CHAPTER – I

Introduction
This study presents largely the core of apartheid policy and its practices on South African society. This work brings out a brief historical sketch of South Africa and focuses mainly on the impacts of apartheid and racial segregation that affected the lives of South African people. Racial discrimination and political exclusion for the blacks were the components of apartheid ideology that enabled the white states to impose racial laws in South Africa. These white states aggressively controlled the lives of South African people. The black South Africans were treated by the whites as brutes and were reduced to the conditions of animals. This gave rise to confusion, violence and conflict between the whites and the blacks in South Africa.

From the literary point of view, it highlights some prominent writers who lived and witnessed segregation and apartheid era. These writers, either black or white, had an anti-apartheid stand. Moreover, it takes into account in brief the historical literary facts, which represent the suffering of South African black people during the segregationist laws of the white government.

South Africa first came into being as a colony. The colonization of South Africa began with the establishment of a refreshment station at the Cape of Good Hope by the Dutch East India Company in 1652 (Ross 21). The main reason behind that was the importance of the strategic location of South Africa, which made the Dutch and the British colonize the country. In this context, the Dutch laid the foundation of a new society i.e. the colonization period with 1652 settlement. Consequently, the settlement was the beginning of racial discrimination between Whites and non-Whites in the history of South Africa.
Gradually the Dutch began to move away from the Cape in search of
more land and they were known as Trekboers (travelling farmers). They
developed the attitude that there was plenty of land, and that it was the right
of the white man to own the land. Their strong control of arms and religion
enabled them to regard the black man as inferior.

Slavery became a dominant institution in South Africa in the
early years of Dutch settlement. The European Dutch found that the
indigenous people (Khoikhoi and San) of South Africa were
nomadic and peaceful people working as shepherds and hunters. The
Dutch treated these indigenous communities (KhoiSan) as slaves and
servants. This period was a base of roots for the creation of apartheid
in South Africa (Berger 31).

These Dutch Boers cut themselves off from the company,
overpowered the Hottentots, and enslaved the natives to work on their lands.
Within six years, they began the importation of slaves from East and West
Africa, Madagascar, India, Ceylon, and Malay, which transformed the infant
European colony into a slave-holding society.

The Dutch settlers, called Afrikaners, as a white group, had a common
code and ideology, which was deeply rooted in the Calvinistic tradition of
the seventeenth-century Europe. They firmly believed in the doctrine of
predestination. This conviction led them to differentiate themselves from
people of a different color and race. The consequent sense of this exclusion
made them feel justified in their right to dominate the lower or damned race;
consequently, the notion of white superiority arose.
Unemployment in Britain after the Napoleonic wars led to the emigration of 5000 British settlers to South Africa. The British took the Cape from the Afrikaners by armed force and set up the British colony in 1795. They started a British government, which challenged the authority of the Dutch.

In 1828, the British enacted Ordinance 50, which entitled “Hottentots and other free persons of color” to all the legal rights of British subject, including ownership of land; prohibited the compulsory service of the Khoikhoi and abolished vagrancy laws that had restricted the movements of non-slave blacks.

*As part of empire-wide policy, the British colonists ended slavery in stages during the 1830s (qtd. in Gordon 31).*

The British could succeed to defeat the Boers and by 1836, the Dutch decided to trek away from the British rule in Cape. Thus, the British antagonized the Boers (Dutch) with the introduction of concepts that regarded black and white as equal. This competition added a new dimension to the region’s history. The British prompted the ideas of equality to outlaw slavery that was practiced by Dutch on indigenous people in South Africa. The British with their ideas made a great influence on South African tribes to accept all traditions practiced by the British.

In South Africa, the British launched their main efforts to end all forms of slavery. Iris Berger says:

*Abolishing the slave trade in 1807 lent a sense of moral purpose to Britain’s imperial ambitions, suggesting that colonization involved a spiritual and ideological commitment to indigenous peoples* (42).
In this way, the British defeated Dutch by many ways and concepts. They freed indigenous people from slavery to live in equality with the whites. The British political issues to improve conditions of the indigenous people were mainly for subjecting indigenous people of the colonial society to be ruled and controlled by the British themselves.

The South African War (1899-1902) between the British and Dutch (Boers) was one of the most important events in the history of South Africa. An important cause of the war was the struggle for control over the goldfields in South Africa.

Thus, South Africa was embroiled in a war between the country’s two dominant groups of white rulers, the Dutch and the British. The Dutch settlers named Boers (farmers) and then renamed Afrikaners –sought to maintain the independence of their settler states. Moreover, the British descendants sought complete dominance over the region. Because of this, the British emerged victorious from the South African war (called the Boer War). At the end of war, the British destroyed Afrikaners’ farmsteads and placed thousands of Afrikaners in concentration camps.

After the Boer War, the relationship between the British and Boers developed. The British conferred full political rights on their former Boer enemies and, at the same time, colluded with the Boers to deny full political rights to the Africans.

In 1910 the union of South Africa was formed. It was hoped that the Afrikaners and the British would resolve their differences and make a single South African nation. The two Afrikaner States of Orange Free State and Transvaal joined the two British territories of Cape colony and Natal. Under
the 1910 constitution, all four states were bound by the will of the British Crown. The Union Act of 1910 paved the road in front of both the two dominant ruling groups of South Africa to divide the country according to their rules and regulations. For this reason, Joyce Moss elaborates:

*The Union of 1910 had brought together South Africa’s two dominant white groups – British and Afrikaner – at the expense of 80 percent of its population; from this union emerged one of the most pervasive systems of racial separation in the twentieth century* (Moss, and Valestuk 25).

By 1910, Whites had conquered the indigenous inhabitants of South Africa. During the ensuing years, however, the new state applied a comprehensive program of racial segregation and discrimination and gained control over the African people. In 1910, the Union brought formal political segregation, with the exclusion of Africans from their political right to voting.

Segregation in South Africa had been refined and extended in the first half of the twentieth century from 1910 to 1948. Segregation was the term adopted in the early decades of the twentieth century in South Africa for the set of government policies and social practices that sought to systemize the relationship between white and non-white, colonizers and colonized. After the Union of 1910, white power was used to make one of the excessive forms of racial discrimination in the twentieth-century world. This system, which developed from segregation to apartheid in the second half of the century, was the central issue of political debates for many historians and social scientists in the country (Beinart, and Dubow 3).
Barbara Bush has given the cause of racial segregation in South African society being enacted by the forced practices and racial ideologies of the British and Afrikaners. She says:

*Segregation was thus the result of complex forces at work in white South African society, including a defensive culture of racism, which was shared by the British and the Afrikaners, but the outcome was a complex class/race system that mirrored racial categories (145).*

Thus, Barbara Bush concludes that British and Afrikaners in South Africa laid the foundations of the racial segregation. The policy of racial segregation in South Africa, newly known by the term apartheid, separate development and multinational development, has had at different times and for different groups a multiplicity of meanings and functions.

Segregation is the endeavor of the capitalist race to meet the increasing demand for cheap African labor in the era of industrial manufacturing capital; at the same time, it is the produce of the demand of White workers for safeguard against the resulting increased contention from Black workers. Olive Schreiner and her husband Cronwright-Schreiner published the famous document *The Political Situation*. This document traces the political situation, degradation and exploitation of black labors by whites. She critically and politically analyses capitalist developments, which constrained or compelled black labors and exploited them. She criticizes such domination of whites on black native labor saying that:

*There are two attitudes with regard to the treatment of this Native laboring class: the one held by the Retrogressive party in this country regards the Native as only to be tolerated in consideration of the amount*
of manual labor which can be extracted from him; and desires to obtain the largest amount of labor at the cheapest rate possible; and rigidly resists all endeavors to put him on an equality with the white man in the eyes of the law (Schreiner, and Cronwright-Schreiner 109-110).

Thus, the ideology of segregation was refined and reached the climax of being practiced in South African society.

Consequently, Segregation conducts at the levels of racist ideology, of social control and of reproduction of labor. Really, if there is a common string that unites these meanings, it is at the level of the imperative for separate territorial/residential areas as the focus of black and white activities in South Africa, joined with the idea that black and white have various needs and requirements in the sphere of social, cultural and political policy.

The main elements of the segregation policy are based on consequences on persistent urbanization, separated territories of land ownership, and the use of traditional institutions. These were used as suppliers of social services and mediums of social control and along with other mechanisms of labor compulsion based on the system of migrant labor, which characterized South Africa’s way to the world of industrialization. The control of black labor was a central feature of the construction of the racial states and the maintenance of white supremacy in a period of massive social, cultural and economic change that affected the lives of black South Africans.

Segregation was based on a number of laws that restricted nonwhites in almost every sphere. These laws imposed increasingly restrictive rules on where black persons could live and work. The Mines and Works Act No 12
of 1911 was enacted to formalize segregation in employment between the blacks and the whites. In 1911, the government prohibited strikes by African mine workers and issued rules and regulations under the Mines and Works Act to enable white workers to monopolize the skilled operations. On that basis, mine labor continued to be split on a hierarchy of racial basis. This Act empowered the concerned administrators to secure occupations in the mining industry mainly for whites but in some lesser cases for Coloreds and Malays. Thus, the state used its power to apply racial discrimination in manufacturing industries and public works for the sake of the white workers.

Apart from this, the Native Labor Regulation Act No. 15 of 1911 regulates the recruiting, employment, accommodation, feeding, hospitalization and medical attention of African laborers. One of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation was the Natives Land Act of 1913 that created a system of “reserves” giving white people control of 87 percent of the land and black people only 13 percent. Further, the Natives Land Act contained clauses intended to diminish all African residents in the white-owned rural areas into tenant and wage laborers. The 1913 Land Act was the landmark of segregation policy that the landownership supremacy is the white rights only and it deprived the blacks of their land.

The 1920 Native Affairs Act appointed district councils, based on tribal divisions, to give blacks a separate administration from the whites. In Cape Town, for example, huge squatter settlements had sprung up, which caused violent feelings in the city, even in that bastion of white liberalism. The local authorities in the city strictly regulated them, pushing them out of city centers and requiring them to use passes.
As a reaction for these laws, many political organizations and parties arose. The most active parties that stood like a rock against segregation are *South African Native National Congress*, founded in 1912 (later known as the African National Congress, or ANC) and *The Communist Party of South Africa* (CPSA), founded in 1921. The leaders of these parties were Western-oriented middleclass people. They aimed to realize the promise inherent in the Cape colonial tradition, first by gaining full equality with the whites for the middle classes they represented, and later by extending the benefits to the masses of their people.

On 8 January 1912 in Bloemfontein city hundreds of South Africans gathered to form the *South African Native National Congress*. The founding of the *Native National Congress* marked the ascendancy in middle-class African circles of the contention that Africans themselves could best promote not through sympathetic intermediaries but rather by activating African interests. The group of men assembled at Bloemfontein in 1912 was well alert of the wider dimensions of the social tragedy and discriminatory laws being enacted around them. The ANC was opposed to white minority rule and sought to free black South Africans from segregation, racism, repression, and denial of democracy. Moreover, the ANC was formed in 1912 in response to the unification of South Africa under the rule of British and Dutch people to provide Africans with equal rights and to overcome the divisions created by factors of ethnicity and conflicting allegiances to create one African nation. The founders of the ANC, Pixley ka Isaka Seme, Alfred Mangena, Richard Msimang, and George Montsioa, were mission-educated Christians who had qualified as lawyers in England. Seme, for example, had grown up on the American mission station in Natal, attended Mount Hermon
School in Massachusetts, received a bachelor’s degree from Columbia University and studied law at Oxford University. In his keynote address to the founding conference of the ANC in Bloemfontein, Seme said that

*We have discovered that in the land of their birth, Africans are treated as hewers of wood and drawers of water. The white people of this country have formed what is known as the Union of South Africa a union in which we have no voice in the making of laws and no part in the administration of them. We have called you, therefore, to this conference so that we can together find ways and means of forming our national union for the purpose of creating national unity and defending our rights and privileges* (qtd. in Okoth 164).

The new organization was known as the *South African Native National Congress*. Later, in 1925, the name was changed to the *African National Congress of South Africa, or ANC*. The *African National Congress’s* leadership had reached to the point of embracing a strategy based on mass action, strikes, boycotts and civil disobedience to be the tools of resistance for example boycotts that raised against transport in Alexandra city. The first boycott occurred in 1940, nine months after the bus fare to town had been raised from 4d to 5d. The 1943 fares were raised once again, and this time, the boycott was longer. ANC played a good role in the leadership of these boycotts.

In 1940, the ANC elected A. B. Xuma as its president. Xuma was a successful leader, energetic and intellectual man. His major political achievement was to streamline the ANC’s organization.

The most important developments in South African politics during the 1940s were the emergence of the *Congress Youth League* and its
influence on the ANC leadership and the strengthening of the relationship between Congress and Communist Party. The *Congress Youth League* was the creation of the ANC leaders such as Xuma. The men whom of the Youth League Xuma were attempting to bring into the organization were well-qualified, professional and creative people.

*The Communist Party of South Africa* (CPSA) was the only political party in South Africa that recruited members from all racial groups and had a multiracial executive. The CPSA was a political party to work with and to take advantage of existing political institutions at the time of revolution against segregation in South Africa.

*The Communist Party of South Africa* (CPSA) ranks as both South Africa and Africa’s oldest communist political organizations. The CPSA played an integral and crucial role resisting segregation in South Africa. The CPSA was not a large body but it was well organized, its centralized structure being patterned on a Leninist model. Generally, the CPSA cling to the doctrine that working-class unity exceeded racial divisions. Therefore, communists were prepared to join forces with white labor on certain issues: in 1922, for example, communists were active in the Rand mineworkers’ revolt despite the explicit racialism of the mineworkers’ leaders.

Apartheid policy had aroused from policies of racial segregation that had been practiced in South Africa since the first settlement of Europeans, the Dutch followed by the British in the 17th century. The official vindication underlying apartheid was that South African people stiffly divided into “Whites” (all Europeans), Bantus or “Blacks,” “Coloreds”
(people of mixed race), and “Asians” (Indians and Pakistanis who had been brought to South Africa as laborers).

The transition from segregation to apartheid legislation was largely a simple elaboration of earlier segregationist measures. Much of apartheid legislation coordinated and extended the racial laws of the segregation era and tightened up the administration of those laws. Therefore, apartheid represented so great an intensification of segregationist ideology and practices enacted in the first half of the twentieth century.

Apartheid is a system in South Africa, which refers to the legal racial discrimination by Europeans in economic, social, and political dominion against Blacks, Coloreds, and Indians. (In the apartheid regime, there was no need to be just British; all European White descents were included in privileged minority.). In this context, apartheid policy can be classified under two categories: ‘petty’ and ‘grand’ apartheid. The first category includes racial laws that affected the entire life of non-whites in civil rights such as hospitals, schools, business, restaurants, even restrooms and so on. The second one is concerned with land, political rights and freedoms. In the grand apartheid, land ownership and the rights of voting of the Blacks, Coloreds, and Indians were seriously restricted, whereas enjoyed by the whites. It means that the minority group of the society could control and dominate the entire society within the country. In the apartheid regime, whites were considered as the only civilized race to maintain absolute economic and political power. Moreover, the interests of whites had always antecedence than the interests of blacks or coloreds. Thus, all interpretations of apartheid developed from the point of the knowledge of the need to protect white supremacy and preserve the purity of the white race. This
ideology was articulated and defended in the language of ‘separate development’. ‘Separate development’ means to separate the country’s racial groups by assigning these different races territorially separate ‘homes’, in which each would maintain its cultural distinctiveness, exercise political rights and attain wealth and education separately from one another.

The apartheid era dawned in 1948 when the Afrikaner National Party won the election of the South African Parliament. This victory enabled the Afrikaner Nationalists to dominate the country imposing racial discrimination on every aspect of life, including education. Because of these racist attitudes, the country entered in a new conflict with complex relations both between and within the major racial groups in the society. Apartheid is defined as:

An official policy of racial segregation formerly practiced in the Republic of South Africa, involving political, legal, and economic discrimination against nonwhites (Apartheid).

Apartheid as Leonard Thompson points out “developed from a political slogan into a drastic, systematic program of social engineering” (Thompson 189).

Nelson Mandela defines apartheid as:

Apartheid is the embodiment of the racialism, repression and inhumanity of all previous white supremacist regimes. To see the real face of apartheid we must look beneath the veil of constitutional formulas, deceptive phrases and playing with words (The Struggle Is My Life 190).
Apartheid as a political and social ideology was built on four premises. First, to preserve the national identity of South Africa’s four racial groups, or ‘nations’, each of which has its own language, culture, history, and social traditions. As racial theorist, Geoff Cronje of Pretoria University explained: “The Afrikaner believes that it is the will of God that there should be a diversity of races and nations and that obedience to the will of God therefore requires the acknowledgement and maintenance of that diversity” (qtd. in Fiske, and Ladd 24).

Second, white people are the custodians of civilization and therefore have an obligation to lead other groups toward civilization at their own pace. Third, in order to carry out this role, whites must have their privileges protected. Fourth, according to apartheid apologists, black persons may be divided into many nations, but white people, of whatever background—most notably British and Afrikaners constitute one nation (Fiske, and Ladd 24-25).

Really, the goal of apartheid system, of course, was to ensure the social, political and economic supremacy of the white minority. The interests of the white population were the first priority of the apartheid government as Hendrik Verwoerd as one of the apartheid officials assures that:

*Our motto is to maintain white supremacy for all time to come over our own people and our own country, by force if necessary* (qtd. in Barber, and Barratt 2).

The red architect of apartheid in South Africa was in fact, the leader of Afrikaner community, Jan Smuts says:
With us there are certain axioms now in regard to the relations of black and white; and the principal one is no intermixture of blood between the two colors. It has now become an accepted axiom in our dealings with the natives that it is dishonourable to mix white and black blood... we have felt more and more that if we are to solve our native question it is useless to try to govern black and white in the same system, to subject them same institutions of government and legislation. They are different not only in color but in minds and political capacity, and their political institutions should be different while always proceeding on the basis of self government (9).

Afrikaners clearly declared their official policy of apartheid arguing that the progress of the races would be developed if they were kept separate. This policy required nonwhites to carry identity cards to determine their racial group, advanced different educational standards, limited employment opportunities, and forbade social integration among races. The effect of this policy was to ensure the complete dominance by whites. Douglas Killam states that apartheid is beyond segregation of color:

Apartheid meant a number of things beyond segregation by color. It was extended to include a ban on social contacts between segregated groups, a ban on interracial marriage, and the creation of separate residential areas, leading eventually to the creation of the notorious ‘homelands’ the consequent emergence of ‘shanty towns’ separate business and the creation of signposted separate public facilities-parks, public transport, and washrooms for each colored group (106).

During this period of apartheid, many acts had been enacted such as The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act (No.55) of 1949 made marriage
between whites and members of other racial groups illegal. Such Act created legal restrictions between the races by making marriage and sexual relations illegal across the color line. Henry John May explains:

But this act to some extent still relied upon the test of appearance, because it provided that any person who is in appearance obviously a European or a non-European as the case may be, shall for the purposes of the Act to be deemed such, unless and until the contrary is proved (May 435).

Because of the problem of movement from one group to another and then ‘passing’ for ‘white’ or ‘colored’, it became clear that the test of ‘appearance’ was not working well. To curtail this mobility of individuals the Population Registration Act No.30 of 1950 was enacted. It became a law that every person’s race must be classified on a national register. Therefore, the movement of people from one racial group to another was restricted through this act.

The Population Registration Act (No.30) of 1950 provided the basis for separating the population of South Africa into different races. This Act provided the machinery to designate the racial category of every person. Under the terms of The Population Registration Act, all South African people were to be classified as white, colored, or native people. Jonathan Farley, rightly calls the Population Registration Act of 1950; “. . . the cornerstone of the whole apartheid system” (Farley 43).

The 1950 Population Registration Act compelled nonwhites to carry passbooks to identify their racial group and to authorize their presence in restricted white areas. Moreover, The Population Registration Act of 1950 is the central pillar of the completely social order in South Africa for it
provides for the classification of every man and woman into a particular racial group. May went further to look at the statutory attempts by the Nationalist government at defining the different racial groups:

*Probably the best short definitions are the following:* a ‘Native’ means any member of an aboriginal race or tribe of Africa, and includes a Bushman, Griqua and a Hottentot living in Native conditions. ‘Coloured person’ means any person who is not entirely European or entirely Asiatic but includes the class of persons known as Cape Malays. ‘Coloured or non-European races’ includes all persons who are not European or ‘white.’ The difference between a person classed as a ‘coloured person’ and one who is a member of the ‘Coloured races’ is simply that the latter includes Indians, Chinese, Japanese, etc., whereas a ‘Coloured person’ except for the inclusion of Cape Malays does not include an Asiatic but refers particularly to the persons who are a mixture of European and Native. A coloured person is not a Native. He is a person of mixed white and black blood. ‘Coloured men vary in colour between all shades which are not quite white to quite black’ (May 434).

The *Group Areas Act* (No.41) of 1950 extended the reinforcements of the *Natives Land Act* (No.27) of 1913, dividing South Africa into separate areas for whites and blacks. This act gave the government the power to remove people from areas not specified for their particular racial group. In addition, the *Group Areas Act* (1950), one of the acts of the apartheid policy, enforced residential segregation in urban areas. In terms of this, the country was partitioned into different areas that were then allocated to different racial groups. Those classified as non-white were restricted to special designated living areas in every urban place.
The enforcement of the *Group Areas Act* led to some of the most flagrancy incidents of ethnic cleansing in South Africa’s history. In this respect, it is notable that the *Suppression of Communism Act* (1950) restricted all Marxist activities, and ended the existence of the ‘Communist Party of South Africa’. The target of communism was to achieve economic, political and social changes in the country that could endanger the progression of the apartheid regime in South Africa defined by the act. This had a major impact not only on CPSA but also on the ANC. This created a kind of cooperation between the two organizations. Speaking of his own conversion to a cooperative posture with communists, Nelson Mandela states:

... *For many decades communists were the only political group in South Africa who were prepared to treat Africans as human beings and their equals; who were prepared to eat with us, and work with us. They were the only political group which was prepared to work with the Africans for the attainment of political rights and a stake in society* (Minogue 291).

In 1952, the *Natives Abolition of Passes and Co-ordination of Documents Act* No. 67 was promulgated. This meant that the previous acts regulating the movements of Africans were abolished. Now under the new Act, natives were to be issued ‘reference book.’ The identity card, as prescribed by the *Population Registration Act*, 1950, was to be attached to this ‘reference book.’ Coloreds and Africans had to carry the document on their person. All the information previously carried around in different documents was now recorded in the ‘reference book.’ In practice, it was still a “pass,” making implementation and administration easier.
After many controversies regarding the use of public facilities and
amenities, the Nationalist Government enacted a law called the Reservation
of Separate Amenities Act, No. 49 of 1953. In addition to customary and
traditional segregation of public places, there always were laws separating
Blacks from Whites through Acts, which restricted public services like
transportation, post offices and hospitals. During this stage, many court
battles were fought. The main reason for the Act was to settle this kind of
litigation:

_The Act declared that it is unnecessary when a separate amenity is provided for particular class or
race in any public premises or vehicle, to provide any or substantially similar amenity for any other class or
race. It gives to any person, whether a public official or a private person who is in charge or control of
public premises or vehicle, the power to reserve or set aside premises or vehicles or any part there of (such
as seats, benches, counters or other amenity) for the exclusive use of different classes and races, making it
an offence for many persons willfully to use an amenity not allocated to which he belongs_ (May 451).

The Bantu Education Act (No. 47) of 1953 decreed that blacks should
be provided with separate educational equipments under the supervision of
the Ministry of Native Affairs, rather than the Ministry of Education. Bantu
education was to be of an inferior quality and numerous statements
reinforced this concern.

The _Bantu Education Act_ (1953), a law that devoted all black
schooling under government control and closed even the option of private or
mission run schools for those seeking to avoid the system, governed black
education. The aim of *Bantu Education Act* was to teach blacks the basic skills they would need in working for whites:

In 1953 the government passed the *Bantu Education Act*, which the people didn't want. We didn't want this bad education for our children. This *Bantu Education Act* was to make sure that our children only learnt things that would make them good for what the government wanted: to work in the factories and so on; they must not learn properly at school like the white children. Our children were to go to school only three hours a day, two shifts of children every day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, so that more children could get a little bit of learning without government having to spend more money. Hawu! It was terrible thing that act (Baard, and Schreiner 48).

Thus, the 1953 *Bantu Education Act* was one of the most offensive racist acts in apartheid era. This act inscribed inequalities in education between whites and non-whites. It limited African education under control of the government and extended apartheid to black schools. Previously, missionaries with some state assistance ran most African schools. Many political activists had attended mission schools. Nevertheless, Bantu education ended the relative autonomy these schools had enjoyed up to that point. Instead, government financial and educational support of black schools became condition on acceptance of a racially discriminatory curriculum. The racist government and its schooling plan aimed for creation of a separate and unequal system of black education rather than a single public educational system for all South Africans. As the Bantu students were isolated with separate educational facilities, the white government declared it clearly that Bantu Education was designed to teach African learners to be
hewers of wood and drawers of water for a white society, regardless of their abilities and aspirations.

The 1953 *Bantu Education Act* gave the state total control over education for Blacks. This petty apartheid law banned most social contact between the races, enforced the segregation of public facilities and the separation of educational standards, created race-specific job categories, restricted the activities and powers of nonwhite unions, and restrained nonwhite participation in government.

Furthermore, the *Bantu Education Act* was to reinforce the instruction of Africans in primary schools in their own mother tongue in order to segregate school system by that. Nevertheless, those Africans who did attend school wanted above all access to English, which they saw as a wider base for communication than their mother tongue. In this way, white South Africans enjoyed all educational facilities and opportunities that black people were denied access to.

Later, with the extension of *University Education Act* No.45 of 1959, the government imposed segregation in higher education as well. Universities were segregated for Coloreds, Indians and Africans. When the *National Party* came to power in 1948, there were in South Africa four English-language universities, four Afrikaans-medium universities, one bilingual correspondence university, and the small South African Native College at Fort Hare. All universities were largely dependent on government support. The Afrikaans-medium universities and English medium Rhodes University admitted white students only. Twelve percent of the students at the University of Cape Town and 6 percent of the students at the University
of the Witwatersrand were black and were taught in integrated classes; 21 percent of the students in the University of Natal were black and were taught in segregated classes (Thompson 197). Since that time, to enter a white university was prohibited without a permit from the concerned Minister. Thus, many laws were enacted to separate education into white, African, Colored and Indian (Gay 125).

As a response to the 1950s apartheid acts, there were many campaigns, protests and disobediences. There were very huge numbers of people committed to the ground of resistance. In 1952, the *Defiance Campaign* was considered the first political opposition against apartheid laws under the leadership of *African National Congress*. The program of peaceful civil disobedience was planned. This meant that African people would amicably raise their demands but intentionally break the law. They aimed to be arrested and deluge the country’s prisons. They hoped that this would draw the world attention to the apartheid laws and force the government to abolish them. For this, mass rallies were held all over the country and groups of enlisters were sent to break the law. They walked through the entrances, in parks designated for whites only. They achieved their aim, broke curfew, and refused to carry their passes. As a result, the campaign had an enormous impact on people and ANC membership increased from 7000 to 100000 members. As a reaction, the apartheid government imposed heavy fines and jail sentences on the volunteers of African people that forced the ANC to call off the campaign (*The Defiance Campaign in South Africa*).

Another important event in this decade was the *Congress of the People*. This assembled on 26 June 1955 at Kliptown where the ANC and
many other organizations adopted the *Freedom Charter* to intensify the struggle. The Congress was a representative gathering. It was attended by 3000 delegates from different organizations and cut across racial lines. In 1956, 156 leaders of the Congress from around the country were arrested and charged with treason. Involved in the *Treason Trial* there were 104 Africans, 23 Whites, 21 Indians and 8 Coloreds. The trial became a major political event in this period.

In fact, the *African National Congress* (ANC) is the most enduring and widely continuing of all other liberation organizations and movements in South Africa. During its existence, it has reflected the various tactics to fighting for freedom in South Africa that have been clasped by the oppressed, as well as international political developments and changes.

Diana R. Gorden explores the effects of the apartheid laws on black South Africans:

*Apartheid laws controlled every aspect of life. Black South Africans could not live, work, or travel freely. They could neither advance professionally nor protect the working conditions they had. The laws prevented them from taking steps to improve their children's education, from demanding better health care and other services, from voting, from protesting against forced removal from lands they had occupied for generations and displacement to unfamiliar and dilapidated townships.*

Thus, the policy of apartheid had a profound influence on the physical, social and economic landscapes of the country. Because of apartheid laws, black South Africans could not live, work, or travel freely. The laws prevented them from taking steps to improve their children’s
education, from demanding better health care and other services and from voting. Resistance to these laws or violations of them brought criminal penalties.

An important cornerstone of the apartheid system was its “Homeland” policy, whereby parts of the country were assigned to different black ethnic groups as a kind of reserve, called “Homeland”. Each “homeland” was to be a separate state with self-government and its own Governor of State, under the control of the South African government.

The land allocated in this way was for the most part farthest poor agricultural land and far away from the cities and industrial centers of the country. Black South Africans were compelled to live and work in places distanced from their families. They were closely regulated while outside their homeland. Thus, the indigenous people of South Africa had become aliens on their own land. The people were forcibly removed from their own places to other parts of the country. Land and property taken in this way was in most cases sold to white farmers or white controlled industry. Townships grew up around all commercial and industrial centers, and here black people lived while working in the cities. In addition, hostels were created in many areas and at the mines, where their employers in extremely poor conditions housed migrant laborers. The citizenship of the black people, who were designated as belonging to such ‘Homeland’, would be replaced with ‘Homeland’ citizenship. In this respect, most of the black people in South Africa would have no more legal claims to participate in the South African government. Thus, the Nationalist policy of apartheid allocated different residences to Africans, Coloreds, Indians and Whites, not as a matter of choice but according to the enforced law.
Thus, South African society was constructed as a society of minorities. In fact, the main aim of the South African government of the time was to manipulate the ill-defined concepts of culture, language and ethnic identity in the name of self – development for achieving its own political purposes. On the other hand, through extension of the racist system by means of petty apartheid laws, barriers were created between people of different skin-colors.

The absolute harshness of apartheid was shown in the events of Sharpeville Massacre on March 21, 1960 when South African police fired on a large crowd of demonstrators who were challenging the government’s practice of apartheid and racial segregation. The events were in the southern Transvaal town of Sharpeville. When the shooting subsided, 69 black Africans were dead and between 180 and 300 were left injured. That same day, and over the course of the following three weeks, other confrontations resulted in additional casualties as well as mounting anger on the part of numerous Africans. The Sharpeville Massacre was most likely the first event that had a countrywide outcome and as such, it can be seen as a dramatic turning point in South Africa’s history. Terreblanche claims that these events of Sharpeville Massacre “caused a flight of foreign investment and a storm of international protest” (Terreblanche 348).

After the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, many South Africans left the country. Some went into exile and a great number of them went to USA. A great number of these people returned to South Africa and brought with them experience of organizational skills which they had learned from the American Civil Right Movement. Most of them subscribed to Martin Luther King Jr peaceful movement. They admired his oratory, rhetoric and above
all his methods of protest. Some followed the methods of the more radical Malcom X and his *Black Panther Movement*. Martin Luther King Jr and Malcom X became the topic of the townships of South Africa.

The strong external factor, which motivated the rise of the *Black Consciousness Movement* in South Africa, was the *American Civil Rights Movement* in the 1960s. *Black Consciousness Movement* (1969) evolved from the activism of the *South African Students’ Organization* (SASO), whose founder was Stephen Biko, a medical student in Durban. However, there are some differences between the two movements. The *Black Americans* had the law on their side whereas in South Africa, the *Black Consciousness Movement* had to work against the law that by its very nature was made to be against the blacks and the struggling masses. *The Black Consciousness Movement* in South Africa had to align itself with the liberation movements, which were fighting for total emancipation of the black people of South Africa.

According to Shannon Hill, who has studied the visual culture of the *Black Consciousness Movement*, the fundamental plan of the BCM philosophy was “to renew a sense of self-worth within black South Africans in order to combat the racism that permeated their lives. It inspired pride in one’s heritage, community, and self,” with the ultimate goal of forcing political and economic change (qtd. in Peffer 50).

During the 1970s, the prices in South Africa increased very much. As a result, Black worker disobedience began. The worker unions were demanding more salaries, equal payment, education, and privileges for Blacks. In this decade, the *Black People’s Convention* (1972) was a
significant step for the natives in the process of struggle against apartheid government. The gathering was a political outline for organization to support Black consciousness. ANC and some other black organizations were the vigorous participants of the convention. Chiefly, to ensure the quality of education for children like that of Whites was one of the major goals of the convention to get benefit in the long-term. Thus, the resistance of Blacks entered into a new stage, which was more organized and more influential.

The *Soweto Uprising* of 1976 is one of the well-known incidents in the struggle against apartheid. Many students, influenced by Steven Biko, would no longer accommodate to the unfairness of the South African educational system. Under the *Bantu Education Act* (1953), the curriculum in Black schools was designed to strengthen the social and economic arrangement of apartheid. The *Soweto Uprising* was impulsive by the requirement that Black students to be taught in Afrikaans, the language of their oppressors. This part of the *Bantu Education Act* had never been practiced before. Approximately, in this uprising, twenty thousand students demonstrated in protest against apartheid and instruction in the Afrikaner language. As the reaction of apartheid government, police killed a large number of students.

In 1983, Pieter Willem Botha, the Prime Minister of South Africa, declared that a new constitution would be constituted. According to the constitution, new administration formation of the state was based on the single executive presidency that must be White. The new constitution would have three different parliaments, regarding racial distinctions and legislative power: a *House of Assembly* for Whites (178 members), a *House of Representatives* for Coloureds (85 members) and *House of Delegates* for
Indians (45 members). However, what about Blacks? In the same year, the new constitution was approved with a referendum of only right of vote of Whites. Thus, the new constitution was still providing White dominance, giving separate development rights to Coloureds and Indians within their own-segmented provinces, and nothing remarkably new for Blacks (Frueh 95-96).

As a result, apartheid was still in process where Blacks were not satisfied by the reforms. The majority of Coloureds and Indians had been familiar with the new constitution because of right of legislative even if Whites were still real hegemonic minority of South Africa. Conversely, Blacks started to increase their resistance to apartheid by giving more priority both to armed and political methods. With this in mind, the United Democratic Front (UDF) was found in 1983. UDF was one of the most important anti-apartheid organizations of the 1980s. It was a framework that organization contained trade unions, youth leagues, churches and other Black organizations. In the 1980s, UDF organized boycotts, protests and civil disobediences. Some movements of Black Consciousness directly took aim at the capitalist structure of apartheid regime such as Azanian’s People Organization (AZAPO), called itself a revolutionary organization. The organization emphasized the relationship between capitalism and apartheid by referring to class struggle, however, it also stressed that Black consciousness should not be understood as just capitalism, but also as racism (Williams 24-25).

The success of AZAPO was not as influential as Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU). Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) was to be the most vital organization that claimed the rights of
Black workers since 1985. COSATU stressed strongly the relationship between capitalism and apartheid, and expanded policies to fight against apartheid regime. In this sense, this organization slowed down its intend to establish a socialist society in South Africa. Really, COSATU could rally effectively Black workers within place of work as confrontation against labor exploitation of apartheid. In addition, the organization worked seriously for educational and gender issues. Thus, COSATU itself had its economic, political and social responsibilities to support the resistance against apartheid.

The Black violence to obliterate apartheid regime was the most critical problem of White government of South Africa. Botha had already started on an entirely repression camping by using both military and political methods. Consequently, the government could not diminish effectively the violence of Blacks. Later, Botha missed the hope of the government and had to resign. Later, Black liberation movements got a persistent impetus by both taking interior and exterior supports. In brief, because of entire Black resistance against apartheid regime, Frederick Willem de Klerk, the President of South Africa between 1989 and 1994, started to rescind the laws of apartheid, and put an end to several decades of imprisonment of Mandela. Therefore, Mandela was elected as the first Black President of South Africa in 1994, and apartheid was legitimately removed in the same year.

Historian Leonard Thompson captured the amazement over the South African transition as follows:

*Between 1989 and 1994, South Africans surprised the world. Although the country was wracked by unprecedented violence and teetered on the brink*
of civil war, black and white politicians put an end to more than three hundred years of white domination and fashioned a nonracial constitution, which effectively transferred political power from the white minority to the black majority. May 10, 1994, the day the presidency of South Africa passed from an Afrikaner who led the party of white supremacy to the leader of an African nationalist movement, was the culmination of one of the finest achievements of the twentieth century (241).

Thus, the newly elected President created a kind of optimism for the future of South Africa encouraging his people to go ahead in their resistance on one hand, and criticized apartheid on the other hand. Mandela also believed in a future where democracy in South Africa would be selected on a nationalized basis.

As far as South African Literature is concerned, it played a good role in protest against segregation and apartheid. South African literary writers depict the critical situation of the black and colored people in South Africa. Amidst confusion, violence and conflicts South African Literature had arisen out of a long tradition of resistance and protest. South African Society consisted of different communities. Each community has achieved recognition through literature and political struggle during the twentieth century.

South African literature is the one that is produced within the South African national borders by different cultures and language grounds residing these borders. South Africa has had a rich literary output. Perhaps the authors wanted to capture and represent the furious history and experience of its people in different stages.
Because of all laws that were enacted in segregation era, many writers and literary figures were active to depict the harshness of such laws. Black South Africans were forced to leave their own lands, carry pass cards, and work on low wages. Olive Schreiner criticizes the ideologies of the Union of South Africa under the rule of the two dominant groups British and Dutch states neglecting non-white races from political representation:

*I am of the opinion that where the Federal Franchise is concerned, no distinction of race or color should be made between South Africans. All persons born in the country or permanently resident here should be one in the eye of the State . . . South Africa should be a free man’s country. The idea that a man born in this country . . . should in this, his native land, be refused any form of civic or political right on the ground that he is descended from a race with a civilization, it may be, much older than our own, is one which must be abhorrent to every liberalized mind. I believe that any attempt to base our national life on distinctions of race and color as such will, after the lapse of many years, prove fatal to us* (Schreiner 166).

Sol Plaatje criticized that *Land Act* caused the greatest hardship in the Orange Free State, where many farmers evicted Africans from their land immediately after the act was passed. Sol Plaatje, the secretary of the recently created *African National Congress* described such experience in his book *Native Life in South Africa*:

*Some readers may think perhaps that I have taken the colonial Parliament rather severely to task. But, … if you see your countrymen and countrywomen driven from their home, their homes broken up, with no hopes of redress, on the mandate of a Government to which they had loyally paid taxation without representation – driven from their homes, because*
they do not want to become servants … , you would, I think, likewise find it very difficult to maintain a level head or wield a temperate pen (Plaatje 4)

Sol T. Plaatje’s book *Native Life in South Africa* represents the plight of black South Africans under the white government of newly unified South Africa. It mainly focuses on the effects of the 1913 *Natives Land Act*, which introduced a radical system of land segregation between the races. As Plaatje shows in this book, it resulted in the instant eviction of blacks from their inherited lands in Orange Free State. It is a very important social text, which shows the effects of rural segregation on everyday life of people.

In Plaatje’s *Native Life in South Africa*, there is a picture of the bad treatment on black South Africans of the Northern cities in South Africa at the beginning of racial segregation represented by *The Native Land Act*. This act was called the plague act or land act in South Africa. Plaatje’s book exposes the plight of South Africans. He elaborates:

*Now let us consider the position in the Northern Colonies, especially in the misnamed Free State. There a very different picture is presented. From the days that the voortrekkers endeavoured to escape English rule, from the day that they sought the hospitality of Chief Moroka, the history of the treatment of blacks north of the Orange River is one long and uninterrupted record of rapine and greed, without a solitary virtue to redeem the horrors which were committed in the name of civilization. Such is the opinion any impartial student must arrive at from a study even of the meagre records available. If all were told, it would indeed be a bloodcurdling tale, and it is probably well that the world was not acquainted with all that happened. However, the treatment of the Coloured races, even in the Northern Colonies, is just what one might expect from their history. The*
restraints of civilization were flung aside, and the essentials of Christian precepts ignored. The northward march of the voortrekkers was a gigantic plundering raid. They swept like a desolating pestilence through the land, blasting everything in their path, and pitilessly laughing at the ravages from which the native races have not yet recovered (88).

Black people were prevented from making a living except by working for whites on farms or in the city. In the book, Sol Plaatje lamented that:

South Africa has by law ceased to be the home of any of her native children whose skins are dyed with a pigment that does not conform with the regulation hue (45).

Sarah Gertrude Millin’s God’s Step-Children portrays the picture of coloreds in South Africa and their situation as oppressed under the supremacy of whites. From the title of this novel, it can be observed that blacks are God’s stepchildren. By this Millin wanted to prove that all people are created equal in the eyes of God. A holy character in the novel named Reverend Flood is having conversation with one of the (black) Khoi characters, Calchas, which proceeds as follows:

We are all God’s children, he said. But is God himself not white? Asked Calchas. And. as the rev. Andrew Flood hesitated for a reply, she made a suggestion: ‘Perhaps, we brown people are His stepchildren’, she said (Millin 34).

Thus, Millin illustrates that blacks are living in a very humiliating situation dominated by superior whites. The Khoi woman (Calchas) in this conversation seems pessimistic in her thought that the majority of black
people are the stepchildren of God and forgets that all people whether blacks or whites are equal in the eyes of God. These lines represent the worst kind of degradation and humiliation of black South Africans being ruled by the white minority.

During 1940’s South Africa witnessed many South African writers, among them, Peter Abrahams, a writer of mixed role descent published his first novel *Mine Boy* in 1946. *Mine Boy* portrays life in black urban areas of the time, and dramatizes the troubles of rural people in an oppressed urban environment.

Another prominent writer who appeared in the 1940s was Alan Paton who drew the world’s attention to the situation of black people in South Africa. His novel Cry, *the Beloved Country* (1948) is a famous novel. The novel put South Africa on the diagram of worldwide politics by making noticeable to Western audiences the effects of racial discrimination and the repression of black people in South Africa.

The novel depicts complexities and conflicts of European/African experiences, cultures and their relations. Stephen Kumalo, a character in the novel, reveals such complex relation thus:

> It was a white man who taught me. There is not even good farming, he said, without the truth...It was he also who taught me that we do not work for men, that we work for the land and the people. We do not even work for money, he said (Paton 229).

This novel opened a fictional discourse which sought life-sustaining bonds could be forged between people across the color bar. What Paton suggests is, as Gurleena Mehta and Harish Narang remark, “the need for a
Christian solution to the political problem of racialism” (Mehta, and Narang. 34).

The journal Drum was formed in 1951. It achieved outstanding heights of protest writing and made a major contribution to modern South African Literature. Magazine Drum gave not only South Africa but also the African continent a new literary voice. It was the first magazine in which black literary publication released. Literature obtained a peculiar significance that led the world to understand the nature of apartheid and its cruelty. Literary writing by white South Africans was inserted into a moralized frame through which apartheid was constructed as an international issue. World allocation was drawn to the South African problem through the novels by Alan Paton, Nadine Gordimer, Dan Jacobson, and many others.

Like the other African literatures, South African literature has developed out of the long history of colonization and owes to the exceptional context of the apartheid-stricken society. The socio-economic and political setting of the South African society manifests itself in the culture of the country. Thereafter, in its literary artifacts, South African writers turn into commentators of apartheid’s oppressive policy. Engaged in the struggle against apartheid, their writings are characterized by a sense of immediacy due to the intense political situation as well as a strong sense of protest against this regime. The South African writers comment, interpret, and reflect their own response to the problems of their society at the time of apartheid era. In the interview that was conducted by Bernth Lindfors, Chinua Achebe answered:
… it’s impossible to write anything in Africa without some kind of commitment, some kind of message, some kind of protest. Commitment runs right through our work … all our writers, whether they’re aware of it or not, are committed writers (Lindfors 29).

The involvement of the committed writers in the struggle against apartheid is so profound that politics in one way or another creeps into their works. Gordimer observes: “the creative imagination, whatever it seizes upon, finds the focus of even the most private event set in the overall social determination of racial laws” (Gordimer, English-Language 100). In such a highly politicized situation, South African writers find themselves with no other choice but to respond to what they see by evaluating, judging, interpreting, and testifying to the compartmentalized society out of which their themes arise.

South African writers approach critically the society which has either oppressed them, like blacks, or has confined them in the cell of their skin and cut them off from the majority of the people, as in the case of the white writers. South African writing is, therefore, marked by the same color bar that has been at work in the other aspects of the society. The delimited perspective imposed on them due to the segregation politics of apartheid features both black and white writings.

Nadine Gordimer illustrates that one thing a white can never experience is blackness with all that implies in South Africa: a black man can never experience whiteness. A novelist’s interpretation always remains imperfect because each-black and white-is largely outside the other’s realm of experience. Gordimer’s remark, “my consciousness has the same tint as my face” (qtd. in Clingman, Writing in a Fractured 162) means
that the committed writer’s potential has inescapable limitations. South African writers share a common sense of commitment and political engagement; they get involved with their historical context differently because of their unequal social situation under apartheid that has inflicted on them a demarcated scope of observation.

South African novels draw their critical force from the stance of one particular situation. The black or the colored novelist, himself/herself is a victim of oppression and exploitation, writes from the inside about the experience of blackness. He has never been allowed to mingle with the other race. S/He cannot know about the white man’s life, because s/he is excluded from the large areas of white experience. In his/her depiction of a white man, s/he resorts to his/her fantasy that is distorted by resentment at the exclusion. In consequence, her/his presentation of white characters, in Gordimer’s words, is mostly in the form of caricature. Similarly, the white writer’s work suffers from the same limitations. He is distanced from the greater part of the society in which s/he lives by the imposed privilege. The white writer’s depiction of this oppressed majority is the tentative result of his/her fantasy (Gordimer, English-Language 119). In this respect, Gordimer’s earlier fiction suffers from the same representational deficiencies regarding her portrait of the other race from which she has been segregated; yet her fiction displays her growing racial awareness as she transcends the color bar more and more. In her essay, The Novel and the Nation in South Africa, Nadine Gordimer comments on the color question:

... It still is the question. It’s far more than a matter of prejudice or discrimination of conflict of loyalties – all things you can take leave alone: we have built a morality on it. We have gone even deeper: we have
created our own sense of sin and our own form of tragedy (39).

The rapid urbanization of South Africa was rooted in the 1913 *Land Act*, which set aside reserves for the black population, outside of which they could only occupy land as squatters or tenants. Thus, blacks were forced to move to the cities to sell their labor and work in cities for the benefits of whites. It led in turn to further legislation segregating the cities according to race.

Abrahams and Mphahlele grew up under the effects of this restrictive legislation, which made them write about such issues as responsible writers. Mphahlele’s *Down Second Avenue* 1959 describes the urban life in the cities dominated by whites:

*The black people conditioned themselves by the day, so as to survive. And the more the white man needed them for his work, the more he hated them. More people poured into Pretoria from the north and the east. The more insecure people felt, the more permanent they looked, as they burrowed into location life, putting up tin shacks on the small plots allotted to the residents. Perpetual refugees seeking life and safety* (Mphahlele 93).

These lines by Mphahlele compare the situation of black slum and white city. In contrast, the white city is a symbol of stability, social aspiration and power. The difference here is clear that the blacks are deprived of the benefits of urban (city) life whereas the whites enjoy the benefits of the city and regard themselves as the purveyors of civilization.

At the dawn of apartheid system of racial and class discrimination, blacks under privileged white South Africans suffered varied forms of
violence, deprived from the political, economic, cultural and social rights. As a reaction to the violence of apartheid system, Alex La Gumas’s novels, *A Walk in the Night* (1962), *The Stone Country* (1967) and *In the Fog of the Season’s End* (1972) are artistic responses to knock over the logic of apartheid through an imaginative consciousness couched in revolutionary aesthetics, which is art of protest for societal change and human advancement.

Alex La Guma’s fiction continuously confronts and questions the principles of apartheid, whose prepared philosophy is bordered on violence. La Guma’s fiction intersects with the historical developments that pervade apartheid; this will place his fiction within the borders of historical enquiry into the dynamics of apartheid and its consequence. The history referred to in this example is that of violence that characterized apartheid South Africa. Patrick Wilmot in his book *Apartheid and African Liberation: The Grief and the Hope* writes about apartheid:

*Apartheid signifies many things to many people, to some, an object of blind outrage, to others a system of economic exploitation, to some – a system of racial segregation, to others a political organization of a European minority to deny the liberty, rights and dignity of the African majority* (xi).

La Guma experienced himself as a prisoner: brutality, discrimination, cruelty and antagonism that permeates the South African society at the time of apartheid state, as it is seen in *The Stone Country*:

*The heat in the cell was solid... you could reach out in front of your face grab a handful of heat, fling it at the wall and it would stick. With over forty prisoners locked up in the middle of summer, the smell of sweat*
was heavy and cloying as the smell of death. The heat seemed packed in between the bodies of the men, like buyers of cotton wool, like a thick sauce which moistened a human salad... Many already depraved and several old and abandoned sucking hopelessly at the bitter, disintegrating butt-end of life (Guma 80).

In Alex La Guma’s *The Stone Country*, a political prisoner, George Adams’ appeals to the moral courage of the prisoners:

*You were on the side of the mouse, of all the mice...The little men who get kicked in the backside all time. You got punched and beaten like the mouse, and you had to duck and dodge to avoid the claws and fangs* (127).

Adam wants to curse the prison as well as the whole country, which is like a stone prison hoping to change the political system in which black South Africans suffered a lot during apartheid era. Through these lines, La Guma has portrayed a full picture of the hardships and frustrations that the people of South Africa faced.

Though South African writers raised their voices in protest against apartheid, censorship prevented most of their writings from being read in South Africa. Consequently, anti-apartheid writers for example Nadine Gordimer, André Brink, Richard Rive, Peter Abrahams and many others had their works banned in South Africa. Moreover, many South African writers, such as Rive, Alex La Guma, were jailed on Robben Island for their writing and political activities. Many other writers of anti-apartheid literature, mainly Black, colored and mixed-race writers such as Rive, Abrahams, La Guma, Lewis Nkosi, and Ezekiel Es’kia Mphahlale were exiled or went into self-exile to get away from political oppression. Before the official establishment of the apartheid regime, South African writers such as Olive
Schreiner and Sol Plaatje criticized the injustice of racial segregation and unjust economic policies that were in effect before the South African National Party institutionalized such practices. Although anti-apartheid literature is multi-faceted and deals with many aspects of human experience, in general there have been two major traditions—the white, liberal tradition begun by Schreiner and continued, in varying degrees, by Alan Paton and Gordimer.

Protest tradition originated in the Black townships, out of which came the fiction of many literary figures for instance Abrahams, Rive, Modisane and La Guma. Some of these writers exposed the forced removals of colored and black people from their residence to separated townships outside the cities, such as, the obligatory removals of blacks and coloreds from the formerly multi-racial suburb of Sophiatown in Johannesburg and District Six in Cape Town. District Six, formerly named Kanaladorp, was built between 1885 and 1905 and occupied an area with Table Mountain on one side and the Cape Town port on the other. Although the majority of its inhabitants were Coloreds, a large number of Africans and European immigrants lived there as well; they thus created a mixed community. Originally, District Six was resided mainly by the working class. It became a slum by 1950. There were, however, some positive aspects of life in District Six: “the people living there created a closely-knit community strongly identifying with their locale” (Rive 127). They considered District Six their real home, moreover because it was also “the heart of coloured culture in the city” (Loflin 80).

The end of District Six falls on February 11, 1966, when it was announced as a white area. The compulsory removals began two years later
when the first District Six population were removed to the Cape Flats, a Cape Town township outside the city.

An event that was experienced by many township residents in apartheid South Africa is thus reflected in Rive’s novel with all its features and consequences. *Buckingham Palace, District Six* is a novel by Richard Rive about the life in District Six before the town was allotted to the whites, during the time when the black people were being told to leave and after they all left. In the first two parts of the book, the detailed fact of life in District Six is narrated. Rive celebrates the efforts of the community whose members stand by each other no matter what and no matter that they have no closer binds than living in the same place. Although none of them are obedient citizens, the reader cannot accuse them as they are all depicted as good people with morals who love District Six and protect it as their only and real home. The possible reason for presenting District Six as a lovable place than it actually was can be found in the remarks of one of the characters, Milton Zoot:

*You know, it’s a funny thing, but it’s only in the District that I feel safe. District Six is like an island, if you follow me, an island in the sea of apartheid. The whole of District Six is one big apartheid, so we can’t see it. We only see it when the white man comes and forces it on us, when he makes us see it – when the police come, and the council people and so on – or when we leave the District, when we leave our island [...]. Then we see apartheid. I know the District is dirty and poor and a slum [...] but it’s our own and we have never put up notices which say “Slegs blankes” or “Whites only”. They put up the notices (qtd. in Tucker 69).*
Sophiatown is the suburb where the black people reside near Johannesburg. The people of Sophiatown were forcibly removed; some of them were given an option to live in the outlying townships of Meadowlands, Diepkloof and Moroka, which now make up part of Soweto. The removal of the black spot of Sophiatown was part of an urban policy under apartheid government. Bloke Modisane writes in *Blame Me on History* that:

_Sophiatown died, not because it was a social embarrassment, but because it was a political corn inside the apartheid boot* (14).

Modisane’s argument towards Sophiatown reflects his awareness that it is partly a product of discriminatory legislation, with its lack of amenities, its poverty and its crime. In short, the codification of race and entrenchment of apartheid ideology represented a new experience for blacks in South Africa, and the recollection of Sophiatown became a site of resistance to this ideology.

Moreover, the statement of Bloke Modisane shows that the apartheid government through these removals created in many cases, a real homelessness or exile for black residents in Sophiatown. Regarding the political and social removals of Sophiatown, Tom Lodge argues that:

_The Sophiatown removals (...) were representative of a much wider social process in which many old-established inner-city African communities were uprooted and reconstructed under the supervision of the authorities. In the course of these upheavals old relationships and social networks were disrupted and sometimes destroyed. The political quiescence of the 1960s was at least in part the result of the social disorientation that accompanied the transition from_
In line with Lodge’s argument, it can be said that the Sophiatown removals tore at social ties that had crossed all tribal and color lines, and had created a deep fragmentation that led to enormous problems and factional fighting. In this action under apartheid government, almost 65,000 people were removed from Sophiatown. At the time, in the first removal operation, two thousands police arrived three days earlier than planned and residents were forced to pack their belongings quickly under the watch of guns.

Brink is a writer who wrote against the injustices of apartheid. Brink’s fictional approach in the novel offers an interpretation of events in apartheid South Africa, including social stratification, alienation, segregation and racial discrimination. Therefore, what is seen in Brink’s *The Wall of the Plague* is a broader depiction of the issue of apartheid. In this novel, Andrea Malga represents the gory and dehumanizing situation of South African people as:

> The point is, I got the impression that a country like South Africa has no place for people who simply want to carry on living, indulge in their sins, have a good meal from time to time, enjoy a bit of music or a good painting or a good book. You’re forced to walk right into the fire. Otherwise, the only choices you have are to go mad or to die (Brink 37).

Brink emphasized that apartheid is more than a socio-political concept; it expands to sex, religion, occupation, status and level of education. As a visionary writer, Brink does not fail to give solutions for contending the policy of apartheid:
You can’t get rid of racism by treating it like the plague: the only way is to regard them as sick people who have to be healed with patience. Until at last we’ll all have grown out of our mental Middle Ages into a slightly more civilized future (Brink 220).

Brink’s vision that the solution to end the problem of interracial conflict in apartheid South Africa is the idea of reaching out beyond the boundaries of race for human contact.

Miriam Tlali wrote the novel *Amandla* that documented the history of 1976 Soweto rebellion and its culmination in detention and exile. It traces the effects of apartheid on black protesters in *Soweto Uprising*. It also portrays, rather than mass action, more or less individual pockets of resistance. The text presents action, which is defeated rather than victorious. The protagonist of the novel, Pholoso, allows Tlali to speak to her readers from various points of view that the different communities of black South Africans have been affected by such riots of *Soweto Uprising* when police opened fire on the protesters. Pholoso presents an objective view of Soweto that shaped in the dawn of the uprisings, explaining the origin of its close-knit community:

*Almost everyone in Soweto had had some personal reason never to forget the 16th of June of the previous year. There had been varying forms of tribulation in nearly every household and family circle. The agony of loss and disaster had left its indelible mark on everyone. The after-effects of the student demonstration and resultant widespread riots were similar to the perils suffered during wars and epidemics* (Tlali 272).
This shows that the police killed the students in Soweto mercilessly. It was a shock for every person in Soweto that intensified the riots and violence.

The novel presents the true nature of the revolutionary program in resisting apartheid. In the novel Amandla, Pholoso has to mask his identity in order to protect his revolutionary program as students’ leader in the Uprising. Pholoso uses the Christian/colonial name Moses. Pholoso’s survival depends upon his becoming Moses. Pholoso has to disguise himself, and the final disguise, the final denial of identity is located in Pholoso’s going into exile, with which the novel ends:

I never wanted to flee, Felleng. I have to go because the student leaders think it is the best thing, better than rotting in jail. The police dragnet is closing in on us. All known leaders are in jail (288).

Thus, Pholoso’s going into exile is sarcastically a sign of defeat as much as of victory. Exile is a necessity, a symbolic move to influence a readership to struggle. Exile, thus, is a necessity made a virtue.

Mongane Serote, as one of the prominent literary writers was engaged in political activism and development of black identity for which he was arrested under the Terrorism Act in June 1969. Serote had spent nine months in lonely imprisonment before he was released without being accused.

Serote’s To Every Birth Its Blood 1981 was a novel written during the dark times of apartheid regime. It deals with an aspect of apartheid townships and anti-apartheid struggle. The chief character of the novel is Tsi, a journalist who works for a white owned daily newspaper in Johannesburg. Throughout the first part of the novel, he opposes joining the
movement, a political organization that is not further specified, although he is aware that many of his close friends have already done so. He tries to solve his agitation, dissatisfaction, disturbance and hopelessness in a way very typical of township men through drinking, sex and aimless roaming. Tsi’s family is critically affected by the apartheid policies which frustrated people’s daily lives and which put people in prison without any legal trial. Tsi’s brother, Fix, is jailed at Robben Island and none has any news of him.

In this story, Serote shows the overpowering control, which the apartheid government had over these people’s lives. Serote, influenced by the situation of the after-Soweto era, prophesies South African future in the worst possible light, as he believes that there is no other way to change the country but the fight. He sets this thought into the characters of the novel, for instance, Dikeledi, whose father is imprisoned in Robben Island as a political prisoner:

She understood so well that South Africa had shut out all other choices. There was no way now that any other thing could be done with the present way of life, with this South Africa, [...] there was nothing else that could be done to save it; there was only one way left – people had to fight (Serote 132).

Serote seems to state that apartheid government affects the lives of people in South Africa especially blacks. They were sent into Robben Island jail by the apartheid state and the only way out is to fight.

On the other hand, Nadine Gordimer comes out as the most creative writer to write fiction from the long experience of apartheid. Her worldwide literary eminence is achieved by her role within South Africa as an activist
in the culture of resistance, and an articulate antagonist of censorship, detention without trial, and Bantu education, and as a tireless organizer of writers across the racial partitions. Gordimer’s importance is the equivalence between the beginnings of her career as writer and the rise to power of the dominated National Party, which has ruled South Africa continuously since 1948. Her thirteen novels, hundreds of short stories, and copious essays of political and literary comments offer a uniquely creative record of the era of apartheid in South Africa. This record gains depth from Gordimer’s acute sensitivity to the history of her times. Among many South African contemporary writers in English, she shows an unequaled ability to combine the shifting political tempers of her society into the very form and texture of her fiction.

Nadine Gordimer’s portrayals of the structure and experience of apartheid are well known, and have received much critical attention. Nadine Gordimer received Nobel Prize for Literature in 1991. Most of Nadine Gordimer’s works deal with the moral and psychological tensions of her racially divided home country. She was a founding member of Congress of South African Writers, and even at the height of the apartheid regime, she never considered going into exile.

Nadine Gordimer was born of Jewish parents on 20 November 1923 in Springs, a gold-mining town outside Johannesburg, South Africa. Her father had fled the czarist anti Semitism of Lithuania and in Springs he learned watch making and became a jeweler. Her mother was born in England. Thus, Springs town was the setting for Gordimer’s first novel, The Lying Days (1953). From her early childhood, Gordimer witnessed how the white minority increasingly weakened the rights of the black majority.
Clingman argues that Gordimer’s novels provide a deep understanding of the history of South Africa, not simply because of their content, however, especially because of their form:

_Gordimer’s novels are so valuable historically because they are so accomplished and developed as fiction. Thus, form will often be the key to consciousness, and it is where the novels are aesthetically richest that they are most useful for tracing out our history_ (Clingman, The Novels 19).

Gordimer shows in her novels a wide series of diverse voices telling how people experienced racial history in South Africa, different perspectives that give a profound understanding of the second half of the twentieth century up to the elimination of apartheid, and show the junction of private lives and the municipal history of South Africa. Her novels thus pretense in acute form the question of whose story will be told, and who will tell it. Bruce King, in an analysis of the evolution of Gordimer’s novels, asserts, “the novel form evolved to become increasingly ‘postmodern’ and multivoiced” (3). This diversity of voices and the corresponding shifts in viewpoint, obvious in each of the novels, provide ways to explore the close connection between the personal and the political. Aware of the possibilities of viewpoint manipulation, the writer often exhibits alternating points of view that show from very different perspectives how people were influenced and determined by the politics of South Africa. The flexibility in her manipulation of point of view in portraying the effects of apartheid and political history of South African people is observed in most of her works especially novels that are taken for the study.
Gordimer was a patriot and proud to be an African. Gordimer has repeatedly stated her view of what it means to be African in terms of an inclusive, indigenous culture. She clearly did not see herself as a European, despite her European roots. However, as a white who identifies herself as an African and is committed to a common culture with blacks.

Being a writer in South Africa, Gordimer has been complicated by the censorship laws, which were designed to stop the publication, not only on authors’ works but also on publishers as well. Gordimer has spoken out many times against censors. She is quite correct to point out the political reason for censorship and banning of book by South African writers:

. . . All those books by South African writers which have been banned, have been banned for a political reason: non-conformity with the picture of South African life as prescribed and proscribed by apartheid (Gordimer, Telling Times 122).

Gordimer defines protest as:

…arising as an ancillary to political opposition in situations where the political machinery is defective in allowing opposition its due voice and corrective influence (Gordimer, and Clingman 89).

In other words, Gordimer argues that the South African culture of protest arose accurately because of the apartheid government’s enforced repression of ideas. In a country where citizens may not express political opinions, they are forced to give voice to their opinions in alternative forms. Such powerful alternative form is literature. Apartheid prevented the majority “blacks” from their rights, which resulted in protest literature. Therefore, that protest literature gives these people a voice. Brink in his book Writing in a State of Siege: Essays on Politics and Literature claims,
“Much of the future lies in the hands of the South African blacks themselves” (149).

Nadine Gordimer was very optimistic that Black South Africans would free themselves and live free in due course of time. She prophesied in her short story Some Monday for Sure:

I knew it must be a Monday. I notice that women quite often don’t remember ordinary things like this, I don’t know what they think about- for instance, Emma didn’t catch on that it must be Monday, next Monday or the one after, some Monday for sure, because Monday was the day that we knew Josias went with the truck to the Free State mines (125).

She suggested that on some day, for sure, black South Africans would free themselves and rule themselves. History has borne out her belief, yet the observation that the day was ordinary is true after the guerilla activity of more than a decade. This day came true in May 1994.

Gordimer’s apartheid writings had an easier relation to social and historical realities and clearer connections, which she deemed necessary for the fidelity with which the writer depicts his/her times. Her novels, short stories, and even essays of the apartheid years were clearly political in their opposition to apartheid. She saw writing as a liberating political act that legitimates itself through the authority of history. Nadine Gordimer made a distinction for herself as an author by undertaking an outstanding position in literature as a privileged, white female writer supporting the dilemma of poor black South Africans.

Nadine Gordimer’s apartheid writings were of active treatment of apartheid themes. Really, Gordimer easily aligned herself with the fate of
her country and its turbulent history and has dedicated her apartheid writings to document its history.

Chapter two of this study deals with racial discrimination and colored identity in Gordimer’s *The Lying Days* (1953) and *My Son’s Story* (1990). It examines the impact of racial discrimination on the colored and black South Africans during apartheid time. Chapter three presents the psycho-political development and marginalization in Gordimer’s *Burger’s Daughter* (1979) and *The Late Bourgeois World* (1966). Chapter four discusses the subversion of power and the problem of alienation in *The Conservationist* (1974) and *July’s People* (1981). Chapter five is devoted to a detailed discussion of the conclusion arrived at through the analysis of the novels under study.