

The Policy of Apartheid and the Japanese in the Republic of South Africa (1)

Seiro KAWASAKI

We have triumphed in the effort to implant hope in the breasts of the millions of our people. We enter into a covenant that we shall build the society in which all South Africans, both black and white, will be able to walk tall, without any fear in their hearts, assured of their inalienable right to human dignity - a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world...

*Never, never and never again shall it be that this beautiful land will again experience the oppression of one by another and suffer the indignity of being the skunk of the world *.*

This monograph consists of two parts: Part One, hereinafter reproduced, was written in December 1964, when I was on a Ford Foundation grant in the United States of America. It was long before the election in September 1989, when Mr. Frederik Willem de Klerk was chosen as State President of the Republic. President de Klerk moved swiftly to relegate the racially based laws from the statute book, and together with Mr. Nelson Mandela, President of the African National Congress - who later was sworn in as South Africa's first black president - he was awarded the Nobel prize for peace on 15 May 1993 for his part in their efforts to dismantle the policy of apartheid in South Africa. (His father, Senator Jan de Klerk, appears in this monograph as Minister of the Interior of the Republic of South Africa.)

After more than three decades, I am putting the monograph into print as it was originally written; the only major modification is in the list showing South Africa's trade partners. In the original edition, it covered the period from 1959 to 1962, but I extended it till 1969.

Part Two, which will be published on a later date, contains some of the information on the subject which I gathered, mostly in Japan, over a long period after December 1964.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that the monograph in the following pages is a piece of purely scientific research. It was carried out, in the United States and Japan, as objectively as I could to put in relief what had constituted a most peculiar aspect of the South African society in its darkest and most sinister days.

* From President Nelson Mandela's inaugural speech on 10 May, 1994, after taking the oath of office in Pretoria.

The Japanese in the Republic of South Africa are no longer labelled “Honorary Europeans” or “Honorary Whites.” The disuse of such curious designations may hopefully herald a new era for South Africa as she grapples with the legacy of apartheid and tries to construct “a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.”

Key words: Republic (Union) of South Africa, apartheid, Japanese, “Honorary Whites (Europeans),” *Mein Kampf*.

INTRODUCTION

This is a personal reflection on the attitude of the white supremacist Government of the Republic of South Africa (the Union of South Africa until 31 May 1961) concerning the legal status of Japanese residents and travellers.

Japanese residing or travelling in South Africa have been accorded a status superior to that of other Asiatics, both in legislation and in practice. This status has led some people and newspapers in South Africa to call the Japanese there “Honorary Europeans” or “Honorary Whites.”

Ronald Segal, a Cape Town-born South African of European descent, now in exile, wrote as follows in July 1963, in the preface to the Japanese edition of his Penguin African Library book *African Profiles*, after dwelling on the importance of trade relations between Japan and the Republic of South Africa:

.... The South African Government has manifested its gratitude to the Japanese Government for its trade by making the Japanese residents in South Africa “Honorary Whites.” Naturally, many Japanese resent such an arrangement. It is high time that the Japanese Government, itself, take umbrage to this. Otherwise Japan will find that her relations with South Africa are jeopardizing her position in the rest of Africa ¹⁾.

The Republic of South Africa has maintained a Consulate-General in Tokyo since April 1963 ²⁾, actively promoting trade between South Africa and Japan. It should be noted that the South African Consulate-General in Tokyo is the only diplomatic or consular representation of the Republic in a non-White country at present. As will be seen later, however, the South African Government has emphatically denied that it is for “materialistic reasons” that it accords favourable treatment to Japanese living in the Republic of South Africa.

The importance of trade between the two countries will certainly be insufficient to explain the stand of the South African Government. Moreover, it would appear that anyone who undertakes study of the particular attitude taken by the South African Government can only fully understand it in the light of universal human nature and that the problem of race relations, whatever the definition of this terminology may be, is, after all, a problem intrinsically related to human nature.

1. "A CHINESE PUZZLE"

"The legal position of Japanese in this country," so wrote *The Star*, a newspaper published in Johannesburg, on 2 May 1962, "remains as tangled as a Chinese puzzle - in spite of the efforts by Senator de Klerk to clarify the position once and for all. Japanese are treated as White under one law, as non-White in terms of at least three other laws, and, in a fourth law, they might be treated as both White and non-White. This is how some M.P.s, poring over their law books, saw the position today." The paper, after stating that in practice a Japanese will be treated as White in all his day-to-day affairs, continues:

For a Japanese with a legal mind, however, these possibilities arise:

Under the Group Areas Act, he is White and may occupy a house on the Berea or a flat in Hillbrow. Under the Population Registration Act, he is classified as "an other Asiatic" and must behave as a non-White.

Under the Separate Amenities Act, people in charge or control of premises or vehicles can set aside "any counter, bench, seat, amenity or contrivance" for the exclusive use of Whites or non-Whites or other groups. Exclusive use, say for "Europeans only," can be set aside on any land (including sea or seashore) building, hall, enclosure, room, office or convenience... Thus, a Japanese could find himself legally excluded from swimming-baths, park benches, restaurants and even business offices reserved exclusively for Europeans.

Under the Group Areas Act, however, he has access to many of these things. He may attend cocktail parties and dances....

As a Nationalist M.P. pointed out in Parliament this week: A Japanese is non-White in terms of the Immorality Act.

A Japanese is also non-White in terms of the Mixed Marriages Act ³⁾.

As a matter of fact, the legal position of Japanese in the Republic of South Africa may be "as tangled as a Chinese puzzle," and leaves many points unclarified. The South African Government, however, has made its stand clear as far as application to the Japanese of the Population Registration Act (No. 30, 1950) ⁴⁾ and the Group Areas Act (No. 41, 1950) ⁵⁾ is concerned. In this connection, the statement read by Senator Jan de Klerk, the South African Minister of the Interior (National Party), on 1 May 1962 at the House of Assembly, is of paramount importance. Senator de Klerk was replying to the debate on the second reading of the Population Registration Amendment Bill, when he made the lengthy statement in question, "so that the whole country will now once and for all know what the attitude of the Government is in regard to this race classification, and in order that this statement may in future be referred to without unnecessarily wasting the time of the House" ⁶⁾. In an attack on the Opposition (the United Party) which, in his words, "could not resist the temptation to follow in the footsteps of the anti-Government press which ridiculed the Government for having allegedly declared the Japanese White," ⁷⁾ the Minister of the Interior read the statement as follows:

.... It is as part of this attempt to condition the public of South Africa to a multi-racial society that...arrangements in regard to Japanese visitors to South Africa have been grasped at [by the Opposition]. On the one hand, the object was to create the impression that it proves that the Government is beginning to yield to integration under the pressure of trade interests, and to serve as encouragement to continue exerting pressure in other spheres in which many members of the public are interested. On the other hand, the object is to enforce similar concessions in respect of other population groups, one after another... The Government naturally did not yield to these tactics of the progressive undermining of its policy of apartheid. It is all the more unnecessary, and it would also have been illogical to do so, because the criticism and the ridicule in regard to the action taken in respect of the Japanese were based on misrepresentation and also did not take into account the most fundamental principle on which the policy of apartheid is based.

This principle is that every racial group has a right to continue existing and to preserve what it has achieved for itself during the course of history, and to the opportunities for development which it can in future enjoy fully within its own group. The question of superiority and inferiority is therefore not relevant at all and the object is not to humiliate any group or race. Consequently it is not necessary to make more comprehensive than is necessary for this purpose the measures in respect of each group which must ensure the rightful and unmixed continued existence of the various racial groups in South Africa. The Japanese in South Africa are not a permanent or a numerous group. On the contrary, the number of those who are temporarily resident here, including visitors, is very small, and they are spread all over the country, and whatever form the measures affecting them might take, it would result in no danger to the abovementioned separate existence. From this it follows that it is not necessary to declare them to be Whites, or to classify them as Whites, or to grant them the status of Whites, as various people have alleged, *inter alia*, in order not to humiliate them.... No Japanese has therefore been declared White, and no Japanese has been humiliated by our not doing so...

There are at the moment 50 Japanese in the country, of whom the majority are not permanent residents. They live as families spread over some of the big cities, and they are therefore not a settled community in the Republic. In addition, the majority of them are strangers and eminent persons who are here temporarily, attending to the interests of businesses of Japan. For this reason it was not considered practical or necessary to declare them to be a separate group under the Group Areas Act. In other words, in 1961 it was decided, for purposes of the Group Areas Act, to treat them in the same way as Whites, but that does not justify any ridicule to the effect they have now been declared White. In fact, it only confirmed the practice which had existed for many years, also under previous governments, in terms of which they have always been allowed access to various places together with Whites. It is so generally known that it is perhaps hardly necessary to add that eminent visitors who come here to attend to business or political or other important matters are treated in this way, whether they come from Asian or from African states, because their temporary sojourn here

does not constitute a threat to the basic object either, and it is not the intention to derogate from the honorable status or human dignity of any state or person.

In the case of Indians and Chinese, the position is quite different from that of the Japanese. The Chinese, who constitute a very peace-loving community of high standing, nevertheless consist of more than 6,000 persons who are mainly located in a few centres as settled communities. They cannot, and do not want to, be assimilated, and when taking any action in regard to them the precedent it may set in regard to larger settled communities must be borne in mind in connection with the aforementioned basic object. In terms of the aforementioned Act, they have therefore been declared a separate group for the purposes of that Act...

In regard to the Population Registration Act 1950, the position is that this Act provides for the classification of the inhabitants of the Republic into various racial groups, namely the White group, the Bantu group and the coloured group.... Here also the State President.... can prescribe and define the ethnic or other groups in which the coloureds and the Bantu are to be classified. So, for example, the Malay group, the Indian group, the Chinese group and the group of other Asians have been defined. For the same reason as in the case of the Group Areas Act, namely that there is only a small number of Japanese in the country, mostly temporarily, it was not considered practical or necessary to establish a separate Japanese group. They of course do not fall under the White group but under the group "other Asiatics," as contrasted with the Indians and Chinese who are settled inhabitants of the Republic in large enough numbers to be defined as separate groups.

In the light of all this, it should now be clear how unreasonable and unnecessary, and indeed even ridiculous, were the attacks on the Government that for materialistic reasons it declared one Asian nation to be White ⁸⁾.

2. THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE JAPANESE

From Senator de Klerk's statement, it can be presumed that the position officially taken by the South African Government with regard to the legal status of the Japanese in that Republic is as follows, as far as the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act are concerned:

(1) In regard to the Population Registration Act of 1950, the Japanese "do not fall under the White group but under the group 'other Asiatics,' as contrasted with the Indians and Chinese."

The Act provides, *inter alia*, that "every person whose name is included in the register shall be classified... as a White person, a Coloured person or a Native, as the case may be," and that the "Governor-General [now the State President] may by proclamation.... prescribe and define the ethnic or other groups into which Coloured persons and Natives shall be classified" (Section 5). As a matter of fact, Mr. E. G. Jansen, the Governor-General, acting upon the power delegated to him in terms of this provision, issued in 1959 a proclamation whereby the following four Asian groups were separated from the Coloured group: Malays, Indians, Chinese, and other Asiatics ⁹⁾. The Minister of the Interior declared in May 1962 therefore that the Japanese fall under the last mentioned group.

(2) In regard to the Group Areas Act of 1950, the Minister said that “in 1961 it was decided, for the purposes of the Group Areas Act, to treat them [the Japanese] in the same way as Whites.” He was apparently referring to his statement made on 11 April 1961 at the House of Assembly in response to a written question from an M. P.

It may be recalled that the groups defined in Section 2 of the Act comprise the White, the Native, and the Coloured groups. But the Governor-General, here again, is empowered to define by proclamation, within either of the Native or Coloured groups, “any ethnic, linguistic, cultural or other group” and to “declare the group so defined to be a group for the purposes of this Act.” And, by Proclamation No. 73 of 30 March 1951, three new groups, viz., an Indian, a Chinese, and a Malay group, were created as sub-divisions of the Act’s Coloured group. The existing position, therefore, is that there are six groups which have been established for purposes of the Act: the White, Native, Coloured, Indian, Chinese and Malay groups. An independent Japanese group has never been created from within the Coloured group, and although the Japanese have never officially been declared White, they are treated “in the same way as Whites,” that is, as belonging to the European group.

It is clear, then, that the Japanese, in terms of the Population Registration Act, are Coloured, and belong to the group “other Asiatics,” while in terms of the Group Areas Act, they have no group to belong to and are treated, for convenience’ sake, as Whites. Both Acts define three racial groups: Whites, Natives, and Coloured, but the sub-divisions of the Coloured group are not the same for these Acts.

It is customary for the South African authorities to divide the population of the Republic of South Africa into four groups: Whites (Europeans), Natives (Bantu), Coloured, and Asiatics. It should be noted, however, that “Coloured” applies in some cases both to persons of mixed blood and to Asiatics; in other words, a “coloured person” sometimes means, as is the case of the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act, “a person who is not a white person or a native” (Population Registration Act, Section 1) ¹⁰⁾.

“Such looseness in the use of the terms for the various groups was particularly frequent in the legislation of the two Boer Republics - the South African Republic (Transvaal) and the Orange Free State and also, to a lesser extent, in that of the two British Colonies of the Cape of Good Hope and Natal.” ¹¹⁾ Even after the constitution of the Union of South Africa in 1910, the “laws enacted by the Union in its early years were frequently equally loose. Again, it is not unusual for an act to empower the authority responsible for making regulations to include definitions of the groups in the regulations or to define in more specific terms the very general definitions given in the Act.” ¹²⁾ Certainly, the Population Registration Act and the Group Areas Act furnish good examples of the last method.

In the case of the Population Registration Act, which established the White, the Native, and the Coloured groups, the Governor-General created the “Asiatics” as a group independent from the Coloured group, thereby dividing the population into the four ethnic groups of Whites, Natives, Coloured, and Asiatics, this being in conformity with the official division of the South African authorities. In the case of the Group Areas Act, which also created the White, the Native, and the

Coloured groups, “many comments were made about the exclusion of an Asiatic group comprising Chinese, Indians, and Malays when the Act was first published,”¹³⁾ but the Governor-General, instead of creating a fourth Asiatic group, established three sub-divisions of the Act’s Coloured group: an Indian, a Chinese, and a Malay group. This has naturally left no place for the Japanese (and also other Asiatics of minor numerical importance, if any). In which of the existing six groups - the White, Native, Coloured, Indian, Chinese, and Malay - should the Japanese be classified? The South African Government had no choice but to treat them as Whites. This has led, I would say, South Africa’s public opinion to call the Japanese ironically “Honorary Europeans.”

3. MR. SONG’S CASE

Before trying to understand intelligently why the Government of the Republic of South Africa is treating Japanese residents in that Republic “in the same way as Whites,” at least in terms of one Act, it would not prove futile to look back at the way in which this particular problem has been treated in the Republic’s parliament.

It is interesting to point out that the 1962 amendment to the Population Registration Act was initiated in connection with a law suit involving a Canton-born Chinese merchant at Durban by the name of David Song. In 1961, Mr. Song appealed to the Population Registration Appeal Board, contending that he be reclassified as a White in terms of the Population Registration Act of 1950. According to the definition given in Section 1 of that Act, a white person “means a person who in appearance obviously is, *or*¹⁴⁾ who is generally accepted as a white person, but does not include a person who, although in appearance obviously a white person, is generally accepted as a coloured person.” The appeal of Mr. Song, who took the legal argument that he was generally accepted as a white person, and that he should therefore be classified as such, was accepted by the Board in March 1962, which caused nation-wide repercussions, some being rather favourable to the decision of the Board. *The Cape Times* of 14 March commented:

The subtle light of a Chinese lantern is being shone on the conditions in which the various South African castes live. No South African should think for a moment that the willingness of certain people of Far Eastern ancestry to be declared “White” is because they particularly admire this skin-colour. We can also be sure that these people are not in the least ashamed of being in reality part of the non-White two-thirds of the world’s population. In no other country in the world would a Japanese or a Chinese even give a second thought to his official colour, if, indeed, that country dealt in such fine distinctions at all...

Here, although he is in no way superior either in culture or character to those of the same colour in any other country, the official White man is the only kind of citizen who can enjoy the full range of social, economic and political rights which is the natural right of all citizens in other Western countries... When the prudent Oriental accepts the rank of “White” he does so in order to be granted the advantage of using the normal civilized amenities of the country without official let or police hindrance. We welcome his good fortune, but the way he achieves

it points a moral about the way the non-White four-fifths of South Africa has to live¹⁵⁾.

The Times of London printed the following dispatch from their correspondent in Pretoria, dated 8 March 1962:

A loophole which has important implications for the Government's race classification policies has been discovered in the Population Registration Act of 1950, as a result of which a Chinese businessman [Mr. Song] has been classified as white....

This presents the Government with a serious problem, for it opens the way for any Coloured or Asian person to be declared white, provided they can bring evidence to show they are accepted as such....

The question now is whether the Government will, after 12 years, try to rectify a flaw which has been inherent in the Act since 1950, or whether it will leave things as they are, in effect, falling in with the considerable body of opinion (which includes many Nationalists) which holds that Coloureds should be included as part of the white race¹⁶⁾.

The decision of the Population Registration Appeal Board of March 1962 was, however, certainly not what the Government of South Africa was expecting. To cope with the situation, the Government at once proceeded to "rectify the flaw in the Act," and in the resulting Population Registration Amendment Act (No. 61, 1962), it is provided now that a "white person" means a person who (a) in appearance obviously is a white person *and*¹⁷⁾ who is not generally accepted as a coloured person; or (b) is generally accepted as a white person and is not in appearance obviously not a white person (Section 1).

It is in connection with the debate in Parliament on the Population Registration Amendment Bill that Senator de Klerk discussed the status of Japanese residents in South Africa on 1 May 1962.

As early as 16 May 1961, however, the Minister of the Interior had the following to say at the House of Assembly about the Japanese:

There is a section that is accepted as White, and there is an arrangement with that racial group that in those cases where they are accepted as Whites, travelling facilities, hotel accommodation, etc., will be given to them as though they are Whites. If it should appear later on that the acceptance of the Japanese or any other group is not subscribed to by the Whites, they will not be accepted as such. I think that that is the right principle. What difference is it going to make to us as Whites if we accept these people?¹⁸⁾

Nearly a year later, that is, on 21 March 1962, in the debate on the Population Registration Amendment Bill in the House of Assembly, Mr. W. V. Raw (Durban-Point) of the United Party challenged the Minister of the Interior in the following terms:

... Then finally comes the ultimate nonsense of this Bill, and that is when you come to the Chinese and the Japanese. I ask the Minister to tell this House very clearly where the Japanese come into this picture, whether they are to be tested by the pig iron in their purse or the pigment in their skin? What is to be the test for people of Japanese origin? I ask the Minister to tell us very clearly what the test will be ¹⁹⁾.

On 26 April, Mr. G. Frank van L. Froneman (Hailbron) of the National Party stated as follows, defending the Government's position:

The Chinese are a group of people who have a higher standard of living than, e.g., the ordinary Coloureds, at least many of them. Many of the Asian peoples live on a high level. Take, for example, a Thai who comes to live in our country. He would maintain a standard of living equal to that of the Whites in South Africa. Because he maintains that standard of living and mixes in that society, and is accepted by the Whites because he maintains that standard of living, he can pass as a White person if acceptance is to be the only yardstick...

They [Japanese] maintain that standard of living and now they make that admission. It is to exclude those people from the White group that we say that they must be classified according to their admitted descent ²⁰⁾.

Also, on the Government's side, Mr. Pelsler (Klerksdorp) of the National Party intervened and said as follows, on 30 April:

...Yes, hon. members opposite will again come forward with the cry, "What do you propose to do about the Japanese?" Absolutely nothing as far as the Japanese are concerned. The Japanese are in precisely the same position as the Chinese, Song, as far as this Act [the Population Registration Act] is concerned. The only difference is that for good reasons the Japanese are exempt from the provisions of certain legislation. [*Interjections*] Those good reasons are that that is in the best interests of the country. There is a very small number of Japanese here. They visit this country for the purposes of trade (which is to our advantage) and these people are exempt from the Group Areas Act because we do not want to cause them unnecessary trouble and because we want to make things easy for them. But that does not mean that they are exempt from the provisions of this Act. If hon. members do not even realize that, then they have no right to discuss this legislation ²¹⁾.

Upon this, Mr. E. G. Malan (Orange Grove) of the United Party made the following remark:

Sir, there is one mystery that is growing every time hon. members on the other side speak and that is the mystery of the inscrutable Oriental and his position under this particular Act. The hon. member for Klerksdorp [Mr. Pelsler] has now confirmed that Japanese will be regarded as Coloured, except that they will be excluded from certain provisions of the Group

Areas Act. Am I right in assuming that a Japanese businessman, coming to do business here in South Africa, can go to the office of his South African colleague, probably a person who is a director of a steel company; that they can consult on business matters; that in that particular area they can even have lunch together, but that should they decide to go out to the factory in Vereeniging by taxi, not having ordinary transport, then the South African businessman must travel in a European taxi while the Japanese businessman will have to travel in a non-European taxi since he still falls under the provisions of the Separate Amenities Act? Would that be the position? ²²⁾

And Mr. Malan continued:

You see, sir, under this particular Bill you are not only denying Mr. Song certain rights and placing him technically in an inferior position, but you are placing the same stigma on 600,000,000 Chinese in the rest of the world. You are placing the same stigma on people from the East - from Indonesia, from Japan, from the Philippines and Formosa... After all, I do not think that there was any harm in regarding Mr. Song as a White person for the purpose of this particular Act. The Chinese are a great people; they were civilized long before our forefathers were. They have achieved great things in culture, in the arts and in the history of the world. They invented gun-powder; they knew about writing, about parchment, about literature, long, long before our forefathers did ²³⁾.

It should be clear now that the statement of the Minister of the Interior read in the House of Assembly on 1 May 1962 was intended to reply to the Opposition's attack on him with regard to the status of Japanese residents in the Republic of South Africa. "The opposition was not in the least concerned with the consequences of their action," said Senator de Klerk, before delivering his statement to Parliament. "On the one hand, they get up here and piously preach that we should tie bonds of friendship with the non-White states of Africa and Asia, but in the same breath they destroy the positive action of the Government in negotiating trade relations with Japan. They do so deliberately. On the one hand they plead that we should have good relations, and if there are good trade relations which are of advantage even to them, they ridicule the Japanese and say, 'It is pig iron and not pigment' which counts, and they do not care if those trade relations are disrupted. Then they continuously emphasize the discrimination in favour of the Japanese, in an attempt to make all the other non-Whites feel hurt, particularly the Chinese, with the object of destroying good relations..." ²⁴⁾

The problem of Japanese residents in South Africa, in which a number of perhaps very delicate elements has been involved, tended to be deliberately avoided by some M.P.s of the National Party. For example, Mr. J.H. Visse (Prinshof) was intervening on 27 March 1962 on the subject of Mr. Song's not belonging to the White group when an M.P. asked him: "What about the Japanese?" Mr. Visse, upon this, replied maladroitly: "I do not want to discuss the Japanese now" [*Laughter*] ²⁵⁾.

Another example was furnished on 26 April by Mr. S. L. Muller (Ceres), another National Party member. In reply to a question raised by Mr. W. V. Raw of the United Party, Mr. Muller said: "...What I wish to point out to the hon. member is that the decision of the community can become ridiculous. [*Interjections*] We had the case of the Chinaman who we all knew was born in China and, rightly or wrongly, a Chinaman is not regarded as White in South Africa." As an M. P. asked him: "What about the Japanese?" Mr. Muller replied: "I am not talking about the Japanese at the moment" [*Interjections*]²⁶⁾.

And Mr. M. L. Mitchell (Durban-North) of the United Party said, ironically:

I have seldom seen that able debater, the hon. member for Ceres [Mr. Muller], look so nonplussed when asked what about the Japanese²⁷⁾.

What was the debate on the Population Registration Amendment Bill like in the South African Senate?

On 16 May 1962, the Government was attacked vehemently by two Senators in the Opposition: Mr. J. M. Conradie of the Transvaal Province, and Mr. G. A. Rall of the Natal Province. Senator Conradie stated:

When the Government deemed fit to do business with Japan and to sell iron ore it opened the door and made the Japanese White. That is the reason for this amendment today. With that action, Mr. President, the Government, the National Party Government, which always raises the smoke screen of "save White South Africa," undermined one of the most important pillars on which our way of life, our Western civilization rests... Mr. President, when the Government opened this door for financial reasons and for no other reasons, to obtain business from Japan, that was where the Government yielded to that temptation...²⁸⁾

Senator Rall, supporting the view that the Population Registration Appeal Board had come to a wrong decision with regard to the Song case, stated:

But were they not perhaps guided by the precedents set by this Government's action in declaring the Japanese White? Were the Japanese not accepted as White despite their appearance?²⁹⁾

The Minister of the Interior, Senator de Klerk, in reply stated:

...The hon. Senator Conradie made a remark which I was sorry to hear and the hon. Senator Rall echoed him. This was in regard to the Japanese whom we declared to be White for the purposes of the Population Registration Act, so I believe. I think that my colleagues...should have studied the detailed explanation which I made...³⁰⁾

After having made it clear that Japanese were declared White only for the purposes of the Group Areas Act and that it had nothing to do with the Population Register, the Minister continued:

When the question of the Japanese was raised we found that there were 50 of them in a few large cities and, Mr. President, only one Japanese has permanent domicile in this country. The others are all here on temporary permits. Hon. Senators mentioned business but do hon. Senators know that when their party was in power - and I have no objection to that either - certain Chinese who were resident here received V. I. P. treatment when they were recommended by their Consul-General?... We have just continued it and have even extended it. The hon. Senators know that we had a deputation from Ghana here and we also had some of Tshombe's people, Black people. How were they treated? They were treated like Whites. Then suddenly, because they thought to drive in a wedge here the question of the Japanese was repeated *ad nauseum* and interpreted incorrectly until I took the trouble to make a very long and full explanation... However, let us say that it was only for the pig iron, as they say. Is that the patriotism that hon. Senators feel? All that business can go to blazes, all those thousands and millions of rand that we can earn there...³¹⁾

4. ORIGINS OF RACE RELATIONS

"By chance or by design the earth's creatures, man not excluded, come in a variety of colours, dimensions, and shapes." So opens Burke a chapter in his book, *Africa's Quest for Order*³²⁾. Why is it, then, that race relations have almost always been discussed in terms of relations, and relations of conflict, between the Europeans and the non-Europeans?

As Park says: "...whenever race relations... have assumed a character that could be described as problematic, such problems have inevitably arisen in response to the expansion of European people and European civilization."³³⁾

True enough, it was, more by chance than by design, the Europeans who first undertook large-scale explorations in all the corners of the world and made "great discoveries" with all ensuing territorial rights. Now European peoples and European civilization were implanted and rooted comfortably and deeply in the Americas, Asia, the Middle East, Africa, the Pacific, the Caribbean, and so on. The indigenous, many of whom had hitherto been isolated peoples, were then forcibly brought into more frequent contact with the Europeans.

What is more, things foreign (in this case European) tend, as it is generally observed at all times, to acquire prestige among the indigenous, simply because they are unfamiliar and exotic to them, if not of much practical value. The same holds true, at least to some extent, for new and strange people. It is said:

Physical difference, within limits, attracts, else the exotic would not be appreciated. The first Negroes brought to Europe by White explorers of Africa were welcomed into intimate

household association with aristocratic Englishmen; they were interesting oddities³⁴⁾.

It is also said that there is little evidence of inherent superior-inferior contact during a period of initial contact between Europeans and non-Europeans, when slave raiding and trading was not organized on a large scale³⁵⁾.

But, on a general plan, the Europeans were placed in a position not only materially but also psychologically superior to that of the indigenous. The sense of superiority of the Europeans over the non-Europeans could be compared to that which the victorious of a war or battle generally have over the defeated. What is more, many of the non-Europeans were presented to the Western world as slaves or imported labor force. Deplorable as it may be, it is an expression of human nature and no one can help it. Is it not a tragedy that two races, or even more, with totally different levels of technical development, should have to meet and get together - not for several hours or days, but for many years, even for a life-time?

In fact, racial conflicts, to which human beings are now accustomed, are, in a sense, but a by-product of the evolution of human society, which in modern times has been largely steered by the Europeans.

One important point has been clearly placed in relief by Prof. Toynbee:

Though in certain other respects the triumph of the English-speaking peoples may be judged, in retrospect, to have been a blessing to mankind, in this perilous matter of race feeling it can hardly be denied that it has been a misfortune. The English-speaking nations that have established themselves in the New World overseas have not, on the whole, been "good mixers." They have mostly swept away their primitive predecessors; and, where they have either allowed a primitive population to survive, as in South Africa, or have imported primitive "man-power" from elsewhere, as in North America, they have developed the rudiments of that paralysing institution which in India - where in the course of many centuries it has grown to its full stature - we have learnt to deplore under the name of "caste." Moreover, the alternative to extermination or segregation has been exclusion - a policy which averts the danger of internal schism in the life of the community which practices it, but does so at the price of producing a not less dangerous state of international tension between the excluding and the excluded races - especially when this policy is applied to representatives of alien races who are not primitive but civilized, like the Hindus and Chinese and Japanese. In this respect, then, the triumph of the English-speaking peoples has imposed on mankind a "race question" which would hardly have arisen, or at least hardly in such an acute form and over so wide an area, if the French, for example, and not the English, had been victorious in the eighteenth-century struggle for the possession of India and North America³⁶⁾.

Let us give further play to our "sociological imagination," to borrow Hughes' term,³⁷⁾ and suppose that it was neither the English or the French, but that it was a race of non-European origin, say the Japanese, who had been the one that discovered parts of the New World.

This is no wild imagination : already in the thirteenth century, Japanese ships roamed the Asian seas, colonies were established in areas of Southeast Asia, and in 1592 Korea was invaded in an extraordinary, but abortive, attempt to conquer China ³⁸⁾. This phase of imperialist expansion, paralleling that of Europe during the same period, was interrupted for two and half centuries by the *Pax Tokugawa* when Japanese leaders chose isolation rather than conquest as the best defense against expanding European colonialism. But if the Tokugawa family had not isolated Japan from the rest of the world, "Wako," Japanese warrior-merchants who were not averse to piracy when opportunity offered, might have been the first to discover at least part of the New World. In that case, the racial problem would have been presented in a completely different way.

Another factor should not be forgotten. The Europeans were, at first, much less numerous in comparison with the indigenous in any territory they had "discovered." It is always possible to imagine a case in which settlers are hopelessly few and, what is more, there is no prospect for new settlers to come. Fletcher Christian, the master's mate on HMS *Bounty*, and eight other mutineers who took the boat to Pitcairn Island in 1789 to found a small colony on the island (which remained undiscovered until 1808) may be a case in point. In most cases, however, the Europeans soon found themselves sufficiently numerous.

Through not only their geographical, but also their scientific and technical, discoveries, the Europeans, scattered all over the world, had built up an incomparably strong economic position and their number, anywhere, had comfortably increased. In some cases, as in the Americas, they had outnumbered the aboriginal population. Those non-Europeans who seek economic opportunities in a White-dominated area tend inevitably to have a sense of inferiority, especially when they find themselves in Europe, America, or any other places where the non-Whites are a minority. This is again a natural outflow of human nature. And when the non-Europeans in such places try to move up along the social scales, then they may easily set fire to dormant racial consciousness in the minds of the Europeans. Blumer says: "...the fact that members of the subordinate racial groups will be moving upward and outward in the changes taking place in the mass society will provide continuing occasion for the affirmation of racial identification. They will encounter obstacles at different points and find themselves confronted by areas of exclusiveness from which they will be banned." ³⁹⁾

It is reported that, in the course of the Conference on Race Relations in World Perspective, held in Honolulu in 1954, an Asian participant asked if concern about race did not reflect the worry of Whites about their loss of power over non-Whites ⁴⁰⁾. This remark, qualified as "provocative" by Conant ⁴¹⁾, is, to the mind of the author of this monograph, not provocative at all.

There is another natural expression of human nature with regard to races. While a racial minority tends, under certain circumstances, to try to lose its racial identity ⁴²⁾, many people have a natural desire to be regarded as part of a racial minority. It is especially the case with today's world, where religions, philosophies and education proclaiming the equality of all men have been disseminated all over the world, where so many non-European territories (which used to be called "peripheric" or "overseas" territories) have gained their political independence, and where differences other than racial among men - as in wealth and educational background - are

attracting more and more attention. This is not only when we belong to a racial minority. We feel privileged when we know we are limited in number under other circumstances, too: when we belong to aristocracy, to the educated few, to exclusive bars and clubs, and the like, and also we should feel happy and privileged when we are alone in a totally foreign community. How many of us have so strong a desire to live or travel in foreign lands! Since this desire is so ardent among us, and since opportunities to realize it have increased so remarkably in recent decades, it is becoming very common for us to do so - too common for some of the people who want to monopolize the privilege of being abroad. It is a well-known fact that the Japanese, living in Paris and forming a community of their own, have, as their number grows, come to disassociate themselves. To meet other people of the same status (in terms of race, nationality, educational background, etc.) in a foreign country does not seem, strangely enough, always a pleasure.

In short, we, consciously or unconsciously, want to be different from others. We want to have what others do not; we want to be what others are not.

5. ATTITUDE OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

Now, let us turn to the more specific problem of the attitude of the Government of South Africa.

The race structure of the Republic of South Africa in 1951 was as follows. Of the total population of 12, 646 (in thousands):

8,535	Bantu	(67.5%)
2,643	Europeans	(20.9%)
1,102	Coloured	(8.7%)
369	Asiatics	(2.9%) ⁴³⁾

What was then the breakdown of the 369,000 Asiatics in South Africa? The report of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa, dealing with the demographic situation of ethnic groups in South Africa, overlooks the existence of some Japanese in that country and states: "The Asiatic population ... has been imported as a labour force. It comprises 365,000 Indians and 4,000 Chinese."⁴⁴⁾

But there were Japanese in South Africa as there are now: Senator de Klerk, in his statement in the House of Assembly on 1 May 1962 and in his intervention in the Senate on 16 May of the same year, said there were at that moment 50 Japanese in the country.

Several facts should be given due consideration with regard to the Asiatics residing in the Republic of South Africa.

(1) By far the most important will be the fact that Japanese in South Africa are definitely few in number and only temporarily resident.

As a matter of fact, it is evident that Senator de Klerk's argument was mainly based on the point that the Japanese in South Africa are "not a permanent or a numerous group," and that they are "spread all over the country."

On the other hand, the Indians and Chinese in South Africa are numerous. The Chinese are much fewer in number than the Indians, but the perception of the Chinese in that Republic may, as

is the case with those in Australia, not be based on an actual head count of those living, but of the hundreds of millions in China itself⁴⁵⁾. What is more, both the Indians and the Chinese are settled permanently in the Republic: they are “a settled community in the Republic,” to borrow the Minister of the Interior’s expression.

(2) Senator de Klerk said that “the majority of them [the Japanese] are strangers and eminent persons who are here temporarily, attending to the interests of businesses of Japan.”

It is true that the Japanese visiting the Republic of South Africa are for the most part people with a relatively good education and a relatively high standard of living. The Japanese in South Africa restrict themselves to their missions as consuls⁴⁶⁾ or trade representatives, and they are never an economic threat to the South Africans of European stock, let alone of non-European ancestry. On the contrary, they take the view that the Japanese in South Africa are playing their part in promoting relations between the two countries in the political, as well as economic, fields.

But the Japanese visiting South Africa may not always be well-educated and well-dressed trade representatives. Senator A. Friend of the Natal Province asked the Minister of the Interior, on 16 May 1962, what the Government would do with the Japanese swimmers if they come to the Republic, and Senator de Klerk equivocated:

Has that anything to do with this Act, Mr. President? I think, Mr. President, that you will not permit me to reply to that⁴⁷⁾.

On the other hand, it is said that the Indians and Chinese in the Republic of South Africa are mostly unskilled or semi-skilled labourers⁴⁸⁾. The South African Government is certainly aware of the fact that the Indians and Chinese have an ancient civilization and a long tradition; but those permanently settled in South Africa are mostly descendants of imported labour, and in that sense they are unlike most of the Japanese in the Republic.

(3) It may be added that the Indians and Chinese in South Africa tend, unlike the Japanese, to lead such lives as they would lead in their home countries. Senator de Kleck was perhaps right when he said in his statement: “They [the Chinese] cannot, and do not want to, be assimilated ...”.

6. TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN JAPAN AND SOUTH AFRICA

Time, in the 19 January 1962 issue, printed an article entitled “Honorary Whites,” in which it stated as follows:

... Prime Minister Hendrik Verwoerd’s racist regime began to have second thoughts about white supremacy as applied to Asians when, a few weeks ago, it contemplated a tempting \$250 million industrial contract with Japan.

Tokyo’s Yawata Iron & Steel Co. offered to purchase 5,000,000 tons of South African pig iron over a ten-year period. With such a huge deal in the works, South Africa could hardly afford to insult the visiting Japanese trade delegations that now would regularly visit the

country. Without hesitation, Pretoria's Group Areas Board announced that all Japanese henceforth would be considered white, at least for purposes of residence, and Johannesburg's city fathers decided that "in view of the trade agreements" they would open the municipal swimming pools to Japanese guests ⁴⁹.

The importance of trade relations between Japan and South Africa should not be denied in the Japanese being granted privileged status in the latter country. As a matter of fact, Japan has been an important trade partner of the Republic of South Africa and trade between the two countries is continually acquiring importance. The list below, compiled from the United Nations' *Yearbook of International Trade Statistics* ⁵⁰, shows the principal trade partners of the Republic, and it is obvious from the list that Japan scores high among them (value in millions of rands):

Trade by Principal Countries of Production and Destination

	Imports (f. o. b.)										
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Total	976.9	1,111.1	1,003.2	1,007.8	1,212.7	1,535.8	1,757.7	1,645.5	1,921.4	1,883.1	2,134.8
Australia	9.7	12.4	15.2	13.7	12.4	16.0	18.8	22.1	31.2	28.1	39.3
Belgium	13.116.2	20.3	12.4	13.8	19.6	26.9	18.4	23.6	20.5	24.0	
Canada	38.9	39.3	26.9	24.9	40.6	46.6	49.7	50.7	57.2	44.5	53.0
France	19.7	23.9	22.7	21.1	31.3	41.2	46.6	41.2	53.8	67.0	61.2
W. Germany	99.0	111.6	109.1	102.2	129.7	165.4	191.3	176.0	231.7	253.6	292.9
Iran	34.8	37.8	32.5	36.7	31.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Italy	21.8	31.6	27.7	28.8	14.1	46.6	70.2	51.3	70.8	78.0	84.9
Japan	30.9	40.6	37.5	41.7	56.4	81.5	100.6	90.1	116.0	123.9	188.2
Netherlands	24.8	27.1	25.4	24.8	30.1	36.7	37.1	41.554.3	42.1	41.4	
Sweden	17.7	21.3	19.3	18.1	22.0	25.4	28.9	25.7	34.0	30.5	37.9
Switzerland	14.5	17.0	13.9	15.9	19.6	28.5	29.7	35.3	31.1	37.2	40.8
United Kingdom	303.2	315.3	291.5	303.0	361.4	432.7	494.5	448.9	497.2	449.1	499.4
U. S. A.	167.1	214.5	177.0	166.8	204.5	292.0	331.2	291.3	332.6	332.5	370.2

	Exports (f. o. b.)										
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Total	789.4	801.3	849.8	873.6	907.0	956.2	1,060.9	1,207.4	1,364.9	1,506.3	1,531.1
Australia	8.3	10.5	11.0	8.7	11.7	11.5	11.2	9.7	12.0	13.1	13.2
Belgium	33.1	32.2	33.4	37.9	38.6	36.3	46.6	54.9	47.3	52.3	63.2
Canada	4.4	6.6	7.5	10.4	13.3	15.0	16.0	20.0	20.8	24.1	28.2
France	25.6	28.3	34.0	31.3	31.4	36.4	37.2	39.2	35.2	37.5	43.0
W. Germany	32.9	35.5	41.0	42.8	49.1	57.8	55.7	69.4	85.7	101.1	102.0
Iran	0.6	0.5	0.4	2.5	0.6	—	—	—	—	—	—
Italy	25.3	26.7	35.7	44.3	49.3	39.9	37.6	44.5	50.2	42.9	44.8
Japan	24.2	30.3	51.3	72.4	70.5	84.2	76.1	83.4	175.2	203.7	151.6
Netherlands	13.8	16.0	20.3	25.2	24.5	23.6	21.0	20.9	23.3	31.5	32.4
Sweden	5.3	4.9	5.7	5.6	5.1	5.2	6.9	8.1	7.0	7.5	7.8
Switzerland	1.1	2.0	2.5	5.7	5.0	4.7	6.2	5.3	4.1	2.4	3.2
United Kingdom	219.5	223.7	254.2	241.9	272.0	301.0	357.8	404.3	421.2	476.1	510.3
U. S. A.	70.6	54.2	68.3	78.1	80.6	82.5	100.2	136.7	107.8	104.6	108.9

It is clear from the same source that India and China are not very important trade partners from South Africa's point of view. In 1962, for example, the South African imports from India were valued at only 2.01 million rands, whereas she imported 41.71 million rands of goods from Japan; in the same year, the Republic's exports to India were nil, while it exported 72.39 million rands of goods to Japan.

In Japan's eyes, the Republic of South Africa is also important commercially. According to the U.N. trade statistics, it is evident that the Republic is becoming Japan's most important trade partner of all African countries. In 1962, for example, the Republic was almost as important as Nigeria as Japan's export market, and was by far the most important as a source of imports for Japan.

Japan, which is a member of the Afro-Asian Group in and outside the United Nations and its specialized agencies, may have not always acted as such with regard to the Republic of South Africa, held in abhorrence by the other Afro-Asian countries. This comes partly, without doubt, out of Japan's consideration over the trade relations she maintains with the Republic.

7. ATTITUDE OF THE JAPANESE AND THAT OF THE CHINESE AND INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA

What is the attitude of the Japanese, the Asians in general, and the South Africans, both of European and of non-European descent, toward the policy of the South African Government and the generally observed practice with regard to Japanese residents in South Africa?

(1) With regard to the attitude of the Japanese *viz-a-viz* the policy of the Government of South Africa, it could be said that majority of the Japanese are simply ignorant that they will be "Honorary Europeans" when they arrive in the Republic. No comment has appeared, as far as the author of this monograph knows, in the Japanese press.

For those Japanese who are residing in South Africa and for those who are informed about the situation in that country, it should be a source of both embarrassment and satisfaction.

Embarrassment, first and foremost because many of the Japanese have a not-yet-faint recollection that the Nazi regime of pre-World War II Germany called the Japanese, their Asiatic allies, "Honorary Aryans."

Hans Gunther, an ardent Nazi, who was professor of anthropology at the University of Jena, advanced the theory that the modern Japanese must have had, eons back, a considerable injection of Nordic blood every drop as good as that of the modern Germans⁵¹⁾. Most obviously, Prof. Gunther was referring to the first inhabitants of the Japanese Islands, the Ainu, a people probably of proto-white stock.

It is said that Heinrich Himmler, the high-priest of the Schutzstaffel (SS), expressed the Nordic gospel in its most outrageous form. He was particularly interested in the runic script, in general use by the Germanic peoples from about the third to the thirteenth centuries. "Studied with the eye of faith, they [runes] might, he believed, yield resemblance to Japanese ideograms, and thus prove the Japanese to be Aryans after all."⁵²⁾

Williams writes: "Acting perhaps on this [Prof. Gunther's] theory, Hitler excludes the Japanese when he strikes at non-Aryans. Japanese residents are not subject to the racial laws of the Third Reich."⁵³⁾

It will be recalled that the Japanese were not "Honorary Europeans" when Hitler was writing *Mein Kampf* in the mid-1920's. It is stated in the book: "Contrary to what many people claim, Japan does not add European techniques to her culture, but European science and techniques are entwisted with Japanese characteristics [mit japanischen Eigenarten verbrämt]."

Mein Kampf goes on to say:

Should further Aryan influence stop to work upon Japan, starting today..., the rise which Japan experiences now in science and technology could go on for a short while; but in only a few years the well would dry up, Japanese characteristics would rebound, but today's culture would atrophy and sink back into the sleep from which it [Japanese culture] was awakened seven decades ago through the Aryan cultural wave. As today's Japanese evolution is given life by Aryan origin, so did foreign influence and foreign intellect once awaken in the grey past Japan's culture at that time...This [petrification of culture] can take place in a people when the original and creative racial essence [Rassekern] has been lost, or when the external influence, which initially provided impulse and material for cultural development, is deprived of at a later stage... One can call such a race a culture-carrying [Kulturtragend] one, but never a culture-creating [Kulturschpferisch] one⁵⁴⁾.

On 30 January 1939, however, Hitler said at the Reichstag:

The Japanese nation, which in the last two years has set us so many examples of glorious heroism, is undoubtedly fighting in the service of civilization at the other side of the world⁵⁵⁾.

He said on 17 May 1942, namely, six months after Japan's declaration of war against the United States:

There are certain foreign journalists who try to create an impression by talking about the yellow peril and by drawing our attention to the fact that our alliance with Japan is a species of betrayal of our own racial principles. One could retort to these oafs that during the First World War it was the British who appealed to the Japanese, in order to give us the *coup de grâce*. Without going any further it is perhaps sufficient to reply to these short-sighted spirits that the present conflict is one of life or death, and that the essential is to win - and to that end we are quite ready to make an alliance with the Devil himself.

Taking a more objective view, it is obvious that the Japanese alliance has been of exceptional value to us, if only because of the date chosen by Japan for her entry into the war. It was, in effect, at the moment when the surprises of the Russian winter were pressing most heavily on the morale of our people, and when everybody in Germany was oppressed by the

certainly that, sooner or later, the United States would come into the conflict. Japanese intervention, therefore, was, from our point of view, most opportune. Apart from that, the way in which Japan interprets her obligations under the terms of our alliance does her the greatest credit and is having a happy influence on the German people⁵⁶⁾.

It was after all out of political consideration that Nazi Germany offered to the Japanese a status of "Honorary Aryans." This kind of treatment today would have little flattering effect on the Japanese, even on those who shared, during World War II, the totalitarian philosophy of Nazism.

In this connection, it may be added that the policy of race discrimination of the South African Government was once compared, in the Senate, with that of Nazi Germany. Senator E. B. Woolf of the Transvaal Province said, on 16 May 1962:

....These [race] prejudices exist in spite of the church, in spite of liberalism, but nowhere are they enshrined in the law of the land... And so it is an unfortunate thing that we have to say that only in Nazi Germany and South Africa do we get this type of legislation as the law of the land⁵⁷⁾.

To this comment of Dr. Woolf's, Senator de Klerk referred later, saying:

....the Nazi did that with the purpose of murdering and destroying, irrespective of sex. This Government does not do it with those motives. Even though it is unique because it is in a unique position, the comparison with Nazi Germany is not relevant to my mind and is completely unfitting. We do so here to save and to educate and to make stronger and to give those races which we wish to develop separately an opportunity to uplift themselves; it is not to kill or to murder⁵⁸⁾.

Embarrassment, secondly because the Japanese are a perceptive people, always taking into account the feelings of their neighbours and associates. Those residing in the Republic of South Africa should be embarrassed when they think of the possible ill-effects on the other Asiatics in the Republic, especially on the Chinese, and also on the South Africans, in particular of European origin. The Japanese in South Africa, being admitted into White society, will feel somewhat similar to those Africans who, after having served Europeans, now give orders to them⁵⁹⁾. In short, Japanese residents in South Africa will find themselves under such circumstances where it is not easy to behave in a very natural way viz-a-viz the other Asiatics as well as the Europeans in the Republic.

Another source of embarrassment to Japanese residents in South Africa has been all sorts of mockery, as appeared in the press, concerning the Japanese being treated as Whites. For example, *The Star* of 5 May 1962 printed a cartoon representing a scene in Tokyo. A Japanese, holding a newspaper in his hand, says to another: "Hon. paper say Japanese Government reciprocating by declaring all Honourable Europeans in Tokyo yellow"⁶⁰⁾.

It should not be denied, on the other hand, that the Japanese in South Africa, few in number and accorded privileges, would sometimes feel satisfied at the decision of the host Government. In South Africa, “things are made easy” for Japanese businessmen, as Mr. Pelser said in Parliament on 30 April 1962. Their satisfaction does not involve, it can easily be imagined, any sense of superiority over the other Asiatics. Anyone will be satisfied, deep down at heart, that the “colour bar” no longer exists against him. Not altogether out of his materialistic considerations; it is rather a natural expression of human nature, due to the consciousness that he now belongs to a privileged minority.

(2) As to the attitude of the Chinese and Indians in South Africa, and of the South Africans toward the legal status of the Japanese in the Republic, little material is available. It may be said, however, that the reaction of European-descent South Africans has been generally favourable to the decision of the Government, with some people ridiculing it, though.

The Chinese in South Africa, especially those who do not belong to the labouring thousands - e.g., consuls ⁶¹⁾ - should be resentful of the situation, all the more since the Chinese and the Japanese are similar in physical appearance. In the already-quoted article, *Time* of 19 January 1962 wrote:

This [declaration of the Japanese as “Honorary Whites”] seemed grossly unfair to South Africa’s proud, little (7,000) community of Chinese, who, it seemed, would enjoy none of the new benefits granted the Japanese. “If anything, we are whiter in appearance than our Japanese friends,” huffed one of Cape Town’s leading Chinese businessmen. Demanded another indignantly: “Does this mean that the Japanese, now that they are ‘white,’ cannot associate with us without running afoul of the Immorality Act?”

In Johannesburg the Chinese were slipping in on Japanese coattails, at least at the swimming pools ... ⁶²⁾

It is ironic that the case of Mr. Song, a Chinese, led the South African Government to clarify its stand on the status of Japanese residents in South Africa.

One thing to be borne in mind is that, South Africa having official relations with Nationalist China, some Chinese residents there may find it difficult, if not impossible, to contact the Chinese Consulate-General in Johannesburg.

The Indians - some of them must have originated from what is now Pakistan or Bangladesh - should also naturally be resentful over the decision of the South African Government, particularly the Indian Government, which, ever since the first United Nations General Assembly, has tried, in vain, to exercise pressure on South Africa so that her policy with regard to the Indians in the Republic would be altered.

CONCLUSION

Before World War II, racial discrimination in South Africa was based primarily on differences

in social customs and, much to a smaller degree, on laws. Consequently, there was no serious problem in the treatment of Japanese residents and visitors, except that they were “prohibited immigrants” under the Immigrant Regulation Act of 1913.

After the war - to be more exact, after the National Party had come to be installed in 1948 - , certain discriminatory laws were passed and the Government’s attitude toward the application of these laws to the Japanese was until recently vaguely defined. Consequently, these laws were often applied to the Japanese, causing them hardships and ill-feelings. But now the Japanese are treated as Whites and almost all housing and public accommodations are freely open to them.

It is the author’s conviction that the privileged status of Japanese residents in the Republic of South Africa has been offered to them chiefly because they are of but a small number. If, say, the Indians who constitute more than 96 percent of the Asiatics in the Republic were a small and scattered group of educated people, they would be treated like so many Whites. It is known that the members of the Indian High Commission in the Union of South Africa - now abolished - were treated as eminent visitors.

The same thing can, of course, be said of the Chinese in South Africa.

The Star of 22 November 1961, printed the following article:

Japanese - irrespective of whether they are born here - are Whites in South Africa... This was confirmed by Government officials in Pretoria today....

South African-born Chinese are regarded as Coloured.

This does not apply to “foreign” Chinese who are granted visas to visit the country, who pass for Whites and use all White amenities⁶³.

It is clear, therefore, that Indian and Chinese visitors to the Republic of South Africa are, and will be, treated as the Japanese visitors are.

Senator de Klerk, the Minister of the Interior, also stated, as we have already seen, that “certain Chinese who were resident here received V. I. P. treatment,” and that “a deputation from Ghana here and... some of Tshombe’s people, Black people” were “treated like Whites.” It was because their number was small and they did not stay long in the Republic.

The South Africans of European stock, however, have an amazing blind spot not to see that the policy of apartheid humiliates the Bantu, the Coloureds and the Asiatics in the same way it would the Japanese. Exceptions to the practice are all the more insufferable to those who are not exempt. Senator de Klerk’s statement on the Japanese reveals a lot more about apartheid than comments of its arch enemies. It is hoped that the comments on the treatment of Japanese coming as they do on the heels of the rationalization in defense of apartheid must have served to prick the conscience of many a white-skinned South African, or at least made him drop the “humane” pretense of apartheid so that he would see it in terms of perpetuating White control.

NOTES

- 1) This is a translation by the author of this monograph from the Japanese edition of Mr. Segal's book, translated by Mr. Yasuo Okuno and published in January 1964 by the Jiji Press, Tokyo (pp. 6-7). The wording of the original English text may be different.
- 2) Opened virtually in October 1962.
- 3) *The Star*, 2 May 1962, p. 1.
- 4) Amended in 1956 and in 1962.
- 5) Amended twice in 1955.
- 6) House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, *Debates of the House of Assembly* (19 January to 23 June 1962), column 4768. *Debates of the House of Assembly* (or *House of Assembly Debates*) will hereafter be referred to in this monograph as *Hansard*.
- 7) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4767.
- 8) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 4768-4771.
- 9) Proclamation No. 46 of 1959. This proclamation was later amended slightly (Proclamation No. 27 of 1961).
- 10) In some other cases, the term "Coloured" is used to designate all non-Europeans.
- 11) UN, *Report of the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa, General Assembly Official Records: Eighth Session, Supplement No. 16 (A/2505 & A/2505/Add. 1)*, 1953, pp. 58-59.
The Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa was established by a General Assembly resolution of 5 December 1952.
- 12) UN, *Report of the United Nations Commission...*, p. 59.
- 13) Kenneth Kirkwood, *The Group Areas Act* (Johannesburg: Institute of Race Relations, 1951), p. 9.
- 14) Italics the author's.

- 15) *The Cape Times*, 14 March 1962, p. 10.
- 16) *The Times* [London], 9 March 1962, p. 10.
- 17) Italics the author's.
- 18) *Hansard* (15 May to 19 May 1961), col. 6506. Quoted by Senator de Klerk himself on 1 May 1962. See *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 4749-4751.
- 19) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4539.
- 20) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4483.
- 21) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4630.
- 22) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4634.
- 23) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4638.
- 24) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4767.
- 25) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4540.
- 26) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4498.
- 27) *Hansard* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 4501.
- 28) Senate of the Republic of South Africa, *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 3792-3793.
- 29) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 3834.
- 30) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 3891.
- 31) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 3892-3893.
- 32) Fred G. Burke, *Africa's Quest for Order* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 79.
- 33) Robert Ezra Park, *Race and Culture* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950), p. 100.
- 34) Robert Redfield, "Race as a Social Phenomenon" in Edgar T. Thompson and Everett C.

- Hughes (eds.), *Race: Individual and Collective Behavior* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), p. 69.
- 35) Burke, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
- 36) Arnold Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial & The World and the West* (Cleveland and N.Y.: The World Publishing Co., 1958), pp. 181-182.
- 37) Everett C. Hughes, "Race Relations and the Sociological Imagination" in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28, No. 6, December 1963, p. 889.
- 38) Edwin O. Reischauer, *Japan: Past and Present* (Second Ed.; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), pp. 74-75, etc.
- 39) Herbert G. Blumer, "Reflections of Theory of Race Relations" in Andrew W. Lind (ed.), *Race Relations in World Perspective* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1955), p. 18.
- 40) Melvin Conant, *Race Issues on the World Scene* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1955), p. 20.
- 41) *Ibid.*
- 42) Hughes, *op. cit.*, p. 883, and Brewton Berry, *Race Relations: The Interaction of Ethnic and Racial Groups* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951), p. 239.
- 43) UN, *Report of the United Nations Commission...*, p. 46.
- 44) UN, *Report of the United Nations Commission...*, p. 45.
- 45) Conant, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- 46) Japan maintains a Consulate-General in Pretoria, with a new branch office in Cape Town. She also has an honorary Consulate in Durban.
- 47) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), col. 3894.
- 48) UN, *Report of the United Nations Commission...*, p. 39 and p. 45.
- 49) "Honorary Whites," *Time*, 19 January 1962, p. 35. To be exact, it was with the Swaziland Iron Ore Development Co. that Yawata and Fuji made a contract on 25 September 1961. For

details, see the Japan Iron and Steel Federation, *Tekkohkai*, October 1961, p.86. (Yawata and Fuji, two iron and steel manufacturing companies of Japan, were merged on 31 March 1970 to form the Nippon Steel Corporation.)

- 50) For 1963, p.625, for 1964, p.668, for 1965, p.694, for 1966, p.720, for 1967, p.752, for 1968, p.747, for 1969, p. 745.
- 51) Wythe Williams, *Riddle of the Reich* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1941), pp. 253-254.
- 52) H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler* (N.Y.: MacMillan, 1947), pp. 21-22.
- 53) Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 254.
- 54) Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (München: Zentralverlag der NSDAF, 1939), S. 318-319 [translation the author's]. The first edition appeared in 1925 (Book 1) and 1927 (Book 2).
It is sometimes maintained in Japan that these portions of Hitler's book were deleted from the original German edition as Japan began to show a marked pro-German propensity; but Mr. Shigeru Takayanagi says it is only an "unfounded legend" in his post-WW II translation with Mr. Ichiro Hirano of *Mein Kampf* (Tokyo: Reimei Shobo, 1961), II, 264-265. The truth is that the Japanese translators of the book prior to, and during, WW II, such as Ryuji Sakai (Tokyo: Naigaisha, 1932), Yasuo Okubo (Tokyo: Mikasa Shobo, 1937), and Ryoichi Manabe (Tokyo: Kofukan, 1943), simply did not render into Japanese these and other anti-Japanese portions of the book. Mr. Takayanagi's and Mr. Hirano's appears to be the first complete translation in Japan.
- 55) Raoul de Roussy de Sales (ed.), *My New Order* (N.Y.: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), p. 591.
- 56) *Hitler's Secret Conversations 1941-1944* (N.Y.: Farrar, Strauss and Young, 1953), p. 396.
- 57) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 3854-3855.
- 58) *Debates* (19 January to 23 June 1962), cols. 3899-3900.
- 59) Abioseh Nicol, "Race Relations in Independent Africa" in *The World Today*, January 1963, pp. 47-50.
- 60) *The Star*, 5 May 1952, p. 8.
- 61) Nationalist China keeps a Consulate-General in Johannesburg.

62) *Time*, 19 January 1962, p. 35.

63) *The Star*, 22 November 1961, p. 1.

(December 1964)

* * *

POSTSCRIPT

After the redaction of the original monograph for publication, Deon Geldenhuys, *The Diplomacy of Isolation: South African Foreign Policy Making* (Johannesburg: Macmillan South Africa, 1984), came to my knowledge as a book having some bearing on the monograph. By way of illustration, it says, upon authority of E. Du Plessis, *Die Buitelandse Beleid van Dr. H.F. Verwoerd 1958-1966* (Pretoria: University of Pretoria, 1978), p.82: "Diplomatic links between South Africa and Ghana had been under mutual consideration since 1957, and Louw [Eric H.; Minister of External Affairs of South Africa] and President Kwame Nkrumah even reached agreement on establishing such relations in future. Nothing, however, came of it, and Ghana from 1960 became increasingly hostile to South Africa's domestic political arrangements" (p.13). The statement made by Senator de Klerk which I quoted towards the end of Chapter 3 reveals that a deputation from Ghana had come to South Africa. I would imagine that the deputation came to Pretoria in the late 1950's so as to explore the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations with South Africa.

I stated in the conclusion that the Indian High Commission in the Union of South Africa had been abolished by the time of writing the original monograph. According to Geldenhuys, India closed its diplomatic mission in South Africa in 1954 "at the Union government's request" (p.15).