

outside the ken of many of his readers. Although he seems to be acutely aware of what the Incarnation should mean to those who believe in it (and of how often it does not, just because of those watertight compartments), a Christian reader will miss any such firm central viewpoint in space and time, and consequently may note many distortions of the view. To say this is not to reproach the author, but to caution the prospective reader.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

YOU ARE WRONG, FATHER HUDDLESTON. By Alexander Steward.  
(The Bodley Head; 12s. 6d.)

While it is true that the Anglican missionary Father Huddleston offered *Naught For Your Comfort* in his attack on South African *Apartheid*, the present author offers far too much in his defence of it. He declares that his main purpose is 'to show that South Africa's approach to the race problem contains . . . cultural and spiritual advantages for the Bantu people'. He purports to give an objective estimate of the problem and of the Nationalist Party's policy which is, in his view, 'a sincere and reasonable attempt by honest men to solve, with justice to all, a most complex problem'. But it is very obvious that he is scarcely less impartial in his plea for the government than Father Huddleston is in his misguided efforts to champion the cause of the Native African. Undoubtedly the thesis of *Apartheid* has been misrepresented outside Africa; undoubtedly the problem is a most complex one, not to be solved by any simple theory of *gelykstelling* (identification) or any unrealistic thesis of integration; undoubtedly, on paper, the overall policy of the Nationalist Government does not call for the wholesale condemnation which it has received. But it is not merely a question of theory or thesis, nor is the policy of the Nationalist Government to be judged on paper; it is to be judged in its actual implementation. The author adduces a number of notable examples to illustrate the humanitarianism of the government towards the Bantu. He speaks enthusiastically, not without cause, of the African township of Meadowlands which is gradually replacing the shocking Johannesburg slum of Sophiatown; but he does not seem to know to what extent the City Council, which has undertaken this project, has been hampered by Government regulations. He records, with illustration, that 'the most modern hospital in Africa was built at Welkom at a cost of £750,000 entirely for the use of the Bantu', but he does not appear to know that this 'Sir Ernest Oppenheimer Hospital' was privately built by and belongs to the Anglo-American Goldmining Corporation for their mine-boys; nor is he apparently aware of the considerable dissatisfaction expressed by the white population of

Welkom, that 'natives' should have so fine a hospital, nor of the bitter complaints at the importation of Catholic sisters to run it on the grounds that they were 'deficient in colour sense'. He outlines the socio-economic reasons for *Apartheid*, and these would carry considerable weight were it not that the existing social and economic inequalities as between whites and non-whites are demonstrably based not on inequalities of culture but on difference of colour. Many individual instances, some of them most tragic, known to our missionaries, prove this to be true. And by the same token it is significant that the author makes no reference at all to the magnificent and effective missionary labours of our Catholic priests and sisters in the Union. In theory, as expounded for example in the Tomlinson Report, in the Bantu Authorities Act and in the Bantu Education Act, '*Apartheid*' offers the Bantu freedom to choose the means by which he will express himself politically' and 'a plan for creating an organic and developing Bantu society in which all avenues of advancement of every kind will be open to its members'. But it is made abundantly clear that the implementation of this policy, if indeed it is intended to implement it, is to be effected by the exclusion in particular of 'the white man's religion' from the avenues of advancement to be opened to the Bantu. The Tomlinson Report does indeed recognize the great work done in the Mission Schools, but it fails to recommend the continuance of these schools, preferring to see them replaced by national secularist schools. The author tells of the defeatist attitude of the Anglicans to the Bantu Education Act, but does not mention the overwhelming response given to the Catholic Bishops' Campaign to 'Keep Christ in our Native Schools'. It is true that he makes capital out of the missionary activities of the Dutch Reformed Church, backed by financial aid from the Nationalist Government, but it is significant that the activities he names are all outside the Union, in Nigeria, S. Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Bechuanaland. He gives instances of the paternalism and condescension of the white man towards the Bantu. These are not to be denied, and the instances could be multiplied; but they bear no real relation to the point at issue; even slaves have been, and still are, so treated in various parts of the world. No evidence is offered by the author as to the general reaction of the Bantu people themselves to the theory and policy of *Apartheid*, though the suggestion is that the more intelligent among them see the advantage of it for themselves and the whites. When, however, an opportunity was recently found of expressing their views of the Tomlinson Commission's territorial *Apartheid* recommendations, as reported in *The Observer* (October 7th, 1956), a conference of representative African leaders from all over the Union of South Africa rejected these recom-

mentations on the ground that they deny to the Bantu inalienable and basic human rights, deny him any share in the government of the country, deny him the right to free assembly and collective bargaining, deny him free movement and civic protection, and deny him even domestic liberty. The Conference declared itself solidly in favour of a middle-course policy of inter-racial co-operation involving neither complete integration nor complete segregation. Why is this reasonable solution not envisaged by the author or by the Nationalist Government? To sum up: In so far as the author set out to substantiate the title of his book, he has succeeded. In so far as he has touched upon a theory of *Apartheid* that can be defended on practical and purely humanitarian grounds, he can claim some approval. But in so far as his object was to justify the practical policy of the present South African government *vis-à-vis* the Bantu, he has failed. This is not to say that the book is without interest or value. One can at least share the expressed hope of the publishers that it may have the effect of 'opening up the discussion of this vital problem on a more widely informed level'.

HILARY J. CARPENTER, O.P.

THE SANE SOCIETY. By Erich Fromm. (Routledge and Kegan Paul; 25s.)

The author of this book has come a very long way. Originally a convinced Freudian, he later began to see that orthodox psychoanalysis is a highly problematical, indeed, fantastic creed and tried to free himself from it. What he did, in company with a few other like-minded psychologists, was to re-interpret the Freudian terms and theorems in a purely sociological spirit and thus to get rid of the crude materialism and sexualism which mars the system of Freud himself. For instance, for Freud's assertion that the little boy feels strongly attached to his mother because she is to him an object of erotic desire, Fromm substituted the suggestion that this attachment was due to the fact that to the child the mother means security in a world where everything is apt to create anxiety. Thus sense was substituted for nonsense, reason for unreason, and a new point of view was won from which many layers of mental life could be examined with solid hope of sound insights. In an earlier book, *The Fear of Freedom*, Fromm presented us with one such exploration. Why do the masses follow leaders like Mussolini, Hitler, and all the rest? Because, so Fromm answered, the breakdown of the medieval order liberated man from old ties but failed to give him new ones, because he was freed *from* something, but not, as Fromm formulated it, *for* something. The vacuum in men's minds so created could be filled by any mountebank, and this is the tragedy of our age.