'lack of strings' has permitted the money to leak out of the coffers of the state.

Wouldn't it be more profitable to let the others do the donating for a bit? When that also ends, as it surely will soon enough, we may possibly arrive at the stage where we can begin 'competing on the open market' - otherwise it is but throwing good money after bad.

We might even get something back in the end.

What, after all, is the worst that could happen?

What great harm would it do if Russia and China gathered in the whole market of Africa. What has it to sell?

In the meantime the Russians and the Chinese would have the headaches. All Africa's present rulers are so used to regular donations to which they have a 'right' (do they not thump the table if there is any hesitancy about giving it to them?) that it is more than likely that they will think it beneath their dignity as 'free men' to pay their bills.

Barter is therefore the only method of exchange, as is fitting in dealing with primitive people. And have they anything that we could not do without - anything for which, if it has to be, we could not find a substitute?

The West should simply add the whole export potential of Africa and South East Asia together and weigh it against the price that it has been made to pay and which, it is still paying. It may well be that it would be to its advantage to cut its losses and to write off the bad debts.

But, asks the nervous man, especially in South Africa, what if Russia and China get a 'foothold' in Africa when the West moves out?

Here it is necessary to do some cool thinking and to face the facts after having divested ourselves of the traditional but outmoded meanings and values of 'footholds', 'zones of influence', 'alliances' etc.

These concepts only had a certain amount of reality when miles were still miles.

In those days a garrison near one's borders meant acute danger. Nowadays, when it is easier to move a regiment, or even a whole army a thousand miles than it used to be to move them one mile over slightly hilly country infested with guerillas, that kind of military thinking has become meaningless. It would even be an advantage to have the embarkation point a thousand miles away as it would be less open to observation, and air attack during the vulnerable stages.

It would now be easier for Russia to deposit an army in the Springbok Vlakke (for instance) directly from Russia, than, at the beginning of the last war it would have been to move it in from Southern Rhodesia - it is no use kidding ourselves that this is not so.

All that saves us from that kind of thing is international politics and the question of if the cost would justify the results - that - and nothing else.

If it became of vital importance to Russia to take us, nothing could save us - and the same is true of America, if they considered it necessary to take us.

The world has become too small for the old-time ideas to be still valid. Helicopters have taken the place of 'bush carts'.

In a military and an economical sense the results of leaving Africa open for Russia and China to see what they can do with it, have, one thinks, adequately been dealt with in the first part of this chapter.

Anything short of actual occupation will not cause a danger for the West so that it cannot be dealt with. For us in South Africa, however, it may mean an intensification of our political trouble but that would hardly worry our white brothers overseas!

The moment occupation takes place however, we will have, in Africa, a replica of what is at present happening in South East Asia, where, as analysed above, actual, fully implemented occupation is not necessary.

When occupation, or the subjection of one African state by another that is helped by a foreign power, takes place, the threatened neighbours will call for help from the opposite side - of that one need not have any doubt. And one can be sure that those calls for help will be answered.

At the same time the masks will then be off and there will be an end to lying and hypocrisy and using high ethical ideals and slogans to promote one's own economical aspirations.

Short of occupation, however, there will be only endless expense and trouble, for, to repeat Crozier's penetrating analysis again: "Mr. Dulles overlooked that the new leaders had no desire to exchange one form of colonial rule for another. They asserted their new freedom by travelling to Moscow and Peking, but the Warsaw Pact was no more attractive to them than Nato or Seato. Moreover, neutralism, positive or not, brought certain impressive advantages. The new leaders could hold one hand out for the Russians to fill it and the other for the attention of the Americans."

Not one of the new leaders will, without overt threat of military might, cede any of their newly gained power and 'freedom'.

Reading between the lines, one can take it that at a personal level (and apart from specious, public theorising and tub-thumping) the Russians have an immeasurably deeper disdain and lack of respect for their black brothers than we have who at least try to establish a common ground and a modus vivendi.

They manifestly do not even try to understand the 'black monkeys' - as is shown by the stuff they load off on them and, from the other side, the way legation after legation is booted out every now and then. The African wants handouts from them and not the kind of communistic overlordship that keeps the countries of Central Europa and Asia in a kind of subjugation to which our 'colonialism' was like the care of a doting mother for her children.

If the West could come to its senses, it would stop paying blackmail and give Africa a chance to see how far it could get with trying to bleed Russia white.

Then, when both sides had had their lesson and seen the futility of 'paying for no other reason than to keep the other side out', some combined scheme of economic exploitation might be found to be workable. And such a combined economic exploitation could then even be designed in such a way that at least a reasonable amount of welfare was passed onto the common man, both at home and in Africa.

At present both sides are merely filling the pockets of the leaders.

As long as we deal only with those leaders UHURU will not come to the common man in Africa.

The West need not fear that Africa will go Communist itself. The African can as little be a real communist as he can be a real democrat. The subconsciously feared 'Black Stalin' will never live a frugal life and die a relatively poor man as did his Russian prototype. Even if he publicly declared himself to be a Communist Dictator, he would still be as little a communist as Nkrumah is a democrat.

For South Africa it would also make little difference what they call themselves up north.

The symbolical burying of 'Verwoerd' and 'Apartheid' by Kenyatta and his ministers, recently, can hardly be thought to be communist inspired. It is unlikely that the Russians would have thought of this amusing equivalent of sticking a nail into the heart of a clay image of one's enemy.

Besides that, it would make little difference if it had been so inspired. Both ways they have Russia's blessing and, if need be, help - for it is a principle of Russian strategy to cause as much trouble as it can in whatever way possible. By that means, at a negligible cost to themselves, they keep Imperialism running around in circles, getting nowhere. It is all a part of the game of "Go Bang"!

In the meantime it seems as if Russia is itself becoming aware of the puppet role it is being made to play.

The refusal to 'go the whole hog' together with China, the opening of trade with the West by its satellites, and numerous other straws in the wind, point to the possibility that the Bear and the Eagle will eventually bury the hatchet somewhere else than in each other's skull. In that case they would be dividing the world (as it naturally should be) into 'the East' and 'the West' with the dividing line running along the Altai and the Himalayas (leaving the placement of the northern and southern borders at present in doubt - say, along the Lena and the Irrawaddy?)

Should this happen, our South African bogey-man, 'Communism', may start to look foolish and it may be wise if we now begin to consider how we will have to readjust our sights so that we can face the real enemy - the thing we have to fight, if we are to survive.

We will try to tackle that problem in the Appendix in which the position of South Africa itself is more specifically examined.

## CHAPTER XXII

### *At Home*

The great danger for the White man personally, is not however in the immediate threat of military and economic complications in the rest of the world. They could at most be a nuisance to him although (as we will try to show later) there is a chance that the eventual 'coup de grâce' will come from there.

The immediate danger lies in our midst and, again, not even necessarily in an organised attempt at revolution, but in the condition that is the simple and inevitable result of the situation which the White man has allowed to develop at home.

There is little satisfaction in smiling wisely at the irony of the fact that the 'winds of change' which America once forced Whitehall to waft out over Africa, have crossed the Atlantic where they are now blowing up into what promises to be one of the infamous tornadoes of their original homeland.

It is unlikely that when he proclaimed that "America would support all legitimate nationalistic aspirations", the idea could have crossed Dulles's mind that very soon in his own 'Land of the Free', one of these 'aspirations' would become articulate and unmanageably importunate to boot. Still less can he have realised that it would be impossible to judge that 'aspiration' purely on its 'pro-' or 'anti-American' qualifications for 'legitimacy', especially where the Black Muslims would understandably be quite unwilling to open the battle with the 'one-man-one-vote' gambit in order to justify their claims.

However, for our present purpose, the American debacle, although the logical result of the factors inherent in the situation there, is distorted too much by racist issues. The short-futured contingent that demands its say is visibly, physically distinguishable so that everyone can see who is who except for those in a thin marginal fringe.

Emotions therefore play too large a part in those who judge; and emotional reactions confuse the basic factors by emphasising the primeval difficulty inherent in a 'mixing of races' instead of a 'mixing of people with different sets of abilities and mental patterns'.

Let us, to avoid these complications in our thinking, imagine that it was suddenly impossible to distinguish a 'Negro' from a 'White' on the evidence of his physical appearances.

With that, the use of the word 'Nigger' would become obsolete and there would be no possible cause for race riots, for fighting for or against integration in schools, for the American type of automatic, hidden and unofficial 'Job Reservation' and for all the excitement about the essentially secondary issues behind which the main trouble is conveniently hidden from both sides.

There would now be one homogeneous American Nation - but would that 'ideal' condition save America?

One doubts it, for if the people remained as they were previously 'inside' (although now without the 'superiority' and 'inferiority' complexes), the personal abilities, the degree of temporalisation, and the way in which they saw the world would still remain the same.

The ex-Blacks would also act and work as they have done up to now. They would still be relatively improvident, thriftless, often shiftless, undependable and unconscientious and at least no better than the lower twenty percent of those who were originally White Americans.

The result is not very difficult to imagine, for now America and its highly organised socio-economic and industrial system would suddenly (instead of some 15 to 20%) have some 25 to 30% short-futured and very short-futured people in its lower layers.

These newcomers would move in from that part of the population which (and despite the pious denials and despite freedom and equality) would, before that, have been automatically segregated into the unskilled and secondary layers of the system.

They would now no longer be held back by their black skins and inevitably start to move 'upwards'.

In doing so they would, as inevitably, come up against the Apartheid that God Himself has instituted in the world of man, the ceiling to their abilities in the world of Western techniques which are mainly built upon a visual image of existence.

In order not to clutter up the text with a confusion of quotations, a resumé of the characteristics of this Divine Apartheid has, as has been said, been given in the second appendix in the end of this book. It is from Nathaniel Weyl's Book: "The Negro in American Civilisation" which was published by the 'Public Affairs Press' in Washington, in 1960 and can therefore hardly be considered 'propaganda'. They are statements of facts made by scientists who have measured and not merely judged. Most of it is from the study by J. C. Carothers, "The African Mind in Health and Disease", which was undertaken under the auspices of the World Health Organisation of Geneva - and published by them. (1953).

If one accepts what is said there to be fact, it follows that in our hypothetical America in which the physical external differences between Black and White had disappeared, it would no longer be possible to be able to eliminate 'at a glance' the largest part of those who would be congenitally unfit for the job they applied for.

Undependability and discontinuity of employment and absenteeism (which are already now very near the danger point because the self-discipline and the official discipline of the whole White system has been white-anted from within by the 'little man' attitude) would increase to such an extent that the efficiency of industry and commerce could be endangered to the degree that it could begin to crack at the seams.

Where the Labour and the Trades Unions have already geared everything down to the lowest denominator, the added burden of the influx of large numbers of what are still essentially primitive men, alien to our culture, would most likely be too heavy to bear. The leaven of longer-futured men, who still are able to keep it going at present, would be diluted down to a point where, for instance, machines (representing a great capital outlay) would break down because those without the necessary sense of responsibility and instinctive understanding for machines had found their way into key positions where inattention and half-work could cause major catastrophes.

It is however possible that careful screening could prevent this happening although (judging by what is even now heard often enough) the outcry of racist discrimination would again be sure to be raised.

As all people are equal it would be impossible that only originally White minds could be fit for the plum jobs. Somebody would be doing the ex-Black man a shot in the eye!

What is however more important is that with the disappearance of the visible race barrier, the 'proletariat' of America, which is at present divided into White and Black camps that are to a large extent still antagonistic (because of their mutual competition - and despite pious protests to the contrary), would become one large proletariat that would constitute a significant part of the American population.

Such an increased proletariat would become dangerous for two reasons. In the first place, where at present about half of them are kept down automatically because they are 'niggers', (aided by the almost instinctive knowledge and acceptance by the Negro of the fact that he should be kept down) this 'divide and rule' principle would become impossible. In the second place, the Black half of this proletariat has up to now had the White man as his oppressor. In the new, 'whole' Proletariat, all of them would turn their hatred and envy at the Capitalists with the dull, unreasoning hatred of the have-nots for those who have and who 'ride around in big shiny limousines' etc.

The end of the race struggle would mean the intensification of the class struggle.

Worse still is that the primitives, the short-futured, would be entering politics and their irresponsibility and lack of insight and foresight act like an infectious disease which drags everything along (as was the case in the MacCarthy episode of a decade ago).

It would be unavoidable that the new government would end by taking sides against the 'tycoons', the 'oppressors of the working man' and 'vested interests'.

At the same time veniality and corruption, which already are a marked characteristic of the American political system (compared with, say, an European one), would increase to proportions where the resiliency of the economic reserves would no longer be able to adjust for it.

Lastly the typical 'African' factor of intimidation would (where, even now, it is not unknown in America) take on dangerous proportions.

Looking into the future there would furthermore be a steady increase of the short-futured percentage, for, where Whites among themselves breed only a certain percentage of the longer-futured ones, the mixture of Black and White genes seems to breed very few, if any at all.

Happily - or unhappily - the Negro is, however, still visibly a Negro and will remain so for the foreseeable future.

He will have to keep on showing openly that he is one of those who lack the qualities on which the Western economic and industrial system has been built and on which it is being sustained.

To those Blacks who think more deeply, this is not a disadvantage, far from that!

It is probable that the largest part of them, if they had the choice (and the understanding) would vote for keeping that 'Black badge', for in a way it is like the 'disease' of the neurotic. They can hide their inabilities and failings behind it.

Where it has officially been declared that all men are equal (and that therefore publications like that of Nathaniel Weyl are mere 'propaganda') it is obvious that if the Black man fails to make the grade, it must be due not to a lack or a fault in him, but to his being an 'Oppressed Black' who is being taken advantage of by the Whites.

It is racism that keeps him where he is. If racism were eliminated he would come to his rightful place in the community, or so they say.

In fact, however, if the 'Black badge' were to be taken away from him, if racism really became as dead as the brainwashed Whites would have it be, then the individual Blacks would each of them stand or fall

and go under, according to their abilities to hold their own in a Western system. One can imagine that then the State, or the Capitalists would have to be the ones who were the 'oppressors'.

Losing their 'Black badge' would not turn out to be popular when it was found out what that would entail.

Most of all, those who would hold the Whites responsible for what their forefathers did to the Black slaves of yesteryear would raise a howl against complete integration.

It needs little insight to realise that, sensing the way the wind blows, these people, subconsciously or consciously aware of what full integration will mean for them, are busy staking a claim to further 'handouts' sufficient to keep them going for the rest of their lives. Removal of the Black badge would make their 'credit notes' valueless and they too would have to earn their living in an essentially alien society where competition is already too fierce for them.

Another thing they would lose would be the inner compensation and the satisfaction now derived from baiting the White man boss. It is a useless pastime and will postpone any possible solution of the basic problem - but it is human and understandable.

Here too belongs the compensation in the sense of togetherness (the oppressed Blacks' against the steadily weakening Whites) which gives them hope and a sense of power and security in numbers which would, individually, be denied them if the Black badge disappeared.

The only thing that could really save the situation as it is now is if, with the changing of the exterior to that of a White man, their interior, their personalities and gifts and characteristics could similarly be changed - but, although that would obviously eliminate the problem itself, it is doubtful if they would be willing to pay that price.

It may be necessary to stress here once again that all this does in no way imply that the Black man is less intelligent, less gifted with feelings, less human or in any general way 'inferior' to the White man. He is as little 'inferior' as the cat is to the dog, or vice versa.

He is merely different and, in other circumstances, he may well be, and often is, 'superior'. It is only in our Western system that he is without a doubt 'inferior' but that makes him inferior only if we take the 'a priori' standpoint that our Western, rat-race culture and our horological slavery is, in an absolute sense, 'superior' to any other civilisation and way of life.

The Black is 'inferior' in our Western society and culture because it was built up by, and in harmony with, what and how the White man is.

Ours is, however, not the Black man's civilisation and most of them will freely and even vociferously - admit and boast that they do not want anything to do with it.

What they want is not our civilisation. That to them seems slightly mad and certainly more than a bit inhuman, cold-eyed, calculated and impersonal. Even Lin Yu Tang (in "My country and My People") has that to say about us although a large part of his writing seems to be that of a White man. (One realises that this will not be considered as a compliment by him!)

Our way is alien to them. Our way of life is to them without the depths of real human emotions, as one can read between the lines in much of the literary work of American Negroes (such for instance as that of Lanston Hughes in "The Ways of White Folks"). They like very little of our art, which to them is rarified and devoid of the warmth of real life.



What they do want is our Standard of Living, our Gadgets, our apparent Freedom of the Individual and our seemingly labourless lives.

All these are to them 'things' that it should be possible for us to give to them without demanding that, (in order to become 'worthy' of them) they should change their way of life to ours. That we do not give them this can therefore have no other reason than meanness and racism, both qualities which we ourselves declare publicly that we abhor.

What they do not realise, and what most of us do not realise either, is that - just as is true of a government - a civilisation grows out of the people, out of the individual people who together, constitute that civilisation by their way of living it.

Just as a government is an expression of the characteristics of its people, and not merely a system of ruling imposed on them, because it must be individually applied and implemented by average individuals from the highest to the lowest ranks; so the whole of a civilisation is the expression of the personal qualities of its members.

A 'civilisation' is not just something that comes along and fills itself with a people (as Oswald Spengler seems to think). It is a people who 'live themselves out' in a civilisation.

Our Western type of 'word thinking' makes it difficult to see this clearly. We think of 'a' civilisation and it has an existence of its own. We think of 'a' people and it has an existence of its own. It 'does' things, it 'thinks' and 'judges' and it speaks up for itself 'through' the mouths of its spokesmen.

Naturally there is nothing of the kind. A people is a group of individual human beings and, whatever 'it' does or says, or thinks, is the summation of what its articulate members do and say and think; driven by their own personal way of seeing things, their concepts of how it should be, of how they would like it to be and according to what it may be possible to do - and last, but by no means least, depending upon what will be to the personal advantage of each human individual for himself.

Once this is clearly understood it becomes obvious that it must be impossible to take only a part of a civilisation and to throw the rest away. Our laws, our way of life, our morals or lack of them, the peculiar structure of our civil service, our religious doctrines and our more or less democratic ways of governing ourselves are as much a result and a necessary outcome of how we are as our industries, our commercial empires and the social structure of our daily lives. One cannot have the one without the other as all of it grows, almost inevitably, out of the same roots.

The wish, the demand even, of the not-White for our standard of living, our gadgets, our 'individual freedom', our labour-saving devices - etc - is as foolish as a pear tree would be if it demanded that he should be 'allowed' to grow peaches. And that without changing his inner self.

It can grow pears (which it is beyond the capability of the peach tree to do) but it cannot grow peaches. To grow peaches it would have to become a peach tree, it would have to grow peach leaves, and peach wood and peach tree roots - and in doing so - it would lose the ability to grow pears.

What then is the special quality of the peach tree, the White man, that makes him 'grow' a Western civilisation and enables to keep it going up to now.

Once again, it is not his intelligence, nor his moral stature, nor his innate sense of justice, nor any of the other perfections that he may wish to arrogate to himself. It is simply and basically nothing more

remarkable than his being a "medium-futured egotist". It is that that has done all the good - and all the harm.

The 'medium-futured' quality defines what is the average of the group and the 'egotism' is not 'selfishness' (for in that quality we differ little from any other people in the world) - but in that we are a self-centred people who, in the final instance, unhesitatingly judge everything from our own individual, personal place in the universe of men and things.

It would be difficult to overstress the importance of the medium depth of the future of our average citizen.

It has been seen how too short a temporalisation makes it impossible to build up anything permanent. We have also seen how, on the other hand, too long a future tends to interfere with getting things done and to a fatalistic outlook on life.

The importance of our medium-future is that it corresponds fairly well with the distance up to which the intellect can construct a valid and reasonably correct image of what is going to happen. Beyond that time imponderables and uncontrollable factors begin to take too large a part in what will eventuate, to allow an adequately motivated image to be constructed so that it can be a guide and an inspiration for the actions of the present.

The more the future beyond this point has reality for us, the more that too long-future is a part of our today, the more we also necessarily become filled with a sense of insecurity and the senselessness of trying to do something about it. The mind tends to turn to busying itself with the things of immediate concern and present necessity, while vaguely wondering about the eternity beyond - or merely trying to forget it because it is no use thinking about it anyhow.

Thus far, therefore, the intellect and the imagination after all do have something to do with it, for only when the intellectually and imaginatively constructed future stretch corresponds with the one that will eventually become reality, is it possible to achieve the best results on that basis. If the foreseen future is reasonably well understood and if there is relatively little there beyond (to confuse the issue and disturb the mind), the person can go at his immediate objects more or less singlemindedly and thereby achieve the greatest possible measure of success.

A three-four year future sense, with an intellectual level that is unable to work out more of it than a few weeks, will also be lost, and tend to give up and shrug its shoulders (of which the poor whites in this country and America are an example). The short-futured man with a very good intellectually determined image of the time beyond, will, again, tend to trip himself up because his 'reality values' and his 'intellectually determined values' confuse each other.

When we now look at the three-four year futured man we find that, almost accidentally, he has hit the jackpot!

Speculating beyond this period would also have tripped him up, not because his values became confused but because, beyond that time, the variables that are present in any human endeavour will take over to produce a future that cannot be foreseen with reasonable accuracy on the basis of what is known now. On the other hand, the three-four years space is long enough to make him amenable to discipline, and to make him conscientious and provident (within the given time span).

He, too, like all human beings, only obeys for fear of punishment. In his case, however, it is not only the fear of immediate retaliation that drives him. Any punishment or disadvantage he may suffer during the next three-four years will have the same effect on him.

For that reason laziness, lack of discipline, lack of conscientiousness in his work, all of them resulting as they will most likely be doing (within the foreseeable, pre-lived years) in loss of employment, loss of standard of living, loss of friends or loss of respect will carry their punishment in themselves. It is this, and almost only this, that keeps the White man's nose pressed to the grindstone.

It is this that makes him get up at the merciless behest of his alarm clock (for, if he is late too often, he may lose his job, and with it the pre-lived future, the paying off of the house, the holiday at the coast, the new dress, or whatever it is that will be taken away from him - or her). If he has the impulse to be unconscientious, the moment that the boss will have him on the carpet (or the time when, in his business, it will backfire on him) is real enough in his mind to make him cast the temptation aside and to get on with the job as it should be done.

If in all these cases the future should be real to him too far into the time to come, the feeling of: "Ah well - something will probably turn up. Things seldom turn out as bad as they look. Worrying is useless - and why miss something now when the whole thing may collapse anyhow," may take over. This will therefore be an inversion of the short-futured man's "Enough unto the day is the worry thereof," into: "It's no use taking things too seriously now. Who can say what will happen next year?"

The most important point here is that the White man's medium deep, but fairly fully overseeable and integrated future becomes worthwhile in itself. It is not too big to manage and to do something about it. It has a definite goal, the actual achieving of which can be visualised.

What he does not fully realise is that this three-four year stretch of future moves on with him through the years, stimulating him to ever new efforts, like the carrot dangling at the end of the stick on his harness, which makes the donkey keep on trying to get at it and, in the meantime, almost as a by-product, makes him do his work.

Then, at last, when, in middle age, a man realises that a trick has been played on him, he is settled in his ways and his values. He cannot change - or he is afraid to change. The need to keep his place, the need to provide for a still nebulous (but nevertheless visible) old age which may not be real to him as an image in his mind, but which is coming at him from the future and which will hit him hard if he is not prepared for meeting it - rule the rest of his life.

This is not a pleasant and desirable condition. It is certainly not the 'best' way to spend the single life that one is given in order to make the most of it. It is however the way our White man's life is lived. Some of us see it so - but usually too late.

To the 'others' it is foolishness - like the Englishman going out into the midday sun.

On the other hand it produces the results for which the others envy us. It has produced our civilisation, our way of life, but also our industries and, almost incidentally, the gadgets and our 'standard of living'. It has produced all that the others see without realising the price and the lives that are lived in utter slavery (as abject as any the world has ever known), to the tomorrow that never comes.

Always it will need another week, or month or year of service before it materialises, and when old age is there (with possibly a modicum of leisure) the ability to enjoy what we have paid for so dearly, has been lost on the way.

This then is the price we have to pay for our Civilisation. It is a price the 'others' do not see and do not even know about. Yet, without that price, we would not have had our civilisation, our standard of living and our gadgets. And - if we stop paying it, we will not have our civilisation for very much longer.

We are already more and more loth to pay it too. We are removing the power to punish, to discharge and to ruin for bad workmanship and irresponsibility. We have begun to imagine that the world owes us a living (and our children are certainly growing up with that idea in their heads) - but, with the stick losing its threatening aspects, we are also for practical purposes turning into more short-futured people than we really are.

If we now add the 'others' to our number, this degenerating process will take a sudden leap forward. They do not know about the price and, when they hear about it, or feel it acting on them, they will refuse to pay it - they will be congenitally unable to pay it because it makes no sense to them.

What we now see happening in America is the implementation of the choice (and what a Hobson's choice it is!) of letting the others in and thereby accelerating their own collapse (not to mention what they will do when the bill comes in and it is tried to make them pay their share) - or keeping them out, which will lead to a type of civil war which it is too utterly horrible to think about.

The primitive African will accept authority without question as long as he knows that it has adequate power to implement its will. Since the beginning of human time, he has known no other way of life. He has always been under absolute authority, from his father, his local chief and up to the great, half-divine Chief in the royal kraal. He was allowed some authority in his own baliwick and, his master, being human, could possibly be influenced (a system that, by our idealists, has been mistaken for a rudimentary democracy!) - but, the authority, even the power over his life, has always been there.

He therefore has never felt it as an 'injustice'. He has never felt the lack of our vaunted 'freedom'. He could not have felt it as an 'injustice' because that would have meant that from nowhere he would have had to acquire a set of values strange to himself and to everyone else he knew.

But now in America he has been told that he is an equal to everybody else; that there is no difference between him and the feared and (usually) respected White man.

The first reaction to be expected from a relatively primitive mind is to try it out - and not only to try it out, but to invert it. If the White man could push him off the pavement into the gutter - he can do it now to the White man. The idea is entirely logical!

When, however, he gets beaten up for that and when, worse still, the expected and preached equal rights fail to materialise, he has a legitimate grudge which he did not have before.

He now actually has a positive reason to be angry and it is too much to expect that he will be reasonable about it. Almost amusingly naive, that seems to be what the American White man does expect of him! Besides this, the primitive mind interprets all unnecessary giving as a sign of weakness. Each giving in, each concession will have no other effect than initiating another demand - and each demand will become more and more preposterous as the 'demanding' becomes 'instruction to give' and the 'giving' becomes the 'price of his goodwill'. Soon the refusal to give will be a refusal to pay a debt, something that should be punishable by law.

When finally a halt is called, this, to him, will be the last stand of what are already self-confessed cowards. Break it down and all America will be his!

One has but to read some of the statements by the more militant leaders (such as for instance those published in the Jan. 13, 1964 number of 'Life') to see that this is so.

It may be true that 'in private discussions' they are more amenable to reason, but one cannot rouse ten million semi-primitive souls with promises of the millennium and then expect a reasonable solution by means of behind the scenes diplomacy and consultation.

To the outsider this 'reasonableness' of the Black leaders seems no more than a making use of the gullibility of the White man and his instinctive trust in 'words', to give the pot a chance to get boiling really well.

What will happen is naturally anybody's guess.

It does not, however, matter that the Negro is only a 10% of coffee in the American milk. American 'civilisation' is profoundly organised and an 'organisation' is always extremely vulnerable to attack from the inside. Organising means centralisation and exposed communication between 'centres'. It means the presence of key points where whole areas or functions can be paralysed with very little effort.

On the other hand the Negro organisations cannot be banned, or declared illegal or subversive. They are, after all, only trying to implement what everybody, White and Black, has been preaching day and night for the last ten years. Their leaders are half-Whites, intelligent, well-educated men who have been made ready for their part in the White world without having had their 'insides' changed - men who now have a legitimate grudge against broken promises and sharp practices.

One can only imagine what the typical American will do when he finds the situation becoming unbearable, when he finds that his beloved 'American Way of Life' is in danger. It is more than likely that it will take the shape of something to which Sharpeville will be a Sunday picnic.

From there on the development is naturally entirely beyond speculation. One can only remember with horror how the Indian problem was solved by declaring them 'vermin'. Possibly there may finally be the formation of 'Negrostates' in the deserts where, like the Indians before them, the Blacks will be able to degenerate in isolation without troubling the great American Conscience.

On the other hand we may see the eruption of a civil war in which State against State, and States against the federal army, the Whites will murder each other to defend the Negro's eternal right to express himself in his own way.

Anything is possible.

Nevertheless one feels that it will be best for America if before that time comes it has made its peace with Russia (if not with Communism).

The Russians think no more highly of the Negro than the average American - and probably very much less - but the opportunity to interfere in the name of 'humanity' would be simply too God-given to resist.

And what is true of America is true, although to a much lesser degree of England, and to a still lesser degree of France.

What has been imported there in the way of human material is not pure Negro, not pure Black stock, and it has not been indoctrinated for half as long with the ideas of 'equality'. A large part of it is even Indian (and therefore 'very long-futured Aryan' material) but, nevertheless it is alien and the balance on which White civilisation depends is very sensitive.

The outcome will, for a large part, depend upon what happens in America, the encouragement received, the lessons to be learnt (in time?), the things that will be tried out and the bloody noses that will be received and dealt out left and right.

Altogether it is inevitable that the White man will receive a painful lesson in the dangers of trying to outgrow the laws of nature before one has outgrown the animal in oneself.

If he survives, which is fairly likely, he will be at least for a time a badly disillusioned man - disillusioned and dangerous.

We may even see a reversion to the evil days before Democracy, the days of the 'Strong Men' - but whatever happens, Democracy itself can never be the same again. Once its inherent weaknesses have been experienced we will demand safeguards.

It will have to be a 'new' Democracy which will be based upon the openly admitted and accepted principle that the voter must have the ability to vote. It will no longer be a right.

That 'ability' will also need to have its threefold components clearly defined: 'Understanding', 'Maturity of Judgement' and 'Sense of Responsibility'.

The days of the blind counting of heads, no matter what their contents, will be past - and, let us hope, the day of the politicians.

In regard to the not-Whites in our midst, it is possible that our machine age, with its unprecedented ability to produce the necessities of life, can after all enable us to accommodate for their presence and to find valid use for their essentially unsuitable talents so that they too may be able to earn a living in other than 'menial' and purely 'auditorily orientated' employments.

To find a peaceful way of living together on that basis, two miracles will have to occur, however.

In the first place we would have to lose - on both sides of the colour line - our instinctive, racist attitude to miscegenation and to social mixing in general.

In the second place we would not only have to develop a democracy based on ability, but, over and above that, a way of ruling ourselves that would be democratic enough to suit our White mentality but which would at the same time be able to adjust itself to the essentially undemocratic, opportunist mentality of the politicians of the coloured group.

What is more, such a precariously balanced, double system of ruling would have to grow out of the old, without any major attacks of violence from either side - and then to be able to maintain itself. As Chesterton said: "A revolution never establishes a democracy".

Admittedly nothing is impossible but one can at least say that it is improbable - knowing what man is.

If one has read J. P. Chaplin's analysis of the several attacks of mob-hysteria that have swept through the White population of America in "Rumour, Fear, and the Madness of Crowds", (Ballantine Books, 1959) the hope that something like this development will 'grow' without causing yet another such an explosion, seems to be pitifully small. On the other hand, the basic characteristics of the African mind as they have been analysed by Weyl and lately abundantly demonstrated in action in Africa, do not hold out much hope either. The Blacks are masters in the art of provocation and, even more than the White men, they have the tendency to run into mindless mobs.

However - in this development there will be so many factors that it is really bootless to speculate further.

Let us therefore take up the trail which we left at the end of Chapter VII and imagine that our Civilisation will somehow eventually be able to overcome the dangers of this special complication (that has only a superficial resemblance to the admission of 'Barbarians' to the privilege of 'Roman Citizenship' which is to be found at the end of that civilisation).

## CHAPTER XXIII

### *Tomorrow*

It would seem to be the most likely future development, both logically and in accord with the already well-established patterns of history, that our great empires will break up into a heterogeneous collection of little states - in this case probably on the basis of racial affinities.

The policeman, in the shape of the 'Pax Britannica', went home and the British Empire has disappeared as if it never was. It became a 'Commonwealth' that now hardly exists in more than name. (Does anybody still think that, if there was another world war they would all automatically fall in on the one side for instance?)

In England the Scotch and the Welsh are still conscious of not being English and Canada has an indigestion in its 'estomac' that rumbles more loudly every year. The United States are still virtually divided into the 'North' and the 'South', and when there is trouble with the federals, the idea of Secession is never very far from the surface. It could only too easily, under the stress of its Negro policies, disintegrate into the 'Disunited States of America' and the Black Muslims want to add a third part to it. Belgium too has been divided against itself almost from the day of its birth and is hardly more united than it was then - that too may break up in the near future. There has already been serious talk about it.

In this age when, sentimentally speaking, "Everyman has a right to be himself - and to 'live himself out'," it must be that like will find like and band together into 'Nations'.

The official encouragement of 'national aspirations' has been a two-edged sword for, in formulating it, it has been forgotten to define the term "national". The slogan has backfired in Africa and Asia and even into our own homelands - and not only between Whites and not-Whites, but even between Whites and Whites themselves. Not only the Naga and the Kurdish tribesmen have remembered their 'racial' origins. We have done so ourselves and we are also drawing together into 'racial' groups. Everywhere would-be 'leaders' are emerging. Black, White, Yellow, Red, and Brown - men who would lead 'their' people to 'freedom' and their own place in the sun.

At the same time the sneaking doubt and the sense of guilt, the feeling that one does not have the right to deny others the possibility to live 'their own lives' makes the final fragmentation into a swarm of little states almost a foregone conclusion; especially as one certainly no longer feels morally justified in sacrificing one's own young men in an attempt to deny them their wish.

True, there is the almost theoretical concept of the NATO nations, but in practice the reaction to anything that could possibly be to the disadvantage of one of them shows that it is no more than a trading cartel at best. Union, or combination under some form of common government is, surely, no more than a pipe dream.

This cracking up into a multitude of States need not deeply influence our Civilisation, however. Ours has always been a Civilisation of many countries although sometimes the one, sometimes the other may have been on top. Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, England, each has had its turn. At present America is in the seat - but 'unity' (even 'unity of purpose') was never our strong point. We warred among each other as, almost incidentally, we took the world and developed our common Civilisation. It is likely that if it had not been for the arrival of Atomic weapons, we would have burst asunder into a swarm of 'Warring States' some time ago.



Atomic warfare is now only a remote possibility although there will always be the chance that some smaller, irresponsible state (having been given 'the' weapon) will start the grass fire that will put an end not only to White Civilisation but to Humanity itself.

If we do not emaciate ourselves with useless, internecine wars, our Civilisation will, in the 'White pieces' of the mosaic of states, theoretically still be able to survive - but for that to happen for any length of time, there must be more than the theoretical possibility.

A Civilisation is a living thing - or rather, it is a thing that is lived. For it to be lived, the people themselves must feel it worthwhile to do so - they must feel that something is being achieved even if, personally, they do not achieve it.

But what is there left to achieve?

A trip to the moon - or even to Mars - or a colony there?

If half the expense in money and brains necessary for that were to be used to establish a colony in the centre of the Amazon valley, it would be much more comfortable for the colonists and infinitely more advantageous to the rest of us.

Theoretically our machines can do anything that we could wish them to do. The principles are known and it is only the designing and the construction that are needed to have yet another machine on our list. They can already in many respects think - and certainly remember - better than we can.

But is the final aim and object of life, the highest goal that can be achieved, a sessile life among a multitude of machines, robots and gadgets that do every possible thing for us except 'being alive'?

Unhappily for us we can think of nothing else!

If, near perfection having been achieved, a frustrated younger generation with nothing left to do should smash them all up in an iconoclastic outbreak - they too, having our minds, would have no other possible object than to start beginning to build them all up again.

Without something to work for, however, work becomes a Sisyphean task, a laborious imposition. Yet free time and leisure must be used.

It is inevitable, however, that there must be an end to the plots on which our style of play or operetta or book can be built.

Our Science is turning in upon itself and becoming incoherent because, necessarily, it thinks (like we do) in words instead of in ideas. It has come to the point where the 'electron' is attaining a 'personality' that is supposed to 'know' where it is going for no other reason than that we have been convinced that it is impossible for us to know - and, as we think, somebody or something should know!

Mathematics has come to the stage where the existence of its 'words' and its 'laws' are more important than the things that obey its laws so that the 'things' could just as well not be there. They are therefore officially declared to be 'of no importance'.

Our graphic arts have certainly reached the limits of the bizarre up to which even a credulous public can accept it as 'Art'. Having discovered the truth of the old dictum that 'Beauty lies in the eyes of the beholder', the Artist has eliminated himself and restricted his function to that of convincing others that the 'art' produced by bicycles, monkeys, babies, computers and pure accidental happenstances is

beautiful. Music, after exploring the profundities of atonal noises, has only something 'new' to give us in the varied, jungle rhythms of Bop and Rock and what have you.

Soon there will be nothing 'new' at all. And how can one go on reading the same stories, hearing the same 'news', eating the same foods, playing the same games, - and doing the same work, day in, day out, year in, year out?

Life will congeal about us.

There will be nothing worthwhile to do.

The important point here is, however, that this is only true for us. It is only true for those who have the three-four year time span in which to live against the background of the thirty years that have, for us, a certain validity.

We, but only we, are bound to that time extent. Within that span we must achieve something or - it is 'wasted'!

In our Civilisation we have come to a point which is something like that when the individual arrives at middle age.

We have begun to realise that whatsoever we achieve within the time span that has been important to us, is not important.

We have not the short-futured man's direct contact with reality and the pleasure at direct enjoyment of what is there. Everything we enjoy, we enjoy with an eye on the future. To us the moment is evanescent. We are too aware of the fact that it will be gone before we have grasped it. But tomorrow will most certainly come. Our values lie in tomorrow - and, alas, not in Eternity.

We need permanency in our values. They must be anchored in the future, for us to appreciate them. And now we have begun to realise that there is no special value in anchoring them in the relatively near future that is real to us. Anchoring them in the Eternity which we cannot make part of ourselves is, however, also impossible.

We are the 'inbetweens' that miss both sources of contentment now that we have fully explored the regions available to us. As long as there was something to achieve there, as long as we could fight and think and strive and feel that we were going somewhere, life was worthwhile and good in itself.

Most of this is gone now. Within the time that is available to our Temporealisation, there is nothing much to gain, and what we can do there is obviously not much value in relation to the Eternity in which it floats.

We have been cheated. The goal is within reach and, as always, only the striving towards the goal was worthwhile. All our lives we have lived with spurious values.

And it is the thinking part of our youth who suffer most. We still had our time of illusions, but our present young have sensed that saturation point is being reached. They are aware that for 'inbetweens' like us there can no longer be a meaning to life.

One needs but to read the words and sayings of those who, among them, are articulate. One can read it in their attitudes, in the quasiphilosophy of the 'Wild Ones', the 'Angry Young Men' and the Beatniks. The hamper is empty and our generation has already scraped the bottom.

There is nothing left.

Not even religion can help for we are essentially areligious and materialistic. Our Gods, where they still exist, are half way between the almost too human Gods of the Greeks and the Eternal Gods of the East who are not very interested in the crawlings and cravings of the human herd.

Our Gods are still interested in 'national aspirations' like Mr. Dulles. They judge us by the purity of our 'democratic principles' like the United Nations. They can be cheated like a rather foolish father and cajoled like an indulgent mother. They can be hurt and angered by what we do and say and think. They are not 'Gods' but 'Supermen' serving no higher purpose than to tie us to an Eternity which we cannot really understand or feel as 'being there'. The intellectuals among us have discovered that 'God is dead' - and the others have split Him into thousands of personal gods - a 'god' for every sect and for every nation. We feel no blasphemy in saying "My God is not your god."

And, deep down, we know that this cannot be so, for if it was the whole thing would have absolutely no meaning at all.

Again, this is only so for us because we are congenitally unable to accept either the short-futured or the long-futured man's God.

The short-futured man's God is simply there like a benevolent father - or an angry one - and he does not feel the need to bother about any 'Eternal' implications in His existence. That has no meaning for him.

Life is directly real to him and has its problems in itself. We can only see him enjoying it or battling with it within his short time span and finding his joys and his sorrows within it without an afterthought. We smile, or sneer, and deep down we heave an envious sigh, like that which one has for the things that are important and all-engrossing to a child or to the very young.

Unlike ours, that short-futured man's view can never clog up and lose its meaning because his world does not even have a meaning. It does not need one. Things are always happening in his world, and as long as the body is healthy and want does not make it unpleasant, it can be continually enjoyed.

Our medium future, being a future, must have a 'meaning', but it must have its meaning within itself and now, having come to the end of it, we know more and more surely that there is none.

On the other hand we cannot be like the very long-futured ones who live in an Eternity, and, knowing that they cannot grasp it, are content to leave its meaning to itself; somewhat like the Roman Catholic who leaves the difficult aspects of religion to his church and is content to find personal peace under its wing, not even bothering to ask how it is that the men who rule his church can know anything more about Eternity than he knows himself.

Both the extreme qualities that make men unfit to live in a democracy therefore go to provide a kind of happiness and sense of security that we will never know! Here too we are the 'inbetweens'. We are the 'blessed' Democrats!

When at last everything has been done, when we become tired of making ever new machines, new robots, and new gadgets, the Great Boredom will come over us and we will either die or seek relief in senseless viciousness.

In the meantime, unnoticed (or if noticed not prevented, because it is not worth it), the 'others' will have taken the keypoints of our degenerate Political system, which to them will be 'new' and 'interesting' and an open sesame to what is immediately enjoyable, no matter what the ultimate consequences may be.

They will also have infiltrated into our artisandom for they do not lack intelligence and most of it will have become standardised and possible to acquire by rote. They too will be able to replace part Tk/mo 528 by part Tk/mo 528 and they also will not know what to do when the part is no longer available because the central store has stopped making them, due to a 'clerical error'.

Peacefully, or in several convulsive upheavals, that part of the world which we now know as specially our own, will fall into the hands of the 'Strong Men', White, Black or any of the colours in between. In the end there will be very little difference between the countries that were ours and those that belonged to the others - except in the nature of their people.

The sea of humanity will be one ungently heaving expanse, waiting, as in the Middle Ages, for a new civilisation to start on its meteoric career 'upwards'.

The 'seed' of Western man will be scattered, for in him he still will have the gift to see things as external realities and to handle them as such. In him will be the preponderance of the visual image, a three dimensional world ruled by the laws of perspective and the laws of cause and effect (because everything in it is there where it is, and can get to no other place other than moving there, impelled by a definite force).

He will retain the instinctive ability to invent, make and run machines and fully integrated organisations.

No social or political degeneration will be able to rob him of what is part of his personal brain-structure.

And he will be needed. He will be a prize possession!

All the nations, all the Strong Men of this 'inbetween' world will have a herd of White men, slaves or free, pampered individuals or held to forced labour, according to the nature of their 'bosses'. They will run the factories for them and produce at command whatever is needed. They will build dams and run lines of communication, organise and drill armies and state departments. They will also probably be in demand as bodyguards for there will still be the strain of loyalty in them to a 'Master' who pays well.

One will find them in the position of advisers like the court physicians and astrologers of old.

Much of this is already in evidence. One sees them already now in 'key' positions everywhere, drawing fantastic salaries, often in danger too when things go wrong or when they become involved in political intrigues.

It is hardly to be doubted that the future will, in general, be some variation of the above. The descendants of our race will live on, themselves more or less diluted down in the process till, except for certain 'nests', they will be hardly distinguishable from the rest.

The genes' will mix, dominant characteristics will regress and vice versa - as they have done with our 'blood groupings' from which racial origins can no longer be deduced.

Finally our 'medium-future sense' will disappear as a characteristic and only the dominantly 'visual' inner world will be the hallmark of the White descendant. In a rather amusing way we will still be the 'salt of the earth'!

All this is, however, conditional upon the delay of the appearance of a new civilisation on the scene.

## CHAPTER XXIV

### *The Day after Tomorrow*

There is absolutely no reason to think that our civilisation will be the last to astound and to horrify the world by its appearance on the scene.

There must still be many surprises in store for poor humanity and we must expect these surprises to be mostly unpleasant. It should not be forgotten that although we in our hearts, think of ourselves as the final perfection of humanity (don't we think that the others should develop 'up' to our level?), we have been to most of the world a rather dreadful phenomenon and a scourge. To many we still are.

Our bleached appearance has not helped to improve that impression very much. We struck and we still strike the rest of the world with the same kind of instinctive disgust that we feel for an albino. Our naturally light hair; our, to them, almost colourless eyes which encircle a pupil that in those of the others, is hardly visible; our aggressive, loutish bent to try out our physical prowess against all comers; our mysterious way of thinking and our seemingly mad way of acting; our proven and inexplicable immunity against the dark powers of Taboo and established prohibitions; our devilish ingenuity when it comes to manipulating the world of existing things and - coupled with that - our boorishness and utter lack of tact - in short, all of what we are, is enough to make the hackles of any 'normal' human being rise; enough to send the prickles of fear and disgust down his spine.

Even so, when some day we have subsided back into the mass of humanity - the newcomers, the new Civilisation when it arises, will undoubtedly again cause a feeling of horror in the world, just as we did when we erupted from Europe a few hundred years ago.

Something that we cannot understand, something that we cannot fight and which works differently from what all our life we have learnt to accept as 'normal', is not only fear-inspiring, it is hideous, horrible and hateful.

As we have seen, each Civilisation is the result of the development of some new characteristic, some new ability, some new way of seeing things, which makes its possessors invulnerable - or at least irresistible.

It is obviously impossible to predict what form the to-be-expected new eruption will take. There is, however, no doubt that its members will have other powers and new gifts which will give them a completely different outlook on life from that which we have. Their values will not be our values. They will have different morals, and possibly another logic, as incomprehensible to us as our 'dynamic' thinking in Space and Time would be to the Greeks, if they could come back and see what we have done with the world.

Things will be true and even self-evident to these people that are not, and cannot be, true to us. They will be entirely incomprehensible to us, able to trump all our aces and to parry all our thrusts. They will laugh at our ideals and principles as being childish - and what will be most terrible about that will be that they will be proved to be right!

Everywhere we are already running up against the end of our own possibilities, butting our heads against imponderables, invisible barriers and mutually exclusive truths. We find this to be so in our Science, in our Philosophy, in our Politics, Economics and Religion. Everywhere - when one has struggled through to the end the confusion is worse than that with which one started. Each question which Science has answered has spawned a dozen more that now need to be faced.

It is difficult to accept that this is not due to the inherent mystery which resides in the things themselves, but that it is the result of a mistake, or a failing in our way of thinking. And yet it must be so.

We imagine that we lack a few of the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle and that when we have found them, the solution will be there before us. This is not the way it is. They are all there but we just lack the ability to see where they fit in (like one who fails in that part of our intelligence tests). We are like a two-dimensional person who is not able to 'see' the forest which, to him, is no more than an area where there are a number of circular places into which he cannot enter.

However that may be, and even though we cannot know the future, it still is interesting to speculate about it. If nothing else, it will give us a better insight into where and how our thinking has gone wrong or, at least, failed us.

Our main weakness, which we have already mentioned in passing, lies in giving too much value to the 'word-containers' in which we place our ideas and concepts for ease of storage and handling.

Very rarely is an idea fully defined at its outer margins. It may be surprising, but even such a simple word as 'chair' has no clearly defined contents, not only as to what is a 'chair' and what not, in regard to its shape, but also as to material, function and at what point in its manufacture it suddenly is 'a' chair.

Yet we use the 'word' chair as if it indicates a fully defined something. When doubts arise we argue about the question of whether something is a 'chair', and not about what we mean when we 'call' something a chair.

If we do that with 'things' and their 'names', how much more must we do it with our abstract ideas?

As it is, all - or practically all - our word concepts overlap and invade each other's domains. The result is that each word contains elements from others that are not essential to its meaning but which are still there as 'qualities' of the subject indicated. In doing so they confuse the issue, for another failing of ours is to take the part for the whole.

If we take 'Democracy' for instance, it means a system of 'Ruling by the Demos'.

We do not bother to define this 'Demos', even though we should know that we give it an entirely different meaning from what it had in Greece where Democracy, as in the South Africa of today, ruled in a 'segregated' community with 'job reservation'!

However, to have a Democracy, it is almost inevitable that one has to have some kind of a system of voting. This voting is not an essential part of the concept Democracy - it is merely a means to an end. Nevertheless, to us 'Democracy' has come to be recognised only by 'one-man-one-vote' elections, at regular, stated intervals. If a people should wish to rule themselves by means of one man whom they trust, they are not a 'Democracy'. If they rule themselves by a thousand men of only one of whom each individual citizen has knowledge, that is 'Democracy'.

One can feel how the 'word' has run away with its own meaning.

The same is, to an even more interesting degree, true of our Science.

A whole theory of Light has been built upon the concept 'ray'; yet no scientist would venture to estimate the diameter of such a 'ray' of light. It 'vibrates' like a violin string, but no scientist would dare to state the actual width of these 'vibrations'.

There is a hole here in our understanding but we go merrily on because we have a 'word' for it. And, as we go on, we absorb into our thinking more and more of the qualities of the 'visible ray' which shines through a small hole in the shutters into a darkened, dusty room.

This tripping up of our Western Scientific thinking over its own words is a subject in itself. It can only lightly be touched upon here but those who have been in contact with it will be able to recognise a similarity with one of the 'faults' of Greek thinking, which prevented them from proceeding any further than their cast of mind allowed.

They could only conceive of movement in straight lines and perfect circles. As the planets did not seem to move in perfect circles, they invented the 'Epicycle' in which the planet moved in a perfect circle around a point that, itself, was supposed to move in a perfect circle around the earth. When that did not explain the whole movement, they conceived the 'epicycle within the epicycle' and made the planet move in a perfect circle around a point that moved in a perfect circle around another point that moved in a perfect circle around the earth. This had to be so because in their thinking, there actually was no other possibility. In the end Ptolemy had a collection of more than 50 epicycles, each inoculated upon the other, before he was satisfied.

Something like this is now happening to us in our modern atomic theory. We are very nearly at the point where we have as many 'particles' in our 'nucleus' as Ptolemy had epicycles to his planetary orbits - and this for no other reason than that our visual mind simply cannot think in any other way than in 'particles'.

It is realised by our scientists that all that we can actually measure of these particles is the 'quantum of energy' which has an effect on our photographic plates and is affected by our magnetic fields. We have no direct evidence for the existence of the particles (as particles) at all, but the need to visualise them in that way makes our image of the atomic nucleus resemble a well-filled snooker table.

This visualising in particles, however, demands that the particles that are knocked out of the nucleus must have been there in the first place. The possibility that there was no more than a structured mass of energy from which different bombardments knock different amounts and configurations of energy is probably the correct solution but our mind cannot really 'visualise' such a situation. It is too complicated. We cannot visualise energy that is distributed in a pattern in what may turn out to be multidimensional space and we will have to wait for a new civilisation, with a new mental capacity to handle it.

It is somewhat chastening to think that they will smile at our 'billiard ball particles' just as we smile at the Grecian 'epicycles'.

They may even be generous enough to call ours a "stout effort"!

On the other hand we can console ourselves with the thought that, even if we one day look slightly dull and backward to the future wielders of the torch of civilisation, it is possible that (like the deeper core of Asian philosophies, in relation to our almost materialistic Metaphysics and Religions) we may, inside, still be nearer to some kind of Eternal Verity than they will be. Who can know?

There is no reason, except in wishful thinking, to suppose that our development is towards a 'perfection', or that as we like to say we are 'progressing', and that the 'new' is 'better' than the 'old'. 'Backward' need not, a priori, be a valid term of opprobrium!

After all, the Dinosaurs may well have claimed that in growing ever bigger, they were becoming more and more 'perfect'. It may be true that they were becoming more and more perfect Dinosaurs but that did



not stop reality from throwing them all into the dustbin of time when they came to the limits of their 'perfection'.

There is, and there can be, no standard for the measurement of 'higher or lower', 'better or worse', and, in the final count, human happiness is the only criterion by which we can presume to judge.

Contentment and Distress, Joy and Pain, Satisfaction and Frustration are common to all living things above the plants.

It is for this reason that the man who looks down upon the 'dirty' aborigine is a fool. The 'black sod' is not our equal, but neither are we his equals. Who will say if his happiness is 'less worthy' than ours?

Seen from this point of view, it really does not matter much what exactly the next Civilisation is going to be like.

But it still remains interesting to think about it.

We can, for instance, imagine a race of telepaths who will be invincible and revolting because they would know what their opponents thought. All subterfuges would be useless against them. They would, of necessity, also be without any illusions about their fellow-men, but at the same time, they would have the inestimable compensation that they could join together in 'concerts' of silent communion, finding joy and togetherness unknown and unknowable to us. 'Love' will be a melting of the inner beings together into one, and 'Hatred' a directly felt, nearly physical flame of pain and danger.

We would quail before their all-knowing eyes which would be able to look into the furthest corners of our mean little souls - tugging out truths from behind our childish little pretexts.

We can, again, imagine a race of people with perfect infallible memories. Such men would be able to analyse out, from what we ourselves would have forgotten long ago, the evidence for the little lies we are in the habit of telling. A lie that would be able to convince them would truly have to be a supreme piece of craftsmanship!

Such minds would also be able to oversee the whole of human knowledge and experience, which to us has become so unwieldy that even our best brains can hope to cope with no more than one small minor detail. They would therefore, not lose contact (like we do) between the various sciences and thereby alone they would be able to discover new truths. They would become aware of basic discrepancies before they had distorted the thinking of the 'specialists' who are (among us) enclosed, each in the personal narrow room of his own 'speciality'.

All this would be child's play to people with perfect memories and they would be horrible to us.

Again, we can conceive of a race of men in whom the possibilities seen by John Donne in 'An Experiment with Time' had become realised. A race with a more or less perfect image of the near future would be invincible and dreadful to us. They would have an entirely different conception of life and reality, a conception which it would be impossible for us to understand, to emulate or to which to adjust ourselves.

But we need not go to such extremes.

Science-fiction writers have already worked out a whole series of worlds in which the special characteristics of gifts of the people gave necessary configurations or structures to their way of life.

They serve no other purpose than to give us a more balanced view on the validity of the values of our own world and to make us realise that everything is merely relative.

There is one other possibility, however, which must be looked into as it is a possibility which may make an end to our peaceful degeneration and our sinking, unsung, back into the matrix of humanity.

This possibility lies in the 'exception' which has cropped up all through our analysis - namely: the Japanese.

Among all the 'others' they are the only ones who have been able to come to our centres of learning and culture, to absorb what they considered that they could use, and to make that really their own without changing in themselves.

They are the only ones who have been able to take from us what they needed and to remain who they were.

All the others returned to their homelands either as cheap imitations of the White man, strange to both us and to their own people - or as violent anti-Whites, filled with an almost rabid hatred of the Whites whom they could not equal or who would not accept them as equals.

Nothing like that troubled the Japanese. They went home and built up an industrial and economic structure, mostly on our lines, but soon with more and more improvements of their own.

Already now it is outpointing us in several aspects.

They have also adopted the Western style of dress, not because they wanted to be like us, but because it was more practical and safe, especially in the proximity of machines. At home, it comes off, however, like an overall, and they revert to their traditional way of life.

There can be no doubt that the Japanese world too is a 'visual' three-dimensional one.

One could have deduced that from one of their favourite hobbies; their ingenious wooden put-together puzzles which demonstrate not only a visual, but an accurate three-dimensional image of space. Some of their puzzles even have an almost four-dimensional quality in that the 'time' of the solving movements becomes important.

Another indication is that, in the fifteenth century, their art already begins to show a 'depth' not to be found in any non-Western art. In some prints it is even somehow more profound and 'real' than in our own.

But that the Japanese have this quality would, at best, mean no more than that they could become an 'extension' of our Western Civilisation possibly by being the next holder of the chair after America had lived itself out or throttled itself in its struggles with the Negro problem in its intestines.

The Japanese however is a totally different person from a Western one (however much we may differ from each other within the group). He is not an egotist. He is basically a 'member of a hive' and very much more a detail in the pattern of his race than the Russian or the Chinese is.

What that means can possibly be best understood by considering a few of his characteristics.

Firstly there is his Shintoism, which is a 'religion' that culminates in an Emperor, who (despite the democratic veneer which the American occupation has left on the Japanese political system) is still at

least semi-divine if no longer fully so. And, unlike his African counterpart, this Emperor is not divine because of the fear he instills in his subjects.

To the Japanese, religion and politics are essentially one, and every man is a part of it all. He is not just 'ruled by priests and statesmen'.

He has the 'very long-futured' quality of the East, with the visual understanding of the West, a particularly effective combination as, because of that, he has the abilities of the West together with the dedication to an Eternal pattern that we lack.

We have but to remember the Kamikaze; those that found glory in purposely dying for their Emperor and their Japan. Our men also died - but only in 'fights', however hopeless. There were no queues for the honour of going on a suicide mission among us. We accepted the 'necessity' and even then there was always the possibility that one would get away with it - or that one would be taken prisoner - or 'something'.

And where it concerns suicides, the act of Hara Kiri demonstrates in the most expressive way possible that, to the Japanese, his public image, his place in society, and his honour is far more valuable than his individual life.

He, unlike us, does not commit suicide from disgust and despair about life but, inversely, because he does not consider himself worthy of it.

There are also the 'Banzai!!' attacks by the Japanese troops. Admittedly they were foolish and resulted in unnecessary loss of life but they show an attitude of mind; the real wish to die for the Emperor. When the Japanese soldier goes to war his family consider him to be 'dead'. He has been 'given' to the Emperor.

This spirit is, however, not only apparent in political and military contexts. There is for instance the (to us) strange loyalty that the Japanese worker has for his employer.

Not so long ago a commission of American business men went over to find out what the 'trick' was!

All they could find was that the Japanese employer had a similar loyalty to his workers.

On the basis of 'all men are equal' that could only mean that as the American employees were not loyal to their employers, the fault must lie with the latter who were not loyal to their employees!

The simple solution that the Japanese employers and their employees seemed to be 'loyal to each other' because both were part of a system, a pattern of living, which they both considered more important than their own immediate advantages, would naturally not occur to the Americans who saw the Japanese as small, yellow-skinned, slit-eyed Americans.

What such a singularly devoted, integrated and visually gifted nation can do, we have already learnt, to our surprise, and discomfiture in the last war.

What they will do is another question for they do not think as we do. It may be that the painful memory of their personal acquaintance with the effects of the atom bomb will have shown them that economical and industrial superiority, gained peacefully, is to be preferred to a military overlordship which will cost millions of lives.

There should also be a particular satisfaction for them in beating us at our own game.

On the other hand, if one of us, irritated by being beaten, should in the way that has always been characteristic of us, take to violence to demonstrate and 'prove' his 'superiority', one can imagine that the world will start to hum as the aroused swarms of retaliation leave their hive in the Pacific.

We have always visualised the 'Yellow Peril' as coming from China.

That idea is essentially false. The Chinese has no very clear 'visual' world image. Running machines, and certainly designing and making them, is not his strong point and waging modern war needs the ability to handle machines.

The Chinese, also, although he can take discipline and makes an excellent soldier as the British officers of the troops at Wei Hai Wei could testify, is incapable of ruling. At present China is a headless colossus whose lower gangliae are having trouble in keeping it alive.

Next to it, on the islands just off its coast, there live a people who are not only capable of submitting to discipline but infinitely more capable of ruling. They are an almost naturally provided 'head' for the Chinese colossus.

The history of China also shows several examples of periods of great prosperity and culture during their periods of subjugation by 'barbarians' who became its 'head'.

We may have another example of this somewhere in the future and this one will certainly be one to reckon with!

A completely, almost fanatically devoted Japanese 'brain', with visual understanding, mastery over machines, the ability to take decisions and organise down into the finest details, placed on the 'perfect' body of some hundreds of millions of Chinese who can obey, who are perfect in the art of copying and who have little personal fear of death, would make a war-machine such as the world has never yet seen.

One would therefore think that, unless we learn not to provoke the Japanese into finding their 'body', it will eventually become preferable to risk a general atomic disintegration rather than what would prove to be a kind of slavery that we would be unable to take.

We can only hope that this will not come to pass and anyway - we need not really worry.

The mill of History grinds, not only very fine, but also exceedingly slowly.

And was it not John Bennet who wrote:

*"A hundred years from now, dear heart,  
We shall not care at all . . . "*

## APPENDIX 1

### *And What of South Africa?*

As we, in South Africa, occupy an almost unique position in this transverse section of world history of our time (especially in relation to the problem of the survival of the White man) it has been thought best

to leave the discussion of our personal difficulties and heart-searchings to an appendix. In the general text it would have been dispersed and have served no other purpose than to confuse the argument.

Our racial (or 'racist') policies and attitudes, our discrimination and our Apartheid cause a continuous spray of epithets like 'despicable', 'disgusting', 'nauseating' and 'not worthy of a civilised nation' to rain down upon our unrepentant heads.

There are also those who are more reserved in their judgement, probably because they happen to remember that, scarcely a generation ago, the principles and policies for which we are now being pilloried were those of the whole world and actually the basic foundation on which a large part of the prosperity of the West has been built.

Even these moderate critics, however, still make a point of condemning Apartheid (of the meaning of which they have no inkling) and say that we are 'backward', 'retarded stick-in-the-muds' who had better wake up and begin to 'move with the times' before it is too late.

Where, however (as is being demonstrated more and more by the troubles that are breaking out everywhere), the world itself - in 'Moving with the times' - is like a herd of bemused lemmings careering down the slopes into a sea of disintegration and confusion, a sensible man should at least have the right to ask why he should run along, bedamn!

We could very well have started this appendix with the first verse of Kipling's "If...":

“If you can keep your head when all about you  
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,  
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,  
But make allowance for their doubting too;  
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,  
Or, being lied about, don't deal in lies,  
Or, being hated, don't give way to hating,  
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise;  
...You'll be a Man. My son!”

This little poem would have been almost as suspiciously apt as the so-called 'slanted' news from our S.A.B.C. if it had not been that it actually expresses the attitude and the ideals of the previous generation before this 'new morality' appeared from nowhere.

It is not surprising therefore that Kipling has lost a large part of his following among the 'little men' of this 'new world' of ours.

To think that any intelligent, civilised man could have been so blind and, at the same time, have claimed that his disgusting and distorted ideas could define a 'Man', must seem foolish, to those who would have all men be equal at all costs. It is a prime characteristic of the little man that he wants to conform and not to do any of the dreadful things that Kipling's Man would do.

And yet the proof of the pudding must, to some extent at least, always lie in the eating thereof.

Keeping to the bad old rules, South Africa has, despite all the prophesies of doom, developed an upsurge of prosperity almost unequalled anywhere (except possibly in Germany and Japan, both countries where discipline is 'rampant'). The critics are now consoling themselves with the idea that this must be only a sham and that it cannot last long, etc. etc.

And this might have been so if our development had been 'forced' in any way.

Quite to the contrary however, it has come upon us, almost despite ourselves. We find it difficult to keep up with it instead of having desperately to push it along to keep it going. Sometimes we run out of breath and sit down by the wayside, letting opportunities go by.

Furthermore, with our almost ludicrously small police force (compared to those in the countries of almost any of our critics) and a three to one not-White population, we have infinitely less trouble - although admittedly not less crime - than any of them.

Considering the amount of money and energy that is being spent in actually fomenting trouble here; considering the moral support given by 'world opinion' to our subversive elements, who in most of the sponsoring countries would be summarily executed or at least put away for life, it is really no wonder that they think that we must be a police state.

People always have a habit of judging others by themselves and, from their reactions, one can only conclude that if their countries were placed under such a stress, they know that only the institution of a police state could possibly save them.

The natural conclusion that we must be viciously repressing our 'majorities' is understandable. In their eyes, what we say simply cannot be true, and we should have patience with them.

Having this in mind, it was extremely amusing to follow the developments in the 'Carpio Affair'. The poor man never had a chance. He simply did not dare to tell what he had seen.

As far as we are concerned however, the question is if it is in any way 'wrong' or 'sinful' or even 'backward', for us to dig in our heels and to refuse to 'move with the times' by joining in the rout.

Strangely enough the strongest moral support we could have here has been given by the new nations to the north of us. Although they are our most vociferous critics they are also not moving with the times and, if anything, they are moving backward to the time before we came here. They have inverted White Apartheid into Black Apartheid and made a mockery of their democracies after the one-man-one-vote initial elections had put the new autocrats in the saddle.

To a calm observer the reason for the vituperative criticism of our refusing to move with the times is that we refuse to move with the other White nations. We are not producing the great bonanza for the Black 'leaders-of-their-people' that they have, by now, come to expect from us.

It is not that we refuse to move with the times but that we refuse to lie down, that we refuse to pay blackmail and refuse to consider appeasement like the others. We are showing them up - and that could endanger the permanence of the flow from other quarters. Hence the hatred.

To any intelligent person it should be obvious that our attitude here must be that they should first demonstrate that they can govern themselves, at least something like a civilised nation should, without Black apartheid, without handouts to keep them going, without white men in key positions (to, unobtrusively, still 'rule' them) and without any white soldiers to help their autocrats stay on their rickety thrones.

They have, all of them, now been given the chance to show what they can do, to show that they are really "any time as good as we are" and there is no reason, no reason at all, for them to be so hasty about wanting us to throw ourselves and the Blacks who are still in our care (and, at present, certainly no worse off than theirs) into the melting pot.

What they have had to show us up to now merely serves to demonstrate that, in that case, we would be committing suicide. Although it may, as our 'idealists' say, be 'inevitable' that we will some day go under, only a coward commits suicide because some day he may lose his life, or die in a battle.

Let them, as even some of our own more intelligent Blacks are beginning to say, concentrate on coming up to scratch in the first demands that freedom places on the shoulders of a 'Man'. Let them show that they have begun to realise, and that they are willing to face up to the fact that 'being free' is much more difficult (and dangerous even) than being 'slaves'.

Let them show that they can handle that danger and that task.

When that has been done we may have to change our ideas, but certainly not before. Only when in that case we remain obdurate, will it be legitimate to criticise us.

In the meantime we have no reason for complacency.

That they are wrong does not mean that we are right.

And only if we are completely right will it be possible to survive these troublous times, for only then can we be sure that our 'cause is just'.

It is not an axiom that White Civilisation must, or even can be saved.

Here the main reason which makes our White brothers criticise us is that they are congenitally burdened with the idea that it is degrading to be a servant, that is: 'to obey another man'.

This attitude is the outcome of their being the descendants of the old egotists of Western Europe. In the old days that characteristic gave rise to the universal urge to do battle in order to be the 'master'.

Paradoxically, but understandably, it has now led to the little man's outlawing all masters.

Because everyone cannot be a master, nobody will be allowed to be one; and in consequence anybody who pretends to personal ruling rights is below criticism - a dirty dictator - a so-called 'superman' ha-ha ... etc.

At the same time the little man imagines how he would feel if he was one of the subjected group and that makes him foam at the mouth!

That anybody could be so degenerate as to be content, and even happy, to be a servant does not even occur to him.

And yet, on two counts he is wrong.

In the first place he is a servant himself, and he is a more abject servant than the real servant usually is.

In the second place this instinctive aversion to serving is a characteristic peculiar to his race and fundamentally not, or only rarely, to be found among the others.

The White man is a complete slave of his social and economic position, of his boss in the office, or the overseer in the workshop, of the State and of the red-tape system that rules almost every detail of his life, if not with a 'rod of iron' then at least with 'bands of steel' that he cannot break. The only difference

between his slavery and the one that gives him goose-flesh is that it is impersonal. Even his boss is but the mouthpiece of the company. The little man can therefore fool himself into thinking that he is free and that no man can order him around. The universal master is never impersonated in such a form that the little man is made to feel that his will is subject to that of another man and that is what he hates - not the serving itself.

On the other hand, the not-White has never known any other social structure than one in which there were masters and servants - those with authority and those who obey. For him all these things are impersonated in men.

To the not-White it is essentially the normal way of life. The ideal is not to be free (that is a fata morgana which we have projected into their lives and through which they are now wandering off into the desert). The basic ideal is to have a master who is both reasonably considerate and high enough in rank and riches to allow one to participate in both without having the trouble of being responsible for the upkeep of either.

The idea that a 'master' is, or claims to be a 'superior' being and that the 'servant' is, or must be, 'inferior' is essentially erroneous of which Sam Weller was already very well aware.

We have been shown by life that there must be masters and servants (in however complicated a way we like to disguise this from ourselves) and we know that the combination is essential for the continued existence of a community.

We also know that good masters cannot be good servants and, what is still more important, that good servants usually make bad masters.

There is an old proverb that says that he who mirrors himself in others flatters himself.

That those to the north of us make a Demockery out of their heritage from the dear departed White Man does not give us the right to do the same.

Our White consciences, and not the illogical and often farcical world opinion, should be our guide and we must base our concepts and deeds on reality and its understanding - not on sentimental slogans bred in another age and under other circumstances.

What then are the basic truths among which we must find a solution, a compromise and a way of living together, while permitting each other at least a reasonable place in the sun?

In the first place, three quarters of our citizens are Black. Most, if not all of them are short-futured people, living each in a world which is predominantly auditory and only secondarily visual in nature.

Most, if not all of them therefore have the qualities, both good and bad, both admirable and disturbing, of the short-futured people we have described under that heading. They are therefore also, as a whole, only governable by autocratic means (as has been demonstrated, and even admitted openly, up north). Our Western organisation of economical and industrial relationships is only secondarily understandable to them. They can fit into it only by applying learnt routines. They cannot (as a group at least) take part in a positive organising and running of it because, essentially, it is not built upon the qualities of their type of mind.

It has also been demonstrated almost (if not totally) without exception, that they only work well in it under supervision. In that case they can often be exceptionally good at their work - better than the equivalent Whites.



One can take it that anyone who has actually worked with them and tried to help them to adjust themselves to earning a living in our Western way of life, will have to agree that this a fair (if not even too optimistic) summing up of their experiences.

Only those who had rather not face unpleasant truths - those who prefer to listen to propaganda aimed at wishfulfilment and who attend multiracial gatherings where they obtain at the same time the confirmation of their escapist dreams and the thrill of being somewhat naughty' boys and girls - will deny the above analysis.

On the other side there is one quarter of our population that is European, or Western - a typical transverse section of almost all the sub-races that constitute Western Man.

These people have the Western way of life in their blood as is demonstrated everywhere - in our booming industries, in our social life and in the almost fantastic freedom given to our press and our politicians (despite occasional grumblings from above and from the opposite side).

It almost would seem as if anything short of active subversion is permitted, even if it is frowned upon. The way in which we battle (often successfully) against the encroachments on personal liberties that, to some of us, seem to be necessary (where we are living virtually in a strange kind of cold war), is itself a symptom of a living and vital Democracy that constantly adjusts itself in an attempt to try and find the line between 'constraint' and 'licence' which is the quality of true freedom.

It therefore seems to be that in those parts of our country where the populations are mixed, there must be an unsolvable deadlock.

As usual the Greeks had a word for it and they called it "Democracy".

In Greek Democracy there was a democracy among the Greeks and an authoritarian rule of the rest.

What we have in South Africa at present is essentially such a Greek Democracy. And under it, remarkably enough, each section is therefore ruled according to its own nature.

The Whites have a democracy as valid and as conscious of the 'rights' of its citizens as any to be found in the world. The Blacks have an autocracy which is in no way more oppressive than that under which their northern brothers have found that they must live if they want to survive.

The only difference is that our Blacks did not have the privilege of installing the autocrat by the one glorious occasion of the one-man one-vote election that set him on his way. The autocrat here had already been given the power over him and he had nothing to say about who it should have been.

This, a few years ago, would have been mere theory and possibly offensive to those who believed in the equality of men and the dream that any people, given the choice, would choose Democracy and guard it as a treasure.

Now, with the almost immediate and seemingly inevitable autocratisation of every democracy that is established in the newly liberated and meticulously 'constitutionalised' countries, this idea is losing much of its erstwhile glamour. The question therefore becomes whether the Black man prefers a Black autocrat above a White one. There is, alas, no other choice for him.

The answer to that is being sought for in our experiment with the Bantustans.

We, the Whites, will never consent to live under anything but a Democracy., and we naturally refuse to let the choice between a Democracy and an Autocracy depend upon a counting of heads especially when the overlarge part of those heads cannot possibly realise what actually is at stake - besides being defenceless against conscienceless propaganda and intimidation.

Forcing the Black man to remain under the White Autocrat would however also be wrong because, as we should know, ruthless suppression is bound to cause an explosion sooner or later.

Therefore the Black man is being given a choice - and it is this:

"If you want to partake, as much as you can, of the advantages of our Western civilisation, of our higher standard of living, our possibly hard but still not arbitrary laws, - in short, if you want to try and find your place among us, you must accept our White Man's rule.

"The Democracy which we practise is sufficiently well taken care of by us who know how to live it, to see to it that you will also be given a fair share.

"If you insist on having a Black man as your ruler - we are setting aside your traditional homelands for that purpose.

"You cannot have it both ways. You cannot have the advantages without carrying your part of the burden.

"Integrating you into our Western system, as has been demonstrated over and over again by your brothers up north, with almost monotonous repetition, would end in destroying both our Democracy and our common economic welfare.

"This is not because you are 'inferior' but simply because our system is built upon a way of thinking, a way of life, and a type of mind that is strange to you.

"We will not permit this.

"If you want a Black man boss - or to be one for that matter we have made a place for you to try it out.

"But not here. Not among us!"

One remarkable thing about arguments about Bantustans, still needs mention before we move on.

It is still the hope of many that the Black man can be made into a democrat - if only he has the time to get himself adjusted and to learn the ropes. If he can only be made to see and experience the advantages.

It is for that reason that the Bantustans are not just 'given a constitution' and 'liberated' like the Congo and its successors. The government is trying hard to guide them into being democracies with the result that we now have the ludicrous spectacle of our 'liberalists' sneering at the 'fake' freedom that we are handing out. Every little finger that the government keeps in the pie, and the iron fist which is kept ready to stop 'congolisation' is ferreted out and held up to show how 'false' our promises of freedom are.

One wonders how it is that they cannot see that the only hope for anything like a materialisation of what they profess to be their ideal is if, in the Bantustans, the Black man can demonstrate that he can be a democrat, and therefore keep a democracy going.

Only on that basis could South Africa ever become one united democracy.

The only objection that they can have to the way that the government is implementing its policy is that it seems to take it for granted that the Black man is not, and, as he is now cannot be, a democrat.

That, before the 'Year of UHURU' might have been a reasonable, even an idealistic attitude but now, with Nkrumah already half a god, with Banda forcing everyone to stand to attention when he happens to be near, with Zanzibar and Rwanda, coming after the Congo debacle, is manifestly a pipe dream.

The 'total' freedom which they demand is therefore the 'freedom to become an Autocracy'. And that, one would suppose, is for the liberalists a very strange ideal. It makes them look very much like mere trouble-makers.

In those parts of the country in which the Western way of life and Democracy have rooted themselves, the conditions will have to remain as they are, and there the only question that remains is to ask what actually is wrong with a minority ruling a majority, when it is not wrong for a majority to rule a minority.

Is there some esoteric justification for the suppression (and even extermination) of minorities by majorities such as we see happening everywhere where there are minorities?

What is it that makes the ruling of the many by the few so particularly repulsive to the idealist?

Is it because the few use force? Or because they refuse to give the others political representation?

If so - is the throttling power of the mere multitude not 'force' and is the political representation of the few not just as farcically impotent as no political representation for the many?

The real problem therefore lies in allowing the other fellow a place in the sun (and not necessarily a quasi 'leader' in parliament).

It is not a problem of majorities and minorities.

That argument is no argument at all. It is merely an appeal to sentiment.

After all, a just and reasonable minority ruling over a majority is to be preferred to an unjust and unreasonable majority ruling over a minority.

In view of what is happening up north, the question is therefore if we are, or if we can become and remain, a just and reasonable ruling minority in those parts that we keep for ourselves.

There is no reason to expect, for the present at least, that the majority in our country will be an exception to the rule and prove to be either 'just' or 'reasonable' if and when it is 'democratically elected'.

From this it follows however that we can only justify our remaining on as 'rulers' if we are 'good' rulers. In any other way we would be 'oppressors' and would actually deserve the opprobrium of the world and any well thinking person.

This then makes it necessary for us to ask ourselves if it is as true as we think that we are good rulers and we must make it a part of our way of life to strive to be good rulers.

It is easy to be a 'subject'. One simply obeys as much as one cannot avoid doing. One tries to get as much as one can get out of the boss or out of any opportunity that occurs, no matter the harm that comes from it. That is not one's affair.

There is no overt, official, 'moral' standard for the subject for he is not supposed to worry about those things. One does not need to strive to be a 'good' subject although much advantage and even genuine satisfaction can be got out of it.

But it is not so with the ruler. By taking it on himself to rule, he has taken the responsibility for everyone on his shoulders, for his subjects' wellbeing as well as for his own. He has actually taken the responsibility for the 'combination' in relation to the outer world on his shoulders and he must see to it that he is worthy of that responsibility.

To be a good ruler, he must not be 'good' in the sense of soft hearted. Rather the reverse. He must be strict, for if he is not, he (and in consequence his subjects) will suffer.

He must however know when to make adjustments, when to close his eyes to minor peculations. He must learn to understand, and to punish only where he knows that 'not-punishing' would do harm.

In relation to his subjects the ruler must also be meticulously just. An injustice done to a subject is infinitely worse than one done to an equal.

One of our first duties should therefore be to revise our present laws which lean over to leniency in regard to wrong done by 'one of us' to the native (if not in the letter then certainly in the practical application, as any reading of the newspapers will demonstrate), into one where it is severely and mercilessly applied.

A White man who does wrong to a Black one, who rapes one of his women, who cheats him out of even a cent in his wages, who overcharges him in a store or who tries to renege on his responsibilities for the result of accidents to his Black workman while he is on the job is committing not only the offence itself but is guilty of treason too. He is 'letting the side down' and endangering our safety, both as a race and as a nation.

This is a thing a great number of us still have to learn. Too many of us are not worthy of the mantle of ruler.

Inversely, an offence by a Black against a White is only the offence itself. It even has the 'extenuating circumstance' that the culprit 'has had no chance' as we like to say of our own delinquents. The only reason for the full implementation of the statutory punishment is that the not-applying of it in full would lead to disrespect for the law. Showing too much mercy is also unjust.

Before everything therefore we must become fully conscious of the fact that, being rulers, we must demand meticulous justice of ourselves, not only because that is the only honourable attitude but (for other reasons which we will soon meet) for our own sakes.

There are too many of our own weaker brethren (and among these, curiously enough, one finds a large part of them to be exceptionally vociferous about the 'rights' of the White man and the detailed application of Apartheid) who are apt to take advantage of the relatively defenceless Blacks.

It is on these that we must visit the full vengeance that the law permits. They - and not the Blacks themselves - are our real danger for they make hypocrites out of us and give the Blacks a legitimate grudge.

We may never forget that, if we wish to rule, we must accept the responsibilities of rulers. We must be 'rulers', not 'oppressors'.

As Swinburne said: "He is master and lord of his brothers who is worthier and wiser than they."

If here we had to go into the details, into the necessity for influx control into the rural areas, free transport to and from the locations in which the principle of apartheid forces them to live, the details and principles of the running of the Bantustan policy and many more, it would make this appendix a book in itself. Suffice it to say that here too, the wisdom and the justice of the ruler will have to be the main criterion by which we must act - and not a set of slogans invented in countries that are homogeneously White and therefore have none of the problems by which we are faced here.

If we can make ourselves behave like rulers worthy of the name there comes the question of the possibility of our survival in a gullible world gone mad with fear and, as will be seen, it is here that that our worthiness becomes of supreme importance.

Our danger can come from three sides.

There can be internal troubles - here there are the potential 'leaders of their people' who, possibly (like Hitler) may start off with the ideal to help their fellow men but who inevitably end up by seeing their own freedom as that of their people - and the Black people themselves.

External interference can be either direct or indirect.

Direct external interference would take the form of a declared war, either from outside or after unacceptable provocation as, for instance, by armed implementation of total sanctions.

This kind of war can only be really dangerous when the enemy is another White country. As analysed in Chapter XX, the Black countries will be unable to muster an army and sustain a modern war even if helped up to anything short of taking over the army.

In the latter case there would have to be a long period of training and preparation - too long for the short-futured Black rulers to accept with equanimity.

A shorter term of preparation would produce only a makeshift army that would easily crack up.

This long term take-over, if it happened, would however give ample notice of intent and still produce no more than a C 3 army.

Atom bombing, as we have seen (killing three Blacks for each White) is also extremely unlikely. They may not worry about what sanctions, if successful, would do to the Blacks, but killing them openly would be going a bit too far, one would suppose.

An all out war against one or more of the great nations would naturally destroy us. However that might well ignite a global war as the possession of our mineral wealth would be too big a prize to permit the others to get for the price of what, to them, would be a 'minor' war.

(The Netherlands retained their fabulously rich Indonesian colonies for exactly that reason. England and America would neither permit the other to take it. Until the last war put everything into the melting pot. When the chance came at last the Netherlands was quickly and efficiently eliminated from the picture.)

We are lucky that we are so far out of the way that it would make a war against us relatively expensive. If that had not been so, with the moral encouragement any invader would get, one of them might by now already have tried to make a quick snatch - just to 'punish' us.

The other 'external danger' would be from an externally supported guerrilla war.

In our country, with its absence of jungles and inaccessible mountain ranges, guerrilla warfare against the kind of troops and equipment we could put into the field would be doomed before it began if such warfare was not supported by our own Black population.

If our own Black population supported them wholeheartedly the position might become impossible to control.

There remain the two weapons of 'Sabotage, and Luther King's 'Sit-in' type of 'peaceful' coercion.

Both of these, however, to be effective, would need two factors:

- 1) A well functioning organisation.
- 2) The full support of our Black population.

On the basis of our theory and, as has been shown in practice in the last few years, the Black is not very well fitted for purposeful organisation, especially under stress. (Underground organisation needs the ability to make quick decisions based on long-term foresight and a 'spatial' understanding of the factors present in the situation.)

The prohibition of all organisations that could be sponsoring such actions should therefore take care of that.

It is here that we meet the White fellow traveller, the paid agitator, the renegade and the honest but impractical idealist, any one of whom can supply the deficit.

Only with White men in the key positions could a subversive organisation hope to become effective for any length of time.

They may otherwise be a nuisance and cause considerable damage but, again, if they are not fully supported by our Black population, they will not be able to achieve anything important.

The White agitator, or saboteur, or idealist, will however also suffer from the fact that he has to work with short-futured material that is lacking in a visual image of the factors concerned, and the chain - as always - is as strong as its weakest link. He will therefore be extremely vulnerable and good police work (as has been demonstrated) should be able to pick him out and eliminate him.

'Sit-in' demonstrations can again only be effective if there are a sufficient number of malcontents together with a reasonably efficient organisation. All but minor intended 'sit-in's have to be advertised and only bona-fide malcontents would keep that advertisement a secret so that effective countermeasures could not be taken in time.

The primary need, as has been seen, is therefore in each case that our Black population remains reasonably content and unwilling to exchange the devil they know for the one they don't know.

Nevertheless it remains necessary that we should rid ourselves of the agitators, professional and otherwise. We must stop the preachers of the lie that "all men are equal no matter in what kind of economic or social system they happen to find themselves".

America is an example of what happens when one omits to do that in time.

Declaring all men officially equal and then slamming down hard on the Negro who wants to take advantage of that equality gives him a legitimate grudge. He has our sympathy for he could hardly have reacted in any way other than he has.

Once one preaches or proclaims equality, one must give equality and Laurence Gandar's theme in the Rand Daily Mail becomes valid. It is then time to knuckle under - or get out. It is also the end of the Western way of life, of prosperity and of Democracy, for no non-White group of men can keep a White civilisation going, just as no group of White men could keep a Black one on its legs.

To stop the preaching of the gospel of Equality, it is however a chastening fact that in a 'democratic' country like ours one seems to need a certain amount of inverse brain washing aimed at branding its disciples "communists". In this way we are using the Russian Bogey man as a justification for constraint where our freedom of speech and the freedom of our press would otherwise make it nearly impossible to expose this 'fifth column' work which can now be named "treason".

This is however not without its dangers. 'Bogey men' inspire fear and a man who is afraid is not reasonable. History, especially that of America, has a sufficient number of examples of this effect to show us.

What is still more important is that, basically, this brain washing is itself a lie. It is not 'Communism' as such that we need to fear. It is 'Equalism', if one has to give it a name.

Even if there were no Russians and no Chinese in the world and even if Communism had not been invented, we would still have the same problem on our hands.

The communists are only acting on this weak spot in our armour because that is where we are vulnerable. The vulnerability is there of itself however and it is this fact that we have to face if we have the wish to survive as men.

At least those of us that think should be aware of this. We can leave the communist bogey to the demagogues and committees of investigation. If some of us at least do not realise the real state of affairs, it may happen that if Russia should join the West against China we would be completely lost.

Let us therefore try to be honest enough to face the actual problem and not blame 'foreign agitators' and 'foreign influence' for it, even if they try to keep the pot boiling.

As long as we do not permit the preaching of equality, we can stop 'subversive' organisations because they endanger the safety of the state.

If Russian or Chinese contacts must be proved first we are missing the real point.

In controlling the preachers of 'Equalism' we do not need wholesale extermination or incarceration however.

We White men do not take kindly to regimentation and being told what to do and what not to do. We would not be where we are and what we are if we were.

Ruthless implementation of repressive laws often (if not always) have, among us, the opposite effect to what they intend to achieve.

It will be enough to keep an eye on them and to pick out the ringleaders who go too far for the common safety of both Black and White.

As long as our Black population has no other reason for legitimate discontent, their machinations will have little effect.

Evidence of receiving money from outside, active preparation for civil war, proof of sabotaging activities etc. must be taken seriously, but even here *the wise retaliation will be exile* and not the traditional execution or incarceration. Execution is needlessly 'inhuman' and gaoling has too many associations with concentration and Belsen camps. Besides that it is quite expensive.

As we have seen, *from the outside* little other than noise can be achieved.

Let them talk away there until everyone gets bored with them or till the political atmosphere changes - as long as we are sure that we have the internal situation well in hand and that our Black population is no sounding board to them because of genuine grievances of their own.

Exile will donate a continuous leakage of our trouble makers into those who do not like us and become a demonstration of the need we had to get rid of them. (Several examples of this are already on hand.)

It will rob them of any possible aura of martyrdom and it will make an end to the stories of 'mass executions' when we let the publicly convicted ringleaders themselves go free - as long as they stop bothering us.

Zanzibar's treatment of its Arab problem, seemingly without too much shocking of 'world opinion' shows that 'exile' is internationally permissible. It will certainly be much cheaper to pay their first class fares to England, America or Ghana - than to keep them comfortably housed and fed on Robben Island. And it will show that we are not afraid of them too.

To conclude, it has often been said that we should get the natives on our side.

That is naturally asking too much. They can never have an adequate understanding of what is involved. Any respect and liking they may develop for us will break down after a few minutes of mob-rousing talk by a trained agitator.

They are like that. They cannot help it, just as we cannot help it that we are as we are.

We cannot get them in our side but we can prevent them from being actively on theirs or, to put it in another way, actively against us.

If we make our rule oppressive, if we 'exploit' them instead of looking for a way in which each man can take his place in our community according to his abilities, his conscientiousness and his understanding without upsetting the whole, it may come to the point that they may feel that a 'Black man boss' would be preferable (even if they fear him now).

In that case we will have truly lost the battle, even before we start.



Guerrilla warfare will become possible, saboteurs will be able to disappear and live among them, unrecognised by us, and any, even badly organised, 'passive resistance' demonstrations will draw them in by the thousands until it will no longer be possible to keep our civilised state and our industrial organisation functioning properly.

The danger therefore lies in ourselves.

And the remedy.

Let us try to teach ourselves to be 'just' and 'reasonable' rulers.

That is the duty which we have accepted by electing to be 'rulers'.

The ordinary Black man-in-the-street is not concerned about having a member in parliament. All he wants is a place in the sun for himself and his family ... and, to that, in any reasonable man's thinking, he surely must have a 'right'.

Finally, if we can do that, History has at least two encouraging examples to show us.

Greece had its Syracuse and Rome its Byzantium in which those civilisations lived on for a few hundred years after they had died 'at home'.

It would be amusing if we prove to have been destined for that purpose in the annals of History.

The long list of remarkable achievements of our small group of Whites - less than a quarter of the population of London - in the fields of science, industry, sport and even the arts would seem to make this less preposterous than it might look at first sight.

**CHAPTER TWELVE OF: "THE NEGRO IN AMERICAN CIVILIZATION".**  
**NATHANIEL WEYL.**  
**PUBLIC AFFAIRS PRESS. 1960.**

## **The African Heritage**

*"Unto everyone that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."*

*St. Matthew, XXV: 29.*

Are there fundamental biological differences between the minds and psychic growth patterns of Caucasians and Negroes?

The answer to this question may be of considerable importance to the future prospects of massive race integration, particularly in the public schools. Given intelligence and good will, cultural differences can be overcome. Biological differences generally cannot except over a span of thousands of years.

In this chapter, we seek a general answer to the question in Africa. If ethnic psychic differences are present, it should be easier to detect them in areas where the native population is of comparatively unmixed stock. Such differences should show up more clearly when whites are compared with trans-Saharan African natives than when they are compared with the nominally Negro, but actually Afro-European, population of the United States.

A search for biologically caused psychic differences between the two races is not necessarily an effort to establish the superiority of either. Value judgments may have their place in religion, but not in science. There superiority and inferiority are always relative to specific frames of reference. When the pattern of culture and education is set by one race and adapted to its own needs and potentialities, deviant mental behavior in another race will probably seem to be evidence of inferiority. However, seeming and being are generally very different things. If the biologically determined psychic patterns of Africans are found to be different, the constructive task will be to ascertain the nature of these differences and their implications in terms of such institutions as public education.

### **A UNIQUE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT PATTERN?**

A decade ago it would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to state whether or not these innate psychic differences exist. Since then, fundamental studies, some of them under United Nations auspices, have cast entirely new light on the problem.

On June 15, 1957, Drs. Marcelle Geber and R. F. A. Dean published an article of great importance in the authoritative British medical journal, *The Lancet*, showing that Uganda native infants had development rates "equal to that of European children twice or three times their age."<sup>(1)</sup>

The 107 infants tested were born in July and August 1956. The babies and their mothers were without known disease. All births were normal and unassisted; twins and caesarian and forceps births were excluded from the tabulation. Except for one 10 1/2 pound baby, birth weights ranged between 5 1/2 and 9 pounds. Sixty percent of the subjects were from the local Bantu-speaking tribe, the Ganda. Others were Bantu, Nilotic and Hamitic. No difference in development rates between the various tribal, linguistic and ethnic groups was found. <sup>(2)</sup>

Almost all of the children were examined in the Mulago Hospital where they had been born. Of the 107 babies, 37 were examined during the first two days of life and 45 between the second and fourth days. The median age at examination was slightly less than three days. No child over eight days old was tested.

The examination techniques are taken from standard French treatises on infant development by Koupnik (1954) and Thomas et al. (1955). Strictly speaking, they are not tests, but quantitative observations of the time of transition from uterine and neonatal kinesthetic reactions to more advanced forms of muscular control. They were designed for European subjects and "are normally considered to be applicable only to children more than one month old..."

Geber and Dean reported that the African infants' eyes were "wide open and had a lively look." In some cases, moving objects would be followed with the eyes even in the first days and this would be accompanied by a rotation of the head. The European norm is to follow moving objects with the eyes at two weeks and to rotate the head at 3-4 weeks.

One of the infants, only one day old, continuously fingered the bandage covering a small, birth-incurred scalp wound in the occipital area. When placed on its belly, this child at once "turned to one side or (even more remarkable) raised his head, propping himself on his arms." (3)

When drawn to a sitting position, 90 of the 107 babies would prevent their heads from falling back. These 90 infants, most of them under four days old, were also able to keep their trunks straight. (By contrast, head control and ability to straighten the back when sitting are acquired by normal European children in the 8th to 12th week.)

The Moro reflex, which persists among white children till the 6th to 8th week, was not found in any African child after the 4th day of life. The article was accompanied by photographs of African infants tested.

A 48-hour-old baby was shown lying on his stomach and raising his chin from a table. Another photograph showed a baby, 9 hours old, sitting up and able to prevent his head from falling forward.

The African infants had an entirely different muscle tone from European babies. At rest their "flexion was much less accentuated" and they had remarkable head and neck muscle control. "So far as could be determined in this series, the results did not vary with the sex of the child, its birth weight, or the parity of the mother."

The broad conclusion drawn by the writers was: "There seems to be no doubt that these African children had been born at a more advanced stage of development, judging by the method used, than the normal European child. The results of the examination were so consistent, and the degree of advance was so great, that there was little room for uncertainty. Much of the activity corresponds to an age of 4-6 weeks. Some was even more precocious ...'

These results were "not entirely unexpected because clinical observations of African children in the first year of life had already shown that the accepted 'milestones' of development - raising the head, sitting, standing, walking, and so on were passed at an earlier age than in European children.

It was conceivable, but "in our opinion unlikely", Drs. Geber and Dean wrote, that some of the findings might be due to local conditions at Kampala, a town virtually on the Equator and at 3,500 feet above sea level. This hypothesis was refuted by giving the same tests to 15 European children (all available at the European Hospital.) and to 60 Indian children at the Asian hospital, Kampala: "The European children

gave exactly the results that have been found in Europe, and the Indian children gave almost similar results. Neither group showed any great degree of overlap with the African children."

New-born African children in Uganda show rates of development in the first days of life which are attained by normal European children only after the first month of life. (4) These differences between the developmental paces of the two races in infancy are much too large to be attributed to chance. Since they appear in salient form as early as the ninth hour of life, they obviously cannot be attributed to socio-economic conditions or other environmental factors.

Finally, the superior performance of the African infants occurs despite a uterine environment which is inferior and possibly grossly so. Protein deficiency and neglect of fruit and green vegetables is general. "The best food may be kept for the men, though it is a recognized principle of modern dietetics that the relative need for many items is greatest in pregnant and lactating women and in children." (5) It is possible that malnutrition may hamstring foetal development and cause cortical deficiency. (6)

The amazing precocity of the African infant in passing the conventional developmental milestones occurs, accordingly, despite congenital handicaps or, at best, in the absence of any congenital advantage.

### **DEVELOPMENT OF THE AFRICAN CHILD.**

In the case of Uganda infants, however, this precocity is not fated to last. The development pattern of Kampala children from the age of 6 months to 6 years was traced in a report which Dr. Geber published a year earlier in the international journal of UNESCO. (7)

Using Gesell tests, she measured the psycho-motor development of 131 native children, mostly from Bantu tribes. Of these subjects, 43 were the children of students of theology who lived in a village with a day nursery staffed with an English directress and African assistant. The others were the children of village people and plantation workers, groups with little education; as a rule poor and living under primitive conditions. Generally the children were examined in the hospital with their parents present.

"The remarkably dynamic behavior and the sociability of the very young children," wrote Dr. Geber, "was in strong contrast to the quietness and timidity of the older children."

The conclusion of the report is worth quoting at length:

"The results showed that the young African child was precocious in development when compared with European or American children of the same age. The precocity was generally lost in the 3rd year and after that time the African children were retarded.

"The advance was found to be particularly remarkable in the first months. The head was raised at a very early age, sitting and standing were also early. Manual development was remarkable for its precision and dexterity. The test objects, although completely new to all the children - toys and objects that might have an educational value being rare in the homes were manipulated and used with pleasure. The children showed a very lively interest, and their adaptivity was greatly superior to that corresponding to their age. Language was also highly developed, as much in expression as in comprehension. Even the very young children were interested by the examiner and attempted to communicate with her. Personal social relations were surprisingly good. Behavior in front of the mirror was remarkable. From 6 weeks onward, the child smiled at his image."8

Using Gesell's Development Quotients (D.Q.s), Geber found that 93% of the children less than 1 year old scored above 100. Above average scores were made by 80% of the 1-to-2-year-olds; 61% of the 2 -

to-3-year-olds, but by only 34% of those over 3. The children of the theological students did somewhat better. Up to the age of 2, all had D.Q.s above 100. Between 2 and 3, the percentage was 56%, and after 3 it was 55%.

The children were best at the adaptation and coordination portions of the test, almost as good in social relations (for instance, feeding without assistance), not as good in language. Nevertheless, half of the infants less than one year old had D.Q.s of 120 or better in the language section of the test. At 44 weeks, one child was able to identify her front and rear image in the mirror, point to the mirror image of a ball she was holding, and say papa, mama, goodbye, etc.

The linguistic abilities of these infants apparently persevere into adult life. At least, the Uganda natives have developed a music of their own which is described as impressive and they transmit orally and intact the laws and traditions of their tribes from one generation to the next.

Dr. Geber has avoided offering any firm explanation of the marked difference between the African and European patterns of child development. She does suggest, however, that qualitative differences may exist between the structure and development of European and African brains.

## **DISCUSSION AND SIGNIFICANCE.**

At this stage only a few points need be made concerning causal factors and significance.

There is difference of opinion as to the relationship between speed of infant development and subsequent intelligence. Gesell admits that a high rating on his developmental tests in early infancy is not necessarily predictive of subsequent mental superiority, but urges that the tests show up morons and other mental defectives as early as the 28th week. (9)

However, a long-range, continuing study at the University of California by Nancy Bayley has shown that infant tests given during the first year of life "are useless for predicting later intellectual status" and that "the correlations of first-year tests with later intelligence measures, though very close to zero, tend to be negative rather than positive. " (10) One hypothesis advanced is that the Gesell schedules test precocity in muscular and kinesthetic development which does not reveal at these early ages whether the cortex or more primitive brain centers are responsible.

Comparing different ethnic or national groups, investigators have found that the supposedly more primitive groups lead in early infancy, but afterwards fall behind. Tests of large samples of white and Negro infants of similar socio-economic status showed that, until the 30th week, the developmental pace was more rapid among the colored children." An earlier comparative study of California infants and Tartar and Russian neonates at Kazan showed the American children lagging. (12)

In the epochal study of the mental capacities, psychology and psychiatry of the African Negro which he did for the World Health Organization in 1953, Carothers expounded the biological basis for the rule that length of infancy is related to ultimate mental development as follows: "The difficulty of early learning is mainly one of cerebral complexity, and it is the rule in all mammalian life for full mental stature to develop early in direct relation with cerebral simplicity. The rat, for instance, is fully competent to deal with his relevant environment within three months of birth, whereas the chimpanzee takes several years. Whenever the central nervous system is enlarged out of proportion to its sensory supply and has many alternative pathways and opportunities for choice, much time is taken in growing up. In Hebb's phraseology, where the association-sensory is high, the learning must be slow, though the final ability to handle complex relations will be great. The long time taken in growing up in the higher animals may be in part a question of maturation, but is mainly due to the need for learning to be

piecemeal and unintegrated at first. This does not last, however; and sooner or later, the animal makes the larger synthesis and becomes competent to cope at any moment with its total situation.” (13)

Applying these generalizations to comparative European and African psychology, Carothers points out that cerebral simplicity cannot explain the "unintegrated thinking" of the African adult. He leaves open the question of "whether or not the African brain is relatively simple ..." (14) Dr. Carothers published his monograph in 1953 and hence was not aware of the major discrepancies between the developmental paces of European and trans-Sahara Negro infants as demonstrated by Geber.

## **THE AFRICAN BRAIN.**

Three authoritative studies of African cranial capacity, as summarised by Carothers, reveal averages for adult males of 85%, 91% and 95% of the corresponding European averages. (15) One of these studies gives a frequency distribution of brain weights in the form of a bar graph, from which it appears that only 25 of 351 East African brains examined equalled the average European adult male weight. (16) Another of the studies indicated that the brains of 51 educated Bantu-speaking subjects were about midway between average European and African weights. (17) Investigations of American Negro brains also revealed somewhat lower average cranial capacities. (18)

Since brain size is correlated both with body build and with intelligence, the lesser cranial capacity of the Africans is not invariably significant. Various investigations in the United States concluded that the cerebral cortex forms a smaller part of the Negro than of the white brain. (19)

In summarizing more recent literature, Carothers cites studies which conclude that the African brain is smaller mainly because it has less height than the European. One American authority found the frontal and occipital regions proportionately smaller in African than in European brains, a conclusion which, if corroborated, would support the theory that "many of the peculiarities of African psychology and psychiatry could be seen (in terms of physiology) as frontal idleness ..." (20)

Those writers who believe that significant differences in brain structure exist tend to agree that the European brain has proportionately larger frontal areas than the African and that the differences tend to concentrate in those cortical areas devoted to the organization of visual and spatial perception and to abstract thought.

## **AFRICAN BRAIN HISTOLOGY.**

Two brief papers by Dr. F. W. Vint of the Medical Research Laboratory in Kenya, published over 20 years ago, present findings concerning the histology (or minute tissue structure) of the African brain which, if correct, are of fundamental importance. (21) Carothers's appraisal of Vint's work is that it "stands in an isolation as complete as it is surprising" and that it "deserves most serious attention." As a former Kenya hospital director, Carothers was "familiar with the quality of Vint's work in general." The summary which follows is taken largely from Carothers's synopsis and evaluation.

Vint took sections from the prefrontal cortexes of 35 brains in the first study and of 100 in the second. His subjects were adult males available for autopsy in the native hospitals of Nairobi, excluding the prison and mental hospitals. About half of the subjects were Kikuyu (the tribe of Mau Mau fame or infamy). They were described as being in poor physical condition and about 70% of native autopsies in Kenya at the time suffered from cirrhosis of the liver, caused less by alcoholism than by protein deficiency.

On the other hand, the Kikuyu are an outstanding native group by any standard. To quote Ian Henderson:

"The Kikuyu are the Germans of tribal Kenya. This tribe of 1,500,000 is noted for its devotion to education, its ability to work hard, and its intelligence. The tribal reserves, which are potentially fertile and most strategically placed, lie close to Nairobi and the European settlement areas.

"In the last 50 years, the Kikuyu have had closer contact with European civilization than any other tribe in Kenya." (22)

Vint determined the thickness of the various layers of the cortex in his African subjects and compared the measurements with those of normal European adult males as determined by Van Economo. He found that the most recent part of the brain from an evolutionary standpoint, the supragranular layer, was only 84% as large among Africans as the European average. The significance of this finding of Vint is that the supragranular layer of the cortex is believed by specialists to be primarily concerned with the organization of the more intricate and abstract aspects of intelligence. Vint also found that the cells were 'smaller in the native brain . . . and . . . many of the cells are only partially differentiated." (23)

Postnatal increases in brain size must occur primarily in the supragranular layer which is only half as thick at birth as at maturity.

These increases are "due almost entirely to the process of myelinization (sheathing) of the nerve axons." (24) Those embryonic cells which fail to develop into nerve axons are not sheathed. Therefore, brain growth after birth consists mainly of sheathing, reflects the maturation of neurons, and occurs in those association areas which are very recent from an evolutionary standpoint and which are concerned with the so-called higher processes of thought. Carothers finds Vint's analysis in accord with the thinking of more modern specialists. (25)

Vint drew the following major conclusion from these histological studies: "Thus from both the average weight of the native brain and from measurements of its pre-frontal cortex I have arrived, in this preliminary investigation, at the conclusion that the stage of cerebral development reached by the average native is that of the average European boy of between 7 and 8 years of age." (26)

In a review of Vint's work, the distinguished dermatologist, Dr. Sequeira, suggested that the discovery of major histological differences between the African and the European brain might have been anticipated on general evolutionary grounds: "Both the cerebral cortex and the epidermis are derived from the same elementary embryonic layer the epiblast. Ethnologists tell us that the characters of the skin and hair afford better criteria for the differentiation of the various races of mankind than any other feature. It should therefore not be surprising on embryological grounds to find differences in the characters of the cerebral cortex in different races." (27)

Additional studies of brain histology seem urgently needed to ascertain whether Vint's findings apply generally to trans-Sahara Africa or merely to Kenya. Another vital question is whether the observed failure of cerebral development to advance beyond the 7-to-8-year-old European level is caused by specific pathological conditions or is an hereditary racial condition.

## **ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAPHIC STUDIES.**

A third area of promising investigation is the electrical physiology of the African brain. Electroencephalography is a very new and rapidly growing science. It studies the living and functioning brain by analysing its wave emissions, their cerebral location and the brain's electrical responses to various stimuli. While it is vastly more complex, each "brainprint" is as individual and unique as each fingerprint.

In 1949 the French neuropsychiatrist, Dr. Gallais, pioneered in the use of this new technique to compare the EEG patterns of different races. (28) He took EEG readings of 100 Negro soldiers from French Guinea, all apparently normal and healthy, in a well-equipped Marseilles laboratory. Dr. Gallais and his associates found that, whereas only 13.8% of European subjects showed abnormal EEG patterns, the percentage of abnormality among the Africans was 58%.

Among the more important deviant findings were the followings: (1) 78 Africans showed visible theta waves; in 31 cases, it was the dominant rhythm in one or more brain areas; in 11 cases, it was the only basic rhythm. (2) Alpha rhythm was widely diffused on the cortical surface and there was a relative abundance of poorly defined low-volt tracings. (3) 36 subjects showed no flicker response.

The presence of theta waves in over three-fourths of the subjects and its dominant position in 30% of the cases is highly suggestive. The normal European experience is that theta waves are dominant at the 2-5-year old age-level and become very small or intermittent by the age of 10. The theta waves are associated with frustration at the withdrawal of pleasure in children or in adults devoid of self-control.

"In bad tempered adults," writes Dr. W. Grey Walter, one of the great pioneers of electroencephalography and an editor of the International EEG Journal, "especially those with an unusual tendency to aggressive behavior, the theta rhythms are often prominent and may sweep through a large area of the brain. Their childish intolerance, selfishness, impatience and suspicion are mirrored in the juvenile appearance of their brain patterns." (29)

For the interpretation of persistent alpha rhythms, we turn to Dr. Walter again: "It was shown in 1943," he writes, "that individuals with persistent alpha rhythms which are hard to block with mental effort tend to auditory, kinesthetic or tactile perceptions rather than visual imagery. In this group of persons the alpha rhythms continue even when the eyes are open and the mind is active or alert." (30) And again: "Recent experimental and statistical studies have confirmed earlier claims that visual imagination and alpha rhythms are mutually exclusive." (31)

In their first paper, Gallais and associates concluded that the anomalies in the brainprints of their West African subjects indicated a high degree of cortical immaturity combined with paroxysmal outbursts. They thought that instability or lability of the higher brain centres was indicated. In a subsequent paper, they suggested that EEG abnormality among Africans was due to racial differences in the "level of psychobiological integration." (32)

Intrigued by the Gallais report, Carothers induced the distinguished electroencephalographer, Mundy-Castle, to run a control study of Bantu brainprints. (33) Mundy-Castle took a sample of 66 Bantu-speaking natives, 53 of them male and averaging 34.9 years of age. Most of the subjects came from kraals and mud huts in the villages, but had lived in the city from one to 15 years. Only 26 had an education better than that of the average nine-year-old European. They appeared to be free from disease. A large proportion had, of course, suffered head injuries from brawls, but brain damage was not indicated.

While Mundy-Castle and his associates did not confirm Gallais's findings of preponderant African EEG abnormality, they did agree with the French investigator that the alpha rhythms of their African subjects were widespread and anterior on the surface of the skull. Another significant variation from European normal response was that, during light stimulation, a large proportion of the Africans did not react at all. Those that did react gave crude or banal responses. Of the 66 subjects, only one gave a non-visual description of his reaction to flicker. He said it made him feel drunk.

Contrast the following description of Photic stimulation by the English novelist Margiad Evans in: *A Ray of Darkness*: "Lights like comets dangled before me, slow at first and then gaining a fury of speed and change, whirling colour into colour, angle into angle. They were all pure alra unearthly colours, not deep visual ones. There was no glow in them but only activity and revolution."



## **A FEW WORDS OF EXPLANATION.**

The flickers are caused by high-speed electronic stroboscopes. Through electrical contacts to the brain surface and feedback mechanism, the frequency of the light flashes is generally adjusted to the rhythmic components of the waves of the brain which is being studied.

These synchronized light stimuli apparently have the power "to overwhelm brain's channels of communication with their barrage of rapid, repetitive impulses." (34) They are insistent and urgent enough so that a directing mechanism alerts the entire brain and the response given is a measure both of cerebral complexity and stability. The stroboscope tunes in to a brain system described in a classic metaphor of Sir Charles Sherrington as an "enchanted loom where millions of flashing shuttles (the nerve impulses) weave a dissolving pattern, always a meaningful pattern, though never an abiding one; a shifting harmony of subpatterns."

The characteristics of a brain with creative imagination obviously include "the structural basis for an immense range of patterns of activity ... an immense wealth of engrams ... (and) a peculiar potency for unresting activity, weaving the spatio-temporal patterns of its engrams in continually novel and interacting forms.. ." (35)

According to this reasoning, the significance of a null response or impoverished response to flicker might well be a failure of the brain to develop, in the areas of imagination, visualization and power of conceptual thought, toward anything approaching maturity. "Our main impression," wrote Mundy-Castle, "was that they (the Africans) reacted in a far more simple way than did the European group." (36)

## **THE NON-VISUAL MIND.**

In interpreting the Mundy-Castle findings concerning African EEG patterns, Dr. Geber considers that the basic difference is the frontal displacement of alpha waves. Since alpha rhythm is closely related to visual perception, she infers that this racial difference may explain the lesser role played by sight in African mental processes. (37)

The theory that the African brain is primarily auditory rather than visual had been advanced by psychologists many years before it received evidential support from the work of Gallais, Mundy-Castle, Geber and others.

Carothers points out that every member of a tribe is expected to know virtually its entire culture, that the average African's vocabulary is extensive, that he is often a gifted linguist and that his love of discussion and powers of expression are often "so dramatic as to disguise the essential triviality, inconsequence, or even falsity of his theme." (38) Complex, frequently changing musical patterns; intricate dances; drum messages; choral singing, and extemporized music, singing, narration and the dance are other characteristic cultural activities which suggest auditory, rather than visual, development.

In 1949 Bourdel published the results of a study of the mental aptitudes of the Oubangien people of the French Sudan. While their capacity for concentrated attention was significantly inferior to that of Europeans, all but the lowest 20% of the tribesmen equalled the white average in respect to long-term verbal memory. In immediate memory, the Oubangien were even more superior. (39)

"African education, using the latter word in its widest sense," Carothers writes, "is verbal, musical, dramatic, and emotional; and the African lives largely in the world of sound, in contrast to the European, who lives largely in the world of sight." 40

The perception of the world in terms of sight, rather than sound, is essential to an understanding of cause and effect and hence to that process of scientific thought upon which all modern civilization is based. The importance of a primarily visual, rather than auditory perception can hardly be overstated. To quote Carothers again: "An understanding of the world we live in, and the development of an objective attitude and of mature responsibility depend on a well developed sense of spatial, temporal and causal relationship and these in turn on a habit of visual as opposed to auditory synthesis ... It is by no accident that the word 'foresight' has a visual connotation, and by no accident that vision, unlike hearing, is dependent on cortical integrity, and it is clear that verbal and musical ability alone must fail to develop most of those faculties that make man pre-eminent.. ." (41)

The excellent rote memory of Africans does not contradict, but rather reinforces, this negative judgment. As general concepts develop in the mind, the individual observations on which they are based are often forgotten. New learning involves building up "cell-assemblies," or groups of cerebral neurons which correspond to perceptions. These assemblies become integrated in increasingly complex patterns as the higher functions of the brain develop. Rote memory, therefore, of a meaningless sort, is easier for the simple or more immature brain which has not developed complex articulations of cell-assemblies. (42) In fact, memory retentiveness seems to be the only mental faculty in which there is little difference between mental defectives and normal people. (43) Idiots savants frequently show outstanding superiority in rote memory.

Connected with this auditory and tactile orientation of the African Negro mind is a tendency toward paroxysmal outbursts, uncontrolled explosions of crude emotion which rise and subside with equal suddenness and without rational cause. "With the Negro, emotional, momentary and explosive thinking predominates," Westermann wrote, "... dependence on excitement, on external influences and stimuli, is a characteristic sign of primitive mentality. Primitive man's energy is unstable and spasmodic." (44)

Summarizing representative European concepts of the psychology of the trans-Sahara African, Carothers speaks of the African as "conventional; highly dependent on physical and emotional stimulation; lacking in spontaneity, foresight, tenacity, judgment and humility; inapt for sound abstraction and for logic; given to phantasy and fabrication..." but also as "having an excellent memory, a large vocabulary, and an aptitude for music and the dance."45

As we have shown elsewhere, the development of African plastic and graphic arts does not necessarily constitute an exception to the generalization that the African mind is primarily auditory. For these visual arts are unimportant in native life; they are highly formalized, and their purpose is to express magical concepts rather than esthetic creation.

## **AFRICAN FRONTAL IDLENESS?**

Carothers makes the interesting point that in many respects the normal African Negro resembles the normal European after frontal leucotomy: "The main function of the frontal lobes seems to be the integration of stimuli arriving from other parts of the brain (thalamus and cortex); it may well be that integrative functions are subserved by the whole cortex; but, even so, when integration is lacking, the frontal lobes would still be relatively idle since they alone subserve no other function. The African, with his lack of total synthesis, must therefore use his frontal lobes but little, and all the peculiarities of African psychiatry can be envisaged in terms of frontal idleness." (46) Gallais and Planques are saying much the same thing when they note the characteristic African "fragility of higher psychic functions..." (47)

Speaking of mental disturbances among Africans, Gallais and Planques call attention to the frequency with which patients, following a crisis and furious paroxysm, will calmly and spontaneously deny all

their previous assertions, offering no rational explanations or arguments. This and other aspects of the psychopathology of the African "seem to indicate that his activity is above all limited to sensory-motor and sensory cortical functions and to the brainstem ... His brain is an organ as developed as ours, but everything happens as if he used only certain parts of it. It is as in the child, the feeble-minded, and those primitive people who exist in the most civilized societies." (48)

Schizophrenia is the pre-eminent form of African, as well as western, insanity. However, the African cases tend to be amorphous with few instances of paranoia. Manic states are common among African psychotics; the depressed state, however, is rare. Similarly, the suicide rate among Africans is about one-tenth that prevailing in England and the United States.

The suggested explanations are again entirely consistent with the picture delineated by other evidence. "The development of depression in standard forms," writes Carothers, "is linked in high degree with personal integration, with a sense of personal continuity, and with a sense of responsibility for one's sins. Tooth (49) says: 'One of the most characteristic elements in the depression of European psychopaths is self-reproach ... but it is certainly true that self-reproach is very rarely met with in the content of the African psychosis'." (50)

### **AFRICAN INTELLIGENCE TESTS.**

Since World War 11, four colonial powers have had carefully controlled investigations made of the psychometric intelligence of the Negro inhabitants of their colonies. Using the methods of Gelb, Goldstein and Scheerer, tests were used which were adjusted to the African cultural environment and which made a qualitative appraisal of African Negro mentality possible.(51)

In 1946-48 Antonia Augusto psychotested 629 Mozambique Negro adult males, belonging to 16 different tribes, for the Portuguese government. Specially adapted tests were used and the hardest questions discarded. Augusto reported that the average score of the black males was 58.7 (maximum 100) as against an average score of 81.5 for a control group of Portuguese soldiers. The 149 Negro women tested were markedly inferior to the men and made a median score of 45.4. (52) V. B. Gonzales made a similar investigation of 273 Negro males and 146 Negro females from the Spanish African colonies. A battery of 20 tests was administered. The average mental age of the Negroes tested was 10.9, their chronological age range being 15 to 20. Gonzales reported that the Negroes were significantly inferior to whites in all tests, that there was little difference in the I.Q.s of members of different tribes and that I.Q. decreased markedly with age. (53)

In a similar investigation made in French West Africa and in French Equatorial Africa, Miss Barbé found that, according to one test, the average mental age of her 10-to-11 year-old subjects was five. Maistriaux, who was charged by the Belgian government to investigate the psychometric intelligence of Congo natives, concluded that the average adult living in the bush had the mental age of a normal five-year-old. (54)

Interpreted in the light of the data made available by Goldstein," Wintringer summarized, "this evidence forces us to place the majority of African blacks in the same mental category as retarded European children, with all the implications that such a classification conveys." (55)

### **AFRICAN PATTERNS AND AMERICAN NEGROES.**

The environment of the American Negroes is vastly different from that of tribal trans-Sahara natives. Genetically speaking, however, the American Negroes are primarily African despite their large admixture of Caucasian genes. Thus, to the extent that the deviations of brain, psychology and psychiatry of the African from the European norm are environmental in origin, we should not expect to

encounter them at all, or hardly at all, among American Negroes. To the extent that they are inherited, on the other hand, we should expect to find them in the American Negro, though to a lesser extent.

The fact that the American Negro brain (like the African) is generally smaller than the European brain has already been noted. (56) Various investigators have also reported that the American Negro has proportionately less frontal brain than the white American. (57) We have also shown that American studies reveal greater precocity among Negro than white infants in the United States, particularly in kinesthetic development. The racial difference in the United States, however, is not nearly as marked as the differences discovered by Dr. Geber in Uganda.

Experts believe that American Negro EEG patterns correspond to those of American whites. This conclusion seems to be based on personal judgment, however, rather than controlled experiment. (58)

Comparative intelligence tests of African Negroes and whites reveal that as few as 1.2% of the former attain the white average scores. Even when tests were given which minimized the importance of familiarity with Western culture, the bulk of the Africans made scores similar to those of educable defectives. (59) Intelligence tests on American Negroes show consistently lower median scores than those of comparable white groups. The median I.Q. of the American Negro is typically about 85% of the white. This places him perhaps midway between the African Negro and the white American in psychometric intelligence.

The theory that the American (as well as the African) Negro is more auditory and less visual in mental structure and function than the white man is supported by evidence. In comparative intelligence tests of white and Negro Americans, the shortfall of the latter is greatest in the portions of the tests which call for abstract thought or spatial perception. In linguistic and verbal tests, by contrast, the Negro lag is significantly less and, in questions calling for rote memory, it may disappear. The evidence from intelligence tests "fit(s) in with the hypothesis of a (Negro) perceptual defect." (60)

The occupational patterns of Negro professionals in America is also consistent with ethnic orientation toward the world of sound. Perhaps 90% of Negro professionals in the South are either preachers or school teachers. The outstanding Negro cultural achievements are not in such visual fields as science and the plastic arts, but in such non-visual areas as musical performance, acting, dancing and sports.

The classic study of the prevalence of mental disease among American Negroes is by Malzberg who found "a fundamental difference with respect to the incidence of mental disease" and speculated as to whether it was racially caused. (61) Heyman reported that Georgia Negroes were singularly incapable of introspection and self-analysis and noted that Negroes were brought into the emergency clinic almost daily in paroxysmal, semi-conscious states "with head lolling and arms and legs making jerky, convulsive movements." (62) Another investigator commented on the fact that, within the manic-depressive group, "the Negro suffers chiefly from the manic form (the excited phase) and rarely from the depressive phase." (63)

Myrdal pointed out that the 1940 suicide rate for American Negroes was 4.0 per 100,000 as against 15.5 for whites and 45.2 for Chinese. This difference seemed to him particularly significant because few Negroes were Catholics and as such indoctrinated against self-destruction. A 1952 study of schizophrenia among a largely Negro institutionalized population in San Salvador, Brazil, also provided striking corroboration of Carothers's analysis. Paranoia, paraphrenia and even paranoid schizophrenia were very rare among the Negro patients. Depressed reactions were also rare and no lower-class patient had been a suicide in the hospital for a decade. (64)

The infrequency of both suicide and the depressive phase of manic depressive psychosis reflects lack of guilt sense, little awareness of ego continuity or introspection - hence a low level of personality

integration. The insanity pattern also jibes with the African observations in the prevalence of paroxysmal outbursts among American Negroes. There are further similarities between African and American Negroes in respect to auditory abilities, apparent perceptual defect, precocity in neonatal development, but developmental lag after infancy, brain size and shape, frontal characteristics, etc.

The fundamental nature of the differences between the European and African mind, as reported by Carothers, Geber, Gallais, Vint, Mundy-Castle and others, the emergence of such radical differences at the moment of birth, their presence in the cell structure of the brain itself, all this indicates that we are dealing with ethnic characteristics which must be at least partially determined by genetic structure.